

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14th March, 1961.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES and Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*).

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.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:-

Chief Secretary's Office,
Barbados,
13th March, 1961.

Sir,

I have to refer to your letter of 6th March, 1961, and to inform you that His Excellency the Governor would be pleased to receive the Reply from the Honourable the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor's Speech on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature on 10th January, 1961, on Tuesday, 21st March, 1961 at 3.15 p.m.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
L. Achille Pinard,
Acting Chief Secretary."

PAPERS LAID

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Fourth Annual Report of the Barbados Housing Authority for the financial year, 1st April, 1959, to 31st March, 1960.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, may I on behalf of my colleague ask the following question?

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

Will the Minister state whether he now has anything to add to his reply to Question No. 17/1960, with respect to the teaching of Economics at Queen's College.

2. Will he further state whether he intends to allow this subject to be taught in all the Grant-aided Secondary Schools and, if so, at what level or levels, and as from when?

Mr. SEARLES:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Government aware that at present illegitimate children of a deceased father are unable to receive any compensation under the provisions of the Fatal Accidents Act?

2. Will the Government consider taking immediate steps to amend the law so as to permit illegitimate children to benefit under the Act?

Mr. SEARLES:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Government aware that the legal position in Barbados still is that on an intestacy the eldest male descendant of a deceased person inherits all the real estate?

2. Will the Government consider the early introduction of legislation to provide for a fair and equitable distribution of the assets of a deceased person among all of his children?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the first Order of the Day, I beg to move that Orders Nos. 1, 2 and 3 be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5,

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

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

12.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: As the Chairman of Committees is not here at present, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. James be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees during the temporary absence of the Chairman of Committees.

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

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

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER No. 2 AS FIRST ORDER

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that when the House adjourned on the last occasion, it was agreed that Order No. 2 should be Order No. 1. I am asking leave for the postponement of Order No. 1 and to take Order No. 2 as the first Order of the Day. It is customary to take the Appropriation Bill first; and when it passes its second reading, that it should be referred to the Committee of Supply and then deal with the Money Resolutions. I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 1 and that Order No. 2 should be the first Order of the Day.

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

NOTICE OF QUESTION

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask leave of the House to put certain questions now, questions which I had entrusted to the office since last week; but they were so so carefully put away that they were now found. If there is no objection to my putting the questions now, I shall do so.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

"Is it true that the local Port Manager has advised the management of Paradise Beach Club, St. Michael, that the latter may 'keep a 20,000 square feet area (200 ft. long by 100 ft. wide) in the sea, roped off for the club's guests'?"

2. If the above is true, is it a fact that there is such a roped-off area, previously marked "keep off", but currently marked "no mooring"?

3. Have any other hoteliers or club proprietors contacted the said Port Manager re roping off other areas within the territorial waters of this Island for the accommodation of their private guests?

4. If the answer to my first query is "yes", did the Port Manager acquaint his Minister that he proposed to tender such advice to the Management of this club before tendering same; and did he obtain the sanction of the Cabinet, or of the Minister, to give such advice to said club Management?

5. If Government sanctions, or at least does not condemn, such a roped-off area within our territorial waters will Government cause it to be universally known, through this Island, that such area is as available to and at the disposal of non-guests, as it is for guests of this club, and in fact as any other portion of the sea or beach (up to high water mark) around our island is at the disposal of everybody regardless of alleged social status, colour, or race?

6. If reply to first question is (a) "no", will Government state whether there has been a roped-off area in the sea off Paradise Beach Club at any time this month, and for what period? (b) "Yes", will Government state whether Police have instructions to report, or prosecute, anyone in respect of any boat whatsoever (to whomsoever belonging) being moored there?

THE APPROPRIATION BILL 1961-62

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume the second reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending on the 31st March, 1962.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not here on Thursday last to hear the Hon. Premier deliver his Budget Speech; but I have a copy of it, and I have noted certain things on it. He said that there were no new proposals; it was just a housekeeping budget this year.

Sir, we are budgeting this year for approximately \$1 1/2 million deficit. Last year, we proposed to budget for a deficit of \$1/2 million because it was felt at that time that that year's crop would be 125,000 tons of sugar. We all know that that was a great underestimation; and that we ended the year with a gross tonnage of 153,000 tons of sugar. But in the interval, Government introduced certain tax proposals, one of which was the motor car tax which was a surcharge of an additional 10%; and that, plus the increased estimate of the sugar, resulted in a surplus this year of over \$1 million. Therefore, what was estimated to be a deficit of \$1/2 million turned out to be a surplus of \$1 million. It is good that we should have that \$1 million surplus; that can be applied to the \$1 1/2 million deficit which we have budgeted for this year.
12.35 p.m.

I am not alarmed at a deficit of \$1 1/2 million under our present finances; although the general revenue balance is in the vicinity of \$5 million and it is the Government's proposal this year to use the entire lot of that money in their Capital expenditure which will result at the end of 1962 in having no revenue balance, we can still point to another reserve under another name to be contributed from the taxpayers. Nevertheless, the Revenue Equilisation Fund stands at \$10 million.

When that Fund was first introduced, I think it was introduced in the days when Governor Savage was here; it was his idea. It was contributed out of current revenue to the tune of \$250,000 a year plus one half of the surplus in any year. That has accumulated and it is a balance provided to cushion in any year in which we have a short crop. We felt last year that increased taxation was unnecessary; we felt so then and we feel so today; the taxpayers in Barbados are the most heavily taxed in the West Indies. That has been stated by economists, who have investigated the matter over and over again, from Jamaica and British Guiana.

When we take into account the inadequate allowances which are given here for education and living expenses as against those in Trinidad, Jamaica and the others, our net income per individual, to say nothing about trade and industry, our taxation is higher. I cannot see the wisdom of Government last year in having these additional taxes.

This year they have decided not to resort to any further avenues of taxation; in the Premier's word, they are going to give a breathing space. This year, with the completion of the Deep Water Harbour and the Airport, which are two projects of great capital expenditure for our resources, we are now at the cross-roads. We find ourselves this year in a public debt in the vicinity of \$39 million. Now we are called upon to service loans and the charges for the servicing of these loans will be well over \$2 million by way of interest and sinking fund. That is a large sum for our economy; and we should now take active steps to see that we should not depend upon the sugar industry to carry the full burden.

In recent years we have made half-hearted attempts to attract other things here; I emphasise the word "half-hearted." Although our Development Board was established eight years after we thought about it, and although we have given it something like \$2 million to attract other capital in, the incentives which we give to capitalists from overseas are still always two beats behind Jamaica and Trinidad. We have never been able to catch up with them because we have not approached the matter in a bold enough manner.

We speak about industrialisation but what have we got here so far? We have two or three little factories at Gratzettes and one or two around Bridgetown; whereas in Jamaica and in Trinidad, they can boast of having at least another six industries. There are over forty in Jamaica and

almost as many in Trinidad. When these industrialists do come in here they find that they are frustrated in many ways; they have to go cap in hand asking for concessions which they thought they had when they first came in. When you have disgruntled pioneer industrialists in the island, when they are allowed to believe that they were entitled to certain things and then they do not get them, that will not be a good precedent for others to follow.

We have a new man as Manager of the Development Board. I say: Do not tie his hands. To bring in industrialists here is one thing but keeping them is another. Let investors know in advance what they can get; if you once do that you will find that others are willing to come in. We give a tax holiday of five years, but Trinidad is now toying with the idea of giving them a tax holiday of ten years.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. Did I understand the hon. member to say that Trinidad is now toying with that? May I ask the hon. member what he said as to comparing the incentives given in Barbados with those in Trinidad? Will he say what Trinidad has that Barbados has not got?

Mr. GODDARD: They have an active and interested Government which we have not got. (*Laughter*) When investors come to talk with the Government here it is as a matter of pulling teeth. In Trinidad they have a Development Board with a responsible Minister and they get things done. That is all the difference. In Trinidad, raw material is permitted to come in free of duty. When investors come here, they want to know what raw material is permitted to come in free of duty. When investors come here they want to know what raw material is for local consumption and what is for local export. These are the little annoyances which keep people not knowing where they are.
12.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I do not think that the hon. member is correct in saying that, at this stage, in Trinidad raw materials are duty free. That is not so, Sir. Not all sorts of raw material in Trinidad are duty free at all.

Mr. GODDARD: I am speaking of pioneer industry. Anyhow, the big difference is the approach to the encouragement of capital and industries by the Trinidad Government and the Barbados Government. You must put your house in order. We have a large capital loan to service. I emphasise that the sugar industry to my way of thinking - I am not a planter - has almost reached its limit. In one year we reached 202,000 tons but we have dropped back to 180,000 and 152,000 tons. Suppose we reached 220,000 tons, though I cannot see it, that would still be our limit. We need something other than sugar.

We have been attempting to encourage the tourist industry, but that still has its limits. The tourist industry needs careful handling with money being spent in the proper way. As I am dealing with that, I might as well say that I am glad to see that the Government this year has put at the disposal of the Tourist Board \$1/2 million for advertising, and for trying to attract more visitors to this island. I commend them. I was the pioneer in here for getting that done; not today, but twelve years ago. Government has now awakened to the idea that the tourist industry is something to be sought after.

What is needed at this moment - and we can spend some of that \$1/2 million on it - is the establishment of a training school for the hotel people. You should not spend all on advertisement; you should earmark a portion to assist in a proper training school to develop a healthy hotel industry. It is no use bringing people here and putting them in hotels if the service is going to be bad. The hotels need assistance too; and they are prepared to pull their weight; and that is something you can assist them in doing. Do not let that suggestion go by the way; make a note of it, and direct that some of this money be spent for training these people.

My remarks are also directed to the Minister of Education, because that should fall under his portfolio too. He

should see that active steps are taken to implement such a training scheme; he knows that this idea has been toyed with for the last three years, and nothing has been done. Proposals were put to the Government but they said that no money was available at the time. Well, you have \$1/2 million now; so earmark \$50,000 of that as a start this year. The hotel keepers will assist in their way by training inasmuch as they are anxious to have trained personnel in the industry. It is another industry that will help to strengthen our economy.

Now while I am on industries, I may as well comment on a remark by the Hon. Premier on the rum industry. The Premier in his remarks asked the rum industry to see that rum was aged and matured for the expansion in trade, especially to meet when customs union comes into being. I am very glad that he has taken note of that, and that he has warned the industry of what is ahead. I know that the Premier knows more about it, but he did not say the whole thing.

Barbados can boast of the best rum in the West Indies. That is nothing new, or something that we know today; we knew it for all times. The reason why I say that is because with duties being equal throughout the West Indies, you will find Barbados' rum in all the markets of the West Indies except those territories which exclude it specifically. On the other hand, you find no other rum in Barbados but Barbados' rum. We do not keep out other West Indian rums through tax.

Mr. Speaker, you will find Barbados' rum from Jamaica back down to Trinidad; I am not sure if it goes to British Guiana; but when we have customs union, and if no tricks are played by the big colonies, we have every reason to believe that Barbados' rum will go in greater quantities into Jamaica, Trinidad and the other islands. We sell to the other islands in great quantity, but this should be a warning to the industry. In Barbados we have large stocks for local consumption, but with the opening of a big market like Jamaica and Trinidad and the widening of that market, our stocks will not be large enough to supply that aged, matured rum which they would want; and that is another danger about it. Trinidad with their very large stocks of rum may easily impose on the industry an appropriate certificate of age, and then we will find that the stocks in Barbados will not be adequate to provide the markets of these big territories. I have been asked across the Table why is something not done about it.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I was only asking the hon. member why he is putting something in their mouths, or their heads, as the case may be, by saying they may well impose an age certificate on the rum.

Mr. GODDARD: If the Minister thinks that they have not been thinking and talking about that already, he is far behind hand; they have been talking to the Premier in Trinidad about that. I am not giving out any secrets. Those business people are very keen down there. We know the conversations that went on.

What I am saying is that, if you wish larger stocks of rum to meet that eventually when it arises - I can see it is going to come - greater stocks will have to be put down here. How are you going to do it? More capital has to be found, you have to put up buildings and racks, and you have to find barrels to put down rum for two or three years. That takes an awful lot of capital; and with the taxation that exists today on trading interests, there is no provision made to find the capital to do that. That is something for the Premier now to look into.
12.55 p.m.

It is for the Premier to call the operators of the rum industry together and ask them what proposals they have to make for that. I go further. In Barbados there is a Still Tax on rum which used to be four cents per gallon; it is now raised to eight cents per gallon. In Jamaica and Trinidad, they have not got that tax; so we start off here at a disadvantage of eight cents rightaway. I am sure that the Hon. Premier knows that there is a tax of eight cents on every gallon of rum produced at the Still even if it evaporates. If we have to get in and stay in the export mar-

ket, then those are things which should be noted and acted upon by the Government.

In the Memorandum on the Estimates, and in the Hon. Premier's speech, I am glad to note that he has made mention of the wide trade gap this year. There has been a large increase over previous years, and you can see where a lot of the money came from. Loans from the commercial banks have risen considerably this year. I am sure the Hon. Premier is well aware that that has come about as a result of the purchasing of goods, especially of a capital nature, on hire-purchase terms. Olds Discount Limited has come to Barbados, and they have taken up where businesses could not go. We have been bringing in more refrigerators and things of that nature; and the masses of the people are buying such things with very small deposits but with high interest rates.

This is a form of trade which you get in all countries; and there are arguments in favour and arguments against it. One argument is that people are paying too dear a price for the commodity but, on the other hand, if that person had not had access to such a facility, he would never have owned the article. It is for the Government to strike the happy balance; and in big countries financial steps have been taken to keep that in true perspective. It is even more important to us because, in Great Britain, and in America, they use the bank rate to adjust that; and they also state the minimum deposit money which must be paid down on the article. They say that a purchaser must deposit, say, not less than 20% on motor cars, but that you pay 30% down on a refrigerator. That is done with a dual purpose: (1) to keep a credit on reasonable grounds; and (2) to increase the flow of production, or to slow it down for the export market. Those countries are mainly manufacturing and industrial countries who are manufacturing goods for export; but we are concerned with the credit, and that can be easily watched; if not, we can run into great trouble.

I do have confidence in the people of Barbados; and that they themselves would use certain restrictions and would not acquire everything they see, and therefore run up tremendous debts. It is to be remembered that, by buying articles on hire-purchase, you are paying more because you have high rates of interest.

Sir, you will note in the Memorandum that the revenue on Customs Duties has risen considerably in the last two years. I do believe that a large portion of that now is due to the opening of the American market, which took place about two years ago. More American goods are coming in; and merchants are paying high rates of duty. Instead of paying 12 1/2%, they are paying 25%; and that is reflected in an increased revenue to the Government. Many of the same items are the commodities now being paid for under the hire-purchase system.

As I mentioned earlier, the estimated cost of main items allied to the port construction proper and port facilities is \$2.25 million. However, the opening of the Deep Water Harbour and the savings that should be effected there should be able to meet that cost.

The Hon. Premier mentioned that we will have a salaries revision this year. No one can say what it will amount to; and it would have been unwise for the Premier to state the figure even if he had had one in mind; he is not the Commissioner.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I cannot hear the hon. member.

Mr. GODDARD: I said that the Hon. Premier mentioned that a salaries revision will take place during the year and also that there would be a displacement fund. That sum will be required so as to pay pensions, gratuities and/or contributions to displaced port workers this year. I think I heard another Minister say that that amount would be \$1.75 million, but he did not state from what fund that amount would be taken. I presume that before the debate ends some Minister will say from where that fund will be

appropriated. It is not in this Appropriation Bill, but mentioned has been made of it. The amount for Salaries Revision will also have to be provided this year. Those will be two large expenditures which have not been included in the Appropriation Bill.

1.05 p.m.

The Premier has told us that no new or additional taxation is intended this year; and therefore I presume that it would be taken from one of the other funds.....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am sorry I did not catch that.

Mr. GODDARD: I said that the Premier has said that no additional taxation is intended this year, so I presume that before the debate is completed or before he replies, he will mention from which of the executive funds this money will come.

As predicted by us when we started this emigration scheme, we have seen that large sums of money have flourished back to Barbados. Last year the amount reached \$6 million, therefore we can see that that money will continue to come for many years. With the provision of \$1 million this year to assist those who are going to England and elsewhere, we can look forward to a great number of people going out. Four thousand persons went overseas last year, which was a large increase on the previous year; and I expect that the number will be the same or more this year. We know that remittances will continue to come back.

In years gone by when people emigrated to America, for years and years money was returned to relatives here in one way or another; and much of that money provided the nucleus of capital for those who will return eventually. They will return to find capital here; and we hope that they will bring in new status. We have a large labour supply, but with industries coming in, unless the industrialists can find some trained workers, it will mean that difficulties will be placed in their way. If we cannot find these workers here, we will have to go to Trinidad for them; that is why I stress that training should be done here at all levels and for all skills. I am glad to know that the Minister of Education particularly is interested in that. I hope that this year will not pass without some evidence seen that that note has been made by the Hon. Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the development which has taken place here should put us in a position to attract industries and other avenues of employment for people. If that is done, you will find people returning here to take up some of these jobs which will be better paid in new industries. With the economic development which we are looking forward to take place with our Deep Water Harbour and the Airport, we are looking forward to the return of many of those persons who have got these skills overseas. We can do with them.

Another phase of development which has not been mentioned in the past, and for which I have great hopes, is the bunkering of ships in the coming years. I am told that applications so far from Steamship Companies have been so great that, if a reasonable percentage of these enquiries were to come here, you would find that the Harbour will be too small in a short time! (*Laughter*). I do not wish to give the impression that the Harbour is too small; I have always said that the size of the Harbour is quite adequate for the handling of cargo in and out of Barbados. But if you are going to add to that the bunkering of ships, and most of them would have to come inside, then the Harbour may be too small.

I would love to see the day when the Harbour will prove to be too small - but only after it has been sufficiently operated. It can be too small with ships lying idle inside. I do not want that; I want boats to come in, discharge their cargo, go out and make room for other boats. If we are going to place bunkering and the handling of cargo in and out, then I can readily understand the remarks of that Captain who said that the Harbour is too small. Provision should be made for the bunkering of ships somewhere else

with an extension, but it is too early for us to say that the Harbour is too small.

I have every hope and wish that the Deep Water Harbour will get off to a good start: because, with that and the Airport, with the coming of Jets, I can see a good economic development if it is properly handled at Government quarters. I wish that they would pay special attention to people who want to come in with new capital in order to make money. They are not coming for the purpose of developing the economy of this island; they are coming for the purpose of making money.
1.15 p.m.

The day they are not making money, they are going to get out and go somewhere else. In making money here, they will find the jobs for our people and will develop the island economically; and this will further the trade of existing businesses, because there will be a greater turn around and a greater flow of capital.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I did not expect that I would have to speak so early. As I look around, I am wondering where are the members of the recognised and accredited Opposition to this Budget Speech.

It is difficult at times - if you have been into politics as long as I have been and you have never changed your political outlook but have always tried to keep a balanced, sane outlook - to reply to speeches of your opponents especially speeches like the one which the Premier delivered, without having people to say you have either joined the Party or you are aligning yourself with the views of the Party.

One of the first things I would like to say is this: Every taxpayer in this community must not welcome, but encourage in his mind some feeling of dread and fear when the Hon. and Learned Premier referred to the fact that Government was giving a breathing spell. The speech in itself has shown some study of the financial implications and the entire financial set-up; it has shown that even the present Government in power must realise that outside of power, making a bid for power and making demagogic speeches on platforms, is a different thing from when you are in power, when you are at the helm, and when you are really steering the ship.

The Budget Speech is one, Mr. Speaker, which in parts could very well have been made by members of my own Party. When you are in power, and you realise what a science it is to administer the Government, it is a big difference. Nevertheless, this breathing spell is what has been causing some of us some worry, for this reason: We wonder if we are given a breathing space merely because this is election year, or if this is a genuine breathing spell!

We fear, Mr. Speaker, that we are given a breathing spell this year so as to anticipate what might happen next year. In other words, now that the tax air has been so polluted - if I may use such a term - one would simply ask who really polluted the tax air; and since it has been polluted by the Government who now admits that they should give a breathing spell - by that spell I take it that you mean from taxation - one wonders what will happen after the breathing spell.

When you read the speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, you will observe that it has taken all phases of financial, industrial and social development of the country into consideration. The Hon. Premier has gone as far back as ten years for his figures of estimates and revised expenditure and revenue, and has shown us what we have been doing over the past ten years. You can very well see that it has been ten years out of fifteen in which the present Government - though not the same individuals - has been in power.

We of this minority group - I hope we will not be for long the minority group in here - wondered when we read the speech of the Hon. and Learned Premier, what would have been the position if, instead of running away with suspicion and shying away to the disgust of the majority of in-

dustrialists and people in this community, he had heeded those who were then trying to suggest that if we must get anywhere, we must look to something beside the sugar industry.

I well recall, Sir, that as far back as 1946 or 1948 we were prodding away at the Government to assist and encourage industries in this island by passing legislation. We were like lone voices crying in the wilderness against the powerful backing of the Government, when we said let us try tourism. It was not done until Sir Alfred Savage persuaded his Government at least to give tourism a chance. Now, today, of course, the only excuse which the Government has for not bowing its head in shame is that given by Ministers in that they are saying that the reason why they did not do this before was because of conditions that existed in hotels - forgetting the answer to that is absolutely clear; they were in power.

If you had intended to do anything then, as you have done now, you had the absolute right to say that this must not happen and that that must not happen. I do not want to blow my own trumpet, but Government could have counted on me if they had brought in the necessary legislation. It did not matter which Party I was in, I would stand up to any unwanted practices in the tourist industry.
1.25 p.m.

When you read the speech of the Hon. Premier you will realise the emphasis which is now being placed by the Government of Barbados on tourism and industrial development. When we on this side of the House, from our benches, pressed for what is now colloquially known as a tax holiday, we were vilified, abused and criticised on public platforms; it was even said that we merely wanted these things for the benefits of the local merchants. When we drew to Government's attention what had happened in Jamaica and Trinidad, and by people who had made money in the big combines in the U.S.A. and Canada, we were abused and criticised then. We find now, however, that what we suggested yesterday, Government has done today; and I make bold to say that what we suggest today, they will do tomorrow!

The Hon. Premier said that this Budget is a breathing spell. The hon. member laughs. I admire his laughter. Nothing has yet turned me back in politics - not even slander nor the vilest liars.

Mr. Speaker, in this Budget Speech, we have great admiration for parts of it, but we wonder how can we take this breathing spell. Nevertheless, despite what my opponents might say, there are two things which I must comment on, and on which I have never been able to compromise. One is as regards the part of the speech which the Hon. Premier, in my opinion, so ably dealt with when he spoke about old age pensioners. The Hon. Premier pointed out that his Government was in sympathy with old age pensioners, and with the plight of the old persons in this country who have made their contributions to the wealth of this country in one way or the other. I do not contradict them when they say they are mindful of them; I must confess that the way to Hell is always paved with the best of intentions - but it is still nevertheless the way to Hell.

The Hon. Premier said in all good faith that Government was trying to get an international expert to come and advise Government on the whole question of old age pensions. I pause here, because I believe it is the Hon. Premier who, as soon as he was returned on each occasion to this House, was the hon. member who asked Government to implement a Beveridge Plan. If I remember well, he was asking for that before he was in the Government.

I do not doubt his sincerity, but up to now we have no Beveridge Plan, while we still have an old age pension scheme which was implemented by a Conservative Government. No change has been brought about; and the Hon. and Learned Premier has said in his Budget Speech that they have asked an international body to send an expert to go into the whole question and advise as to what best can be done on a contributory basis.

Sir, that has a tremendous lot to recommend it. I am not prepared to go into the merits, or demerits, or details

of it. I saw the Hon. Premier entertaining medical men from Chicago here recently; and I am sure that they must have given him all the new and up-to-date data on the method of the American contributory plans for old age relief and assistance; I believe that he must have discussed the matter with them; it is one of his pet subjects. In the absence of a highly industrial or partially industrial community, or in a community such as ours where you must depend on agriculture and then on your next industry, tourism - which we have pressed for so long - and in a community where your workers can only earn a steady living for four months, I think it is merely a gesture to bring someone to Barbados to say how unique it is to work such a plan here. It would be quite unlike Canada and the U.S.A. which are countries highly industrialised.

The Hon. Premier went on to say:-

"Now, in all other places I know of old age pensions and social security are a contributory scheme. The employee when he is working has his weekly deductions from his salary, the employer makes his contribution and the Government makes its contribution; but in this case, the Barbados Government makes all the contribution."

I believe that the Hon. Premier made an error in good faith when he said that. In all countries, old age pension and social security are different things. What the Hon. Premier spoke of is in respect of social security, and not old age pension. Although I must agree that in these matters you must have your experts to advise you, I still feel that on the whole question of old age pension I must here disagree with the Hon. Premier and the Government. We feel that something should have been done in Barbados, and done immediately for these people.

1.35 p.m.

I am going to watch this Government. The Premier says that they are in sympathy with the Old Age Pensioners. There are ten thousand Old Age Pensioners who get \$1.80 per week. I differ from the majority of hon. members over here; I feel that if the amount remains at \$1.80, the qualifying age should be lowered. I feel that people should be allowed to draw the Old Age Pension at the age of 65 years. The Premier has said absolutely nothing about that; all he has mentioned is that they cannot afford to give any more money to these people at this stage.

The Premier has mentioned the fact that it was recommended - and he knew it would be referred to - that the amount should be carried gradually to ten shillings per week. I have never compromised on the qualifying age of 65 years, because I feel that, in the tropics, 98% of the people who must draw the Old Age Pension would be those who have worked in the industry of this country from the age of 12 years and even under. To keep them back until they are sixty-eight years of age would have been a good thing for the Conservatives comprised of the plantocracy of this island, but not for those who sit there and pretend that they are Socialists. You do not have to walk about with placards on your back to show that you are a Socialist; you can be a humane man without that.

Has the Government taken time off to be able, through the Statistical Department, to find out how much it would cost to give Old Age Pensioners \$1.80 per week and reduce the qualifying age to sixty five years? I say that the way to Hell is paved with good intentions. For the last five years we have been hearing that these people must be given more money; your financial advisers have said that the economy of this island cannot afford to give more than \$1.80, per week but what about reducing the qualifying age of these people to 65 years?

The Ministers of this country have always been saying that they are demanding a proper standard of living for people and that they are not any different from the United States of America or England; but they keep the qualifying age at 68 years when other people have the qualifying age at 65 years. Can they tell us now approximately how many more people would draw the Old Age Pension if they reduced the qualifying age to 65 years?

The Premier says this: "Now it is generally known, I think, that old people need not suffer;....." I think it was one of the great Socialists whom they entertained here, who, in a speech at the Empire Cricket Grounds, said that the true Socialists could be seen and known by the way in which they look after the old people and the youth of the country. The Premier went on to say this in reference to the Old Age Pensioners: "They get the Government contribution and according to the law they are also entitled, if they prove their case, to public assistance....." Is the Premier aware that for the past four years the Public Assistance Board has been instructed by the Government not to give one cent more....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, I challenge that statement; I would like the hon. member to prove that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will resign if I am wrong; and will you resign if I am right? That is a challenge. The Government of this country wrote to the several Public Assistance Committees - do you want me to substitute the word "Committees" for "Board" (ASIDES) Shut up, man!

Mr. SPEAKER: These asides are very unseemly.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not make asides when I am on my feet, My asides.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City was addressing the House and on more than one occasion he used the words "shut up". To whom was he speaking? Were those words addressed to the Speaker? Is the hon. member telling me that I have not heard the words "shut up"? I have ears and other hon. members also have ears. I need not remind this House as to how often they have heard the words "shut up". They were not addressed to me and therefore they were unseemly asides.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry, Sir. I know that there is an injunction in Holy Writ "He that hath ears to hear let him hear." Everything which has reached Your Honour's ear was not meant to be for Your Honour's ears. I want to apologise to Your Honour, but if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would keep himself quiet, I would not have to tell him to shut up.

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order. Even if I made an aside to the hon. member when he made a mistake, I thought he would have taken that in good faith. The hon. member has amended his remark from "Public Assistance Board" to "Public Assistance Committees" because the Hon. Premier would have taken him up on that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Does the hon. member think that I would not have corrected myself? The Hon. Premier says that these people get the Government contribution and, according to law, they are also entitled to a contribution from public assistance. The hon. member who has just sat down apparently has given the cue to the Premier not to accept my challenge. As Chairman of the Northern District Council, he himself realises that for the past four years the instructions given from the Government were that you should not increase or do anything more than what you are doing.

1.45 p.m.

I do not think the Premier can know, or is *au fait*, with everything. Those are things you cannot increase; you cannot do more than you were doing. That was the Interim Order issued by the Government of Barbados to Public Assistance Committees in this country; and it stands good today. The Chairman of the Northern District Council tried to interject at the time to prevent the Hon. Premier from taking my challenge, because the Premier might have had to go out if I had won the bet. I suppose the Premier should thank him. This is what the Premier goes on to say: "If it can be proved that they are in need of certain essential elements of life, public assistance has to come to their aid."

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is absolutely right there; there is no challenge to that. I have no favours to ask the

Premier, but I believe that down in his heart he feels that people of this type should be helped; the Government has not approached this in a scientific manner. If you say today that you cannot give more than \$1.80 because you have actually 10,000 people in the island who must receive old age pension, you have a low, low standard of living. When I think of the low standards and of the things I see and know, I still maintain that the Government of this country could reduce the age to 65. To these 10,000 people who gave of their blood and sweat to this country, the Government say that they cannot give any more; and there will be a couple more next year for which I think there has been an increase of \$28,000.

What I want to know, Mr. Speaker, is what is going to happen later in the year. I am now going to destroy your socialism and show what a fallacy and a farce it is. Are you saying that according to the laws of Barbados as long as a person gets less than \$2 a week you will give him \$1.80 a week? Then according to your socialism he must live on \$3.80 a week. That is your means test. I go further and say.....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. As far as I remember the means test is \$3 and not \$2.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will grant the hon. member that it is \$3. But that does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that you are working for \$3 a week; it means if you are living in a 2X3 house which the man feels is worth \$3 a week; I doubt whether it is \$3, though I am not contradicting the hon. member. We lowered the means test some time ago; if we did not lower it they could not get it.

Maybe this will prevent me from getting votes, but it does not matter; I am going to say that according to your method of socialism they can live on \$1.80 because they live in small houses - but you have voted more than that for the police dog to live on. There is a law against committing suicide, but possibly there is no law against dying from starvation. When the Hon. Premier uses the words "you need not suffer", he speaks *ex cathedra* and with a tremendous lot of experience as a medical practitioner. You need not suffer; you can end your own life; you can die.

Now, Mr. Speaker, who are those 10,000 people for whom we have asked you to reduce the age to 65 years. I will wager that within the next few months, because this is an election year, the entire Civil Service will have its salaries raised. Do you think you can come here and put up their salaries and leave the old age pensioners the same place? That is not good enough. You have to find something for the old age pensioners. I have read the speech most carefully. The Labour Party once held a strong Socialist meeting at Empire Cricket grounds, and the guest speaker reminded people that the true Socialist can be seen from how he treats old people and children. You will remember well, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I was not there.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Were you not interested?

Mr. SPEAKER: I said I was not there. That is a different thing altogether.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, we are told about this breathing spell. Deep down in our hearts we are concerned about these old age pensioners. Who is an old age pensioner? An old age pensioner is somebody born in Barbados who has reached the age where he has absolutely nothing. Ninety-eight percent of our old age pensioners worked in the fields of this country, and 75% of them sleep on the floor. I remember listening to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who said that conditions had changed so much that old age pensioners did not have to sleep on the floor or tie up bags to provide shelter any longer; but I still say that you have not changed conditions to that extent. 1.55 p.m.

Sir, I will gladly pay my contribution, if it will take \$500,000 more so as to give a little more to those persons who have made it possible for us to be here today, and who

have brought our economy up to what it is. I will gladly pay my contribution if you will lower the qualifying age for old age pensioners down to 65 years, and even if you carried the contribution to only \$2.00 a week, I do know that 20 cents a week more would be able to assist a poor old pensioner to get an extra tin of condensed milk. I have asked many of them how they work this \$1.80 out; as Your Honour knows, I see these people every day except Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, we in my Party feel that the Government of Barbados can afford to undertake the further expenditure of \$500,000 to assist the old age pensioners of this island. You might well say that they are old and decrepit and it does not matter; that they are not interested in voting; but that is not being kind enough to them. I speak on behalf of my Party when I say that we would certainly like to see something done for them.

On the question of education I would like to say at the outset that the Hon. Minister of Education is a person with tremendous experience in education.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 p.m. o'clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. o'clock. 2.00 p.m.

On resumption,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw to your attention that there is no quorum and ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is Question Time but I understand that there are no answers ready.

Mr. SPEAKER called Private Members' Business but there was no answer to Private Members' Business.

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The House now reverts to Government Business. On the suspension, the hon. senior member for the City was addressing the House. I observe that the hon. member is not in his place.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I just rise for a few minutes to make some comments on one aspect of the Hon. Premier's Budget Speech; and, as you may guess, it is on the question of old age pensions.

Much of the speech of the hon. senior member for the City who spoke before the luncheon recess was very well taken, certainly by hon. members on this side; and it ought so to be taken by the whole House; but there is an aspect of the matter to which I think the attention of the House ought to be drawn. The Hon. Premier has put it as a matter of conscience to this House why he cannot consider an old age pension increase at this time. It is very strange to think that it has now become a question of conscience, not whether consideration should be given to the old age pensioners but whether consideration ought not to be given.

In other words, the Hon. Premier has not invited the House to consider carefully what can be done for these people. He has put the boot on the other foot, and has told the House that it can only recommend an increase of old age pension on a bad conscience. He has asked the House to search its conscience to see whether it can seriously and sincerely recommend an increase in old age pension. He means to say that your consciences would have to be very bad to recommend it. If theirs would have to be searched, not for doing something good, but to justify them doing nothing at all, that is good. Our view is that the economy of the island of some \$94 million or \$95 million must be in a very bad shape that some portion of the revenue cannot be found for a cause which is most worthy.

I speak for my Party on this matter. We do not confuse the general question of social security with the specific

and peculiar matter of old age pension; we well know that if a social security system was established and implemented, the problem of old age pension would still remain, for the simple reason that old people cannot be expected to participate in a social security scheme on a contributory basis. However broad and full such a scheme may be, the old people would still have to have provision made for them on a non-contributory basis. Mr. Speaker, we do not agree with the Hon. Premier on that; and we condemn him for trying to confuse the issue in the public's mind. We would like to keep these things separate in the public's mind. A social security scheme can be argued for; and it is no credit to the Government to be now talking at the last moment of having an expert to come down here and stay with us for this purpose.
2.35 p.m.

You have the figures given by the hon. member who has just spoken, and if the figures are correct, you have some ten thousand people who are living below subsistence level in this country. The hon. member asked very pertinently how we can expect them to continue living like that; and he queried what an old person could do with \$1.80 per week. It is on record that I have in this House, some three or four years ago, been condemned by the hon. members opposite because I brought into this House what I thought was dynamic evidence of what old people have to undergo in this island. I showed to the House then that the purchasing power represented by \$1.80 per week is so small that it would not keep an old person in even modest comfort. That has nothing at all to do with the fact that there is a public and private charge which does, to a certain extent, blunt the edge of poverty. When all of that is taken into account, it does not absolve the public authorities from attending to this matter in a sympathetic and generous way.

I do not think that we are so badly off in this island as not to be able to afford another quarter million or half a million dollars for people who are at the lowest ebb of subsistence. We are not asking for an increase in the Old Age Pension for people who are guaranteed two square meals a day at least; we are not asking for it for people who enjoy an income of \$5.00 a week. With the public assistance or pension which the Government pays, there are very old people, if any, who could boast of a composite income of \$5.00 a week. If there are such, they would be in the very small minority. If the question of conscience comes into the matter at all, it is the conscience of the entire community and not only of this House.

We do not want to go on record as saying that we are so bankrupt of ideas that we cannot cut and contrive or devise some means, some shifting of priorities, in order to do this most necessary thing. I would feel, if I were in the Government which has confessed such a lack of imagination, that it would be time for me to back out and let somebody else carry on. The greatest condemnation which can be made of any Government is when it confesses that it can do nothing to help a deserving cause.

If the argument on that side of the House was that this cause was not a deserving one and therefore the Old Age Pensioners were not as badly off as we, on this side, are claiming, then on both sides of the argument it would be possible to find some merit; but the Government is not taking their stand on that ground at all. The Government's stand is that however necessary an increase may be, however necessitous the circumstances of the pensioners may be, yet they cannot, in the circumstances, do anything about the matter.

When my colleague who is going to make the main speech for our Party speaks today, I believe that he will blow to smithereens the argument that they cannot afford it; it does not require detailed argument to show that we can afford it. The very fact that the Government has said through the mouth of the Premier that even if the Old Age Pension remains at the present level, public assistance will supplement it, that fact alone shows that another source of revenue is going to be tapped to supplement it. Whether it will supplement it adequately or not is not the point at issue now; but the realisation that public assistance

is there and can be used, is a question by itself. That is an admission that the Government knows that something more has to be done. Our argument for it does not lie in that region at all; our argument is based on common humanitarian grounds. If we use economic and financial arguments, it is only to make the issue clearer but not to make the argument stronger.

In a community of two hundred thousand souls, if ten per cent is of workable age it is the intention of democratic politics that the worker must be protected from the worst insults of poverty and destitution of the community. That is something which cannot be the basis for argument if you have people in a democratic society. Therefore, to say that nothing can be done for the Old Age Pensioner when in truth and in fact the last increase was given five years ago, and argue it and use it as an excuse, is to confess that we have become so callous-minded and indifferent that we are not prepared to rescue and succour the weakest of the whole community.

I do not need to raise any argument that the people whose merits we are discussing now are those who have contributed to the wealth of this island. We know that; but the fact that they have contributed to the wealth of the island in their years of toil is not the real argument why they should now receive consideration. They should receive because they deserve to receive, because they are at the extremity; and the population and the community are in duty bound to look after the very old and the very young, if that is not quite clear to those who lie between those two ages. It is a matter of human sympathy. No argument based on a specious appraisal of the economic situation caused by the neglect of the Government, can wash out the stronger argument which the claims of humanity must bring.
2.45 p.m.

If the economy cannot afford it, that is not the fault of the old people. If the economy needs a breathing spell, that must not be used to deny an old man or an old woman another dollar or so per week. What an old man or an old woman can do with that dollar would be to purchase the necessities of life, and purchase the very necessities which are subject to tax. It is the very poor who pay the majority of taxes anyhow; and, consequently, to give them a little more shields them from the worse effect of indirect taxation - although it is true that what you give them will be so inadequate in the long run that they will have to spend it on the bare necessities on which tax is exacted.

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that some part of what you give to them must come back in the Treasury in the ordinary course of events; we have not yet reached a stage where we can devise a means to cushion the shock of the cost of living for the old people. It ought to be possible in this island for an old person to get a tin of condensed milk for 20 cents, but we have not yet thought of those things, therefore they have to buy it like anybody else on a reduced income. Even so, Mr. Speaker, if the case is made out that you cannot do anything for 10,000 people, very soon we shall hear you cannot do anything for a greater number, and where will be?

It is these people's taxes in some measure which you use to give them old age pensions; you are not withholding from them something which belongs to somebody else; you are withholding from them their own money. The money we are asking you to give old Rhoda Franklyn and old Carlisle Griffith - they are just names to hon. members, but they are people - is their money anyhow; and there are old people in the eleven parishes who have as good a claim as anybody else; so you are only asked to spend a little more of the people's money on the people.

In the course of this very debate, Mr. Speaker, when the House goes into Committee, we shall have reason to criticise Government very severely for some extravagancies, administrative and otherwise, which we have noted and which are put into the Estimates and justified by necessity. I therefore know of no better necessity than the necessity to keep alive and to be nourished; and it is a necessity which should be prior to almost any other. If

you can spend a lot of money one way with small justification, we equally feel that you can spend some more money with greater justification. The question therefore is not whether you can afford to increase old age pensions; the question is whether you can afford not to.

You cannot tell these people that in 1956 when you were advised to give them \$2.40 you only gave them \$1.80 - that is 60 ¢ less than what they should have had then; and you cannot tell them that you cannot give them anymore now, because the very least you owe them is 60 ¢ which was not given then, but you gave your reasons then. You owe that to them. My feeling is that even if you give them now, you still would not be doing very much because the value of money to everybody, but certainly to them, has fallen in the last five years. Even an increase of 60 cents now would not be as much to them as if they had had it five or six years ago.

As for wanting an expert to come and tell you what to do to make your old people happy, that is the biggest joke one has ever heard. In any case, Mr. Speaker, this Government is not going to heed the expert if they have a preconceived notion of what they intend to do. If it should happen that the recommendations of the expert call for a level of expenditure which they do not want to take, overboard will go the recommendations however good those recommendations are.

It is unfair, Mr. Speaker, to hang the two things together as I have pointed out. They should be kept separate and distinct; and the argument that it is no good to handle social security matters piecemeal is a good argument on paper. It is not so good when you reflect that by using it, you are depriving a section of the community of comfort to which they are entitled. To ask the old people to wait a little longer is not the same thing as asking the Colonial Secretary or the Attorney General to wait two years for an increase in salary; it is a different order of experience altogether; for the difference between two years to get another dollar or \$1.50 for them and waiting two years for people higher up in the social and other scale or asking that kind of person to wait two years to get another \$100 or so a month is a difference not only in coin but in degree. In the case of one they are living so far below subsistence that any help quickly given is a tremendous relief; but in the case of the other, while an increase in salary is always welcome, persons at that end of the scale usually have to balance the monetary increase with deductions which they would have in the case to make out of it for taxation.

It is no question like that existing in the case of these people; and that is why I say that Government has no excuse whatever and cannot justify it on any grounds; you cannot justify it on the grounds of arithmetic or any other ground. It is the duty of a Government to look after the things that are necessary; and I have yet to hear it argued that the claim of old people to have their pensions is not a necessary claim. It is no part of a Government's duty to throw in the sponge and say it cannot afford it if the thing is necessary. 2.55 p.m.

The Government should use its intelligence and tap its resources so that everything, whatsoever it may be, should fall into its due and equal place in the scheme of things. To say that the choice lies between suspending the operation of certain necessary services and increasing old age pension is fallacious; it is fallacious because the claims of old people to extra purchasing power are no less important and no less substantial than the claims of other sections of the community.

My counsel to the Government is to find some kind of money to give to the poor people of this colony. We are not prepared to let you get away with the contention that it cannot be done. The Hon. Premier will have to think again on the matter in the coming months. The Opposition certainly does not accept the contention that old people must exist at subsistence level, while other sections of the community must have improved conditions showered on them.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the one interesting thing, although it is not a novel disclosure, which was stated by

the Hon. Minister of Finance who unfortunately presides over the destinies of the people of this island - a disclosure which is significant to people outside and inside of Barbados - is that all he can do is to add and subtract. He made those remarks towards the close of his Budget Speech if one can glorify it by that name. The Hon. Premier said: "I am not an economist so that I cannot speak with any authority; I can only add and subtract money."

I have always carefully avoided the excruciating pain which is caused to members on this side of the House who are unfortunate enough to come in here and listen to the Hon. Minister of Finance, a man who can only add and subtract, read his Budget Speech. It is clear that the Premier regards the function of a Minister of Finance to be that of regurgitating a collection of garbled facts and figures supplied by an equally incompetent Financial Department of which he is head.

We have deplored the fact that the Financial Department of this Government is staffed by persons who, like the Hon. Premier, display a remarkable ability for addition and subtraction and nothing else. We are living today in a world where the very conditions of life, the dynamics of Government financing, the basis of the economic existence of people, particularly in under-developed areas and all of these things, are in very rapid change and in a perpetual state of flux. It is therefore all the more important that the people who arrogate to themselves the right to be financial experts, to say to who can pay, pay and he payeth, to say to another man, give and he giveth, and to say to another, take and he taketh, that those people should have a thorough grasp of the elementary principles of addition and subtraction.

Not only do we demand a standard of financial arithmetic higher than what obtained in my day in High Primer: that is the stage at which we left the mysteries of addition and subtraction behind us; not only should they have a firm grasp in the fundamental principles of Government finance, but they should also have financial mystique; they should have a sociological mystique plus some of the basic ideology which would guide them in re-allocating the national revenue of this country; and surely not on the simple formula that we have heard expounded by the present and former members, who perhaps are not in the island now, of the Government soaking the rich and perhaps drenching the poor. All scientific principles such as economics, or priming the economic pump and stimulating activity should be applied, so that we can raise the standard of living of people in the country in which we live.

I personally, have never listened to the Hon. Premier, the Hon. Minister of Finance on previous Budgetary Bills; I have never suspected him to be guilty of only knowing addition and subtraction, but he has assured us that he is capable of that and that alone. I am not going to be facetious. 3.05 p.m.

When it was pointed out to him that he must watch the people in the Financial Secretary's Department, he said that the policy of the Government's finance was a question of good housekeeping, of providing something for a rainy day. No serious student of finance has ever been heard to say that Government's finance is like good housekeeping. I have gone so far as praying and beseeching the present Financial Secretary - who must be capable of something which is a little higher than addition and subtraction by the salary alone which he is drawing; subtraction is probably what he is best at - I have gone to the extent of asking that gentleman to go in the name of the Almighty and leave the people of Barbados to their own findings; and I am sure the people of Barbados would be better off.

When the Premier says that the summit of his own ability is subtraction and addition, you will then have to fall back on the Financial Secretary and the Departments which are intimately connected with this matter. I do not like to attack Civil Servants; but I am not saying anything which I have not said for ten years. And I want to make that clear. It is particularly because the Premier is not only suspected, but admits that addition and subtraction are the summit of his understanding, that it seems to me that in Barbados we

should have people who should be able to expound the intricacies of simple and compound interest to the Premier. He considers that the Government finance is a problem of housekeeping and it is clear, as the Premier has said, that we will have to continue marking time in Barbados for as long as we have the misfortune of that Government in office and as long as we are suffering under the disability of the Financial Secretary in these terms.

It is absolutely tragic that when all of the other islands in the West Indies, particularly Jamaica and Trinidad, are thinking in terms of the increase in the gross national product, the increase in the productivity, making sure that their population growth is at least equated if not surpassed by the net increase in productivity of labour and resources, that there has not been a single mention, except in a very oblique fashion by the Premier, of this most important aspect of our economic life. It is an oblique reference because the Premier has anticipated or estimated or guesstimated that the national income will be some \$98 1/2 million.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member use the word "guesstimated"? Is that ordinary parlance?

Mr. BARROW: It is not unparliamentary. I have heard it from Government Servants, and I have heard it on the floor of this House. His case is as good as mine. I hope that Your Honour does not think it offensive.

As I was saying, Sir, there is only the reference in an oblique way that we have to look forward not only to the inevitable increase in population and the number of mouths which we have to feed by about four thousand, but to a drop in the gross national income. It is not for me, in view of the admission of the Hon. Premier, to go into such omissions from his Budget Speech, his terms like *de facto* costs, and market value. The Premier has used expressions such as the value of domestic exports in 1960 was 34.9 million in 1959; and we have no indication at all whether those are figures which relate to *de facto* costs, market values or any of the other qualifications.

Figures are employed so that we can have an accurate idea of what the person is saying. To ask the Premier to add relevance to these figures which he has regurgitated, is to ask him to do something which is beyond him. I do not want to appear to be pedagogic, but it is obligatory in more civilised countries like Trinidad and Jamaica, that the public be given some idea of the basis on which you are calculating expenditure, exports, balance of payments and balance of trade. You cannot just say that something is estimated; there are many values which can be put to figures. It can lead to a lot of dishonesty, because a person who wants to conceal the true economic plight of this country can talk about *de facto* costs and market values in different breaths, c.i.f. and f.o.b., leaving out those terms which give the figures, which are true in a certain way, but which are irrelevant to each other because they are calculated at different levels.

I know that the Statistical Department is very young. Although we have been asking for it for the past several years, although a former Officer administering the Government of this country implored them to do something about setting up a Statistical Office as far back as 1952, we know the general *malaise* which afflicts the Financial Secretary's Department and therefore I prefer to say no more about that. But when we have hon. members getting up and asking questions, or pointing out the deficiency of the quotations in these matters made by the Hon. Minister of Finance, and when you get him coming back the next year with a confusion of his addition and subtraction and doing absolutely nothing to remedy the defects in his presentation of the Budget figures, it is no part of my duty to supply these defects; it is no concern of mine except that of seeing the matter exposed and letting him know that he is not fooling me.

3.15 p.m.

I doubt the Premier is fooling the Chamber of Commerce, or the investors or prospective investors who have

money to prime the economic pump of this island; and who may be contemplating investing money here. I can assure the Hon. Premier that when one indulges in that form of exercise of omitting to state whether exports are f.o.b. or c.i.f., or whether the gross national product is at market value or *de facto* cost and matters of that kind, the people who have their money to risk only do so on the advice of financial experts, and outside of the Government circles on the advice of bankers and people who are acquainted with these things and who go a little deeper into them than the average member of the public would.

If the whole purpose of his omitting to qualify these figures which he has given is to lull the public into a sense of somnolence and false security, in that he has partially succeeded; but if it is his intention, if intention he has at all, to beguile investors about the happy condition of the economy of Barbados, I would like to warn the Hon. Premier that he is living behind hand. Again, Sir, I must underline and underscore the absence of any preliminary white paper dealing with the state of the nation in Barbados. The Budget Speech in my opinion is not the prelude to a disclosure of the economic condition of the country. A Budget Speech makes the recommendations and sets out the proposals of Government revenue and Government expenditure, the sources from which it is anticipated that revenue will be raised, and the direction in which it is planned to spend the money which has been taken out of circulation by the Government by way of taxation, and to give an indication of the channels in which this money taken out of circulation will be directed. That is the purpose of a Budget Speech.

Sir, I recommend to the Hon. Premier to sometimes do what some of us on this side of the House frequently do: go to the Librarian of the Legislature and borrow some of the Hansard Parliamentary Debates and read the speeches of the Chancellor of the Exchequer delivered round about this time every year; and he would get some idea of the approach we demand nowadays from a Minister of Finance, a person who is in the position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England.

The Hon. Premier should have at his fingertips every single detail about the movement of money into and out of this island. The Premier should be well versed in the day to day fluctuations in banking in the four Commercial Banks of this island; and he should also have a very firm control over the expenditure by Government Departments because, when they put in appropriations in the Estimates for particular Government Departments, we know that round about the half of the year there will be a general raid on the Treasury of this island.

The Minister of Finance has not said anything about what measures he intends to adopt to see that we get greater productivity and efficiency, and in brackets I would like to say "courtesy", although that is not strictly a matter of finance — but it pays in the long run for the Civil Service; and what control he is going to keep over the habit of coming to the Legislature for supplementary votes in certain Government Departments. I could probably draw up a long catalogue, Mr. Speaker, of the sins of omission which have occurred in the course of the Budget Speech of the Hon. Premier; but I do think that members, aware of his multitude of defects as a Parliamentarian — I am not talking about him as a man because I am not called upon to do that — know that this is one of the things which, like in a family, is a source of great embarrassment. It is not exactly a skeleton in a cupboard, but something which we in Barbados do not like to discuss with strangers. We find it completely embarrassing to have people from the other islands, from the United Kingdom, Canada or from the United States of America come here and make comments on the general deficiency of the Hon. Premier as a Minister of Finance, as a politician, or as a Premier at all. We find that to be a source of acute embarrassment as much on us as maybe some of the more conscious or less semi-conscious members on the other side of the Table. It is one of those things which the family does not talk about.

The Premier is a luxury which this country cannot afford. As to the Financial Secretary, if there has been any

bankruptcy, it has been bankruptcy in outlook in that Department; and it is almost tiresome to come in here and discuss a Budget Speech, because we get the same regurgitations of disjointed figures which have no connection whatever, something which we can read in the Estimates for ourselves, the accuracy of the figures which we can very often impeach, but we prefer to wait until the House goes into Committee of Supply to do these things.

All of this is a matter of severe embarrassment to us. We are Barbadians, and we do not like to see a Government, no matter how much we disapprove of their policy, no matter how much we do not like their approach, made the laughing-stock of the whole of the Caribbean area. I challenge any member on that side to get up and say he has heard Mr. Donald Sangster or the late Mr. "Crab" Nethersole deliver a Budget Speech like this. Have you ever heard the Hon. Dr. Eric Williams who himself is not an economist? He will tell you that he is no economist, but realising that he is in charge of the Government, he probably knows more about economics than most people who go through a University and get Economic degrees.

Dr. Eric Williams is a historian, but he can argue any point with any economist that I have met short of the Principal of the University College of the West Indies. Here you have people who realise they owe a duty to the community; and that merely visiting an office after they have left another office is not a sufficient discharge of their public duty. These are people who take an interest, converse, read, explore and study, and then try to apply the best possible solutions to the economic difficulties with which they are surrounded.

3.25 p.m.

You get these people in Barbados, in the same conscious state, talking about last year the economy was buoyant. I have never heard any sensible person use that term; anybody knows that a cork or any bilge coming out of a ship is buoyant. However, it was fashionable to talk of the economy of the island of Barbados as buoyant. If that term was used before, then this year the economy has become waterlogged; if it was buoyant any slight disturbance must upset the state of equilibrium and overboard we would go. You will have to excuse the hon. member.

It is that kind of ignorance, it is that lack of appreciation of the problems confronting us, that lack of any earnest quest for a solution and the importation of terms into economic affairs that can only have reference to stagnation, which make Barbados the laughing stock of the West Indies in matters of this kind. The picture which the Hon. Premier has painted can only give a great deal of comfort and joy to those people who live in a perpetual state of fear that they are going to be taxed more; so much so, that when the Hon. Premier said that he did not propose any new taxation, the ranks of Tuscany could scarce forbid to cheer.

We are somewhat ashamed to mention that there are 26,000 unemployed in this island; and to me you can tear up the whole Budget Speech and throw it clean out of the window if you are not going to deal with that one important problem which confronts you. You, as the Government, are going to tackle the problem of economic growth, of expanding the national income by extending the amount of taxes which you take from the people; but the Government which really gets down to brass tacks and tackles the problem of the increase in the productivity and increase in the growth of the national product by increasing the amount of money which the individual consumer, householder or family has to spend, in other words, increasing the purchasing power of the masses, would have no problem of obtaining Government revenue at all. It stands to reason that if you increase the purchasing power of the masses, you increase the gross national income.

If I were a specialist called in to give an opinion on the treatment of the Budget which has been prescribed by the Hon. Premier, I would say that his prognosis of action would be very negligible indeed; that is, their expectation is nil. I want to make it clear that I am not suggesting anything in his professional capacity as a medical doctor, but in his capacity as Minister of Finance.

This situation is all the more desperate because we do not start off with a country which has full employment;

we start off behind the eighth ball. We have been described as underdeveloped, pre-technological societies, emerging nations, non-industrial nations and all sort of terms like that, which add up to one simple thing, that is, that we are not in the forefront of those countries which have a high standard of living or countries which have diversified their economy to such an extent that the impact of the falling off in any one source of the national income is not necessarily visited with overall disaster. Whether one calls it an underdeveloped society as a matter of terminology, I am not prepared to argue that. To talk about somebody's grandmother as being not this or that, is not advancing the standard of living for the people of Barbados. To say that we are having a steady-as-we-go budget this year is not what an underdeveloped country should entertain and should have in its vocabulary at all.

We are a subject people; the overall control over our economic livelihood is vested not squarely in the hands of the Legislature of this island, but by the financial institutions of the metropolitan countries. Of course, recently, the Hon. Leader of this House said that we are not a Crown Colony. We do not call these Estimates Colonial Estimates any more. However, it does not matter to me what kind of names they call us in United Nations, in Great Britain or in economically advanced countries; it does not matter anything more to anybody on this side whether the grandmother of the hon. senior member for St. Michael is of a certain pigmentation; that is a matter of supreme indifference to me. But let us admit that we are a subject people. Well, once we are realistic, we should admit that that is a state of affairs with which I have never agreed and which I have been fighting against, the implications of which I will demonstrate in a few minutes. The level of employment in Barbados, Trinidad and other parts of the West Indies being subject to the economic situation at the moment in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales is something which I do not think should be happening in the twentieth century. 3.35 p.m.

One may think that I am a very harsh critic of the Government, but I am a harsh critic of any monkey who tries to handle a musket, because muskets are not the proper instruments to be used by that particular section of the Animal Kingdom. Therefore, a person who is not qualified or who does not intend to qualify himself to grapple firmly with the problems which affect and concern other citizens of the country whom he is supposed to be leading, is being dishonest to himself and to the people.

It is all the more vital that we who can speak and who belong to the emerging colleges of technological assistance, must face up to the fact that we have further to go and therefore we have to work harder and be more honest with ourselves. We have to be more forthright; and we have to have ever so much more know-how and ability at our disposal than the people who are already in a state of security. That is very simple.

Unless you accept that this business of first and second-class citizenship, and this question of inferiority as the necessary scheme of things, we cannot tolerate this idea that there must be demanded a lower standard than is demanded by people in any other part. If you have a Financial Minister in Barbados, the mere fact that Barbados is 21 x 14 miles and that there are only 250,000 in this island, does not mean that that Financial Minister should not be able to get up in the House of Parliament and make a competent Budget Speech. The person who is Minister of Finance, who is the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the equivalent office holder in an underdeveloped territory by virtue of the fact that he is in a country which has more problems — not perhaps quantitatively, but there is a very important qualitative distinction to be drawn between problems in Great Britain and those in Barbados; in other words, they have not got the headaches which we have — has to be more careful than the equivalent Minister in England or the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the equivalent office holder in America. We are not going to get anywhere unless we get people of the right calibre controlling the affairs of the country. The Ministers should be controlling their Departments; it is not enough for people to say that all they

can do is addition and subtraction. That is a disreputable state of affairs considering what we have to face in this country. I think I have made myself clear on that point.

Mr. Speaker, this is my main theme: How can anyone who is being honest with himself get up and make a Budget Speech which is supposed to be an amalgam of a state of the nation's speech and a white paper, an economic survey, as it were, and a Budget Speech. That is what it purports to be. You completely ignore the fact that we have a grave economic problem in Barbados, grave as has been anywhere else in the West Indies; you have ignored the fact that there are at least 26,000 able-bodied persons of working age in Barbados — at least the figure is now between 26,000 and 31,000 unemployed. They have a Report made by Mr. George Cumper from the Institute of Social and Economic Studies of the University, which was sent to them on February 14th, 1956; they sit down on that survey of unemployment for about two or three years if not longer. It was laid on the mysterious Table which nobody sees, and which is only an expression because many reports have been mislaid on the Table of this House.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that you must have experienced very great difficulty sometimes, when some weeks or months after a paper is supposed to be laid, to find that it has been mislaid and it is in the Ministerial Buildings. Up to now they have made no effort to make the Report of Mr. Cumper available to members of the general public. When the Elections in 1956, the Federal Elections and Local Government Elections were over, then the Government thought fit to release the Cumper Report and they claimed that it was — I think Your Honour made mention of the fact — with the printers who had it for an inordinate length of time to read and you yourself have not been vouchsafed a copy of that Report.

To me, two of the most important documents which have been written about the economy of Barbados and the general set-up of this island would be the Richardson Report of 1954 or 1955 which up to now has not been debated — the hon. senior member for St. Peter has questioned that omission time and time again — and the Cumper Report on unemployment. We do not even mention things like the unwritten report of Mr. Cadbury which is as liquid as a milk chocolate, as far as I can see; nobody has seen it in any tangible form; probably that is not going to be printed, or the Hospital Report either.

But here are the documents which deal with specific issues on those problems which are central to the economic survival of this country; there are the problem of social security and the problem of unemployment. Nowhere in the Budget Speech does the Hon. Premier disclose to the members of this House what he intends to do about unemployment in Barbados; nowhere does he tell us what concrete proposals the Government has for coping with the net increase in the population which is taking place from year to year.

Quite apart from what he has said about their inability to do anything for the old people who are living now and the young children who will reach the age in another twenty years to join a contributory pension scheme, quite apart from all that, he has not even told us what the Government intends to do about the unemployment problem which exists now, far more the increase in unemployment which is bound to be inevitable in a country where the gross national product is not keeping pace with the net increase in population.

3.45 p.m.

In other words, the Hon. Premier said that it is \$98 million; I challenge the accuracy of those figures, but it is not my duty to do that here. I think I will put it down in more concrete form and give my observations later on that.

Let us say that the national income, the gross national product in Barbados, is \$100 million today; that means that in a country with 250,000 people the average income per head of population is about \$400 a year. I do not at this stage want to make an attempt to be accurate; I am merely

giving an illustration, but there are members who are more competent than the hon. member; I forgot his innocence of long division or short division; he is only guilty of addition and subtraction, so I cannot even ask him to do the calculations for me.

Let us say it is \$400 a year; it could not be much more, but he has put the figure at \$98 million. If we get another 4,000 people coming in here next year — and when I say coming in I mean via Pan American or through the Deep Water Harbour — as the Premier has prognosticated, the gross national income is not going to rise. If it is not going to rise, it means that the cake remains the same size; or by the icing hardening he has anticipated that the cake will shrink, and there will be more people to eat it. Everybody will therefore have to take a smaller slice, everybody except the Ministers and the Civil Servants. Where does that leave the 26,000 people who have not got jobs; and the 4,000 school children who have left school and are looking for jobs; not to say anything about the 4,000 babies who come in to take their place, and who will want milk; and the people who are becoming old age pensioners next year.

Where does the Hon. Premier get the statement "steady as we go" from? From the Landship? You know the Premier used to take the salute at Landship parades in his young days! He used to be on the quarter deck! (*Laughter*). The Hon. Premier was an expert in taking Landship salutes, and he seems to have imported their Landship terminology into Government finance. "Steady as we go" is like "in two's form fours" that I used to hear in the Landship. I rather like the Landship; I think it is one of those characteristic Barbadian institutions which we should try to encourage and foster. As a matter of fact, I think that I was even considered as an Honorary Fleet Commander at one time of the "Iron Duke" in South District. The Landship is all right for carnival, Friendly Society work, and that sort of thing; but "steady as we go"! Where are we going from here? Last year we were buoyant, we were not moving; and this year it is "steady as we go". Do you mean hasten slowly, go slowly, do not go at all, or start and take two paces back? I really do not understand. This phrase "steady as we go budget" means we are out of wind. I want to know who is to catch his breath. If it is the 26,000 people who are unemployed, they had better catch as much as they can because it may be their last breath; as I do not see any hope for them at all in this Budget.

I never thought I would live to see the day when we would read the Finance Minister in Barbados stating in his Budget Speech that "it is desirable that the economy should be allowed to catch its breath, I do not propose any new taxation. (*Cheers*). " Where do you think those "cheers" came from? The Premier has denounced in no uncertain terms all the sacred principles of deficit financing, and he himself or should I say they themselves — I cannot be sure from day to day whether they have collective responsibility or not — but he himself last year budgeted for a deficit; and this year he came back and budgeted for another deficit, although we told him it was nonsense and they were only playing housekeeping and they would get more money coming into the Treasury. I have the debate here.

He has denounced the whole principle of deficit financing, something which brought the American people between 1934 and 1939 out of the trough of depression when they had 25 million people unemployed; when France had 10 million people unemployed and Great Britain had something like 5 million or 6 million people unemployed, and on the advice of the man who at Bretton Woods was responsible for the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction. The man who was the promoter of all these ideas, Professor John Maynard Keynes, had his ideas adopted by no less a person than Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America.

Even a lackaday convert, Mr. Churchill, a man who denounced it, himself turned around and saw the feasibility and the necessity of deficit financing. Then he went to France and the same thing happened; and these countries today, even France, not to mention Germany at all, have proper budgeting. What of Germany after the First World

War? If they did not have deficit financing, where would they be today? Two days ago the German "Mark" became the hardest currency in the world.

The Premier of Barbados in the fulness of his wisdom denounced deficit financing, and still budgeted for a deficit because this is only a game of arithmetic — addition and subtraction — that they are playing. In other words, when they budgeted for a deficit, it is only because their estimate of expenditure is exceeding their estimate of revenue without imposing a new taxation in an election year to take up the gap. That is all that has happened. They are not going to have a deficit at all, and I will say that without any fear of contradiction. I said it last year and I say it again this year.

3.55 p.m.

It is almost dishonest to budget in Barbados for a \$1 million deficit. Since I have been in this Honourable Chamber — and this is with a short sojourn outside — from 1951, the revenue of this island has always exceeded the estimate of expenditure by at least \$2 1/2 million; so much so, that at one stage it was an embarrassment to the officer administering the colony; I am sure that he must have got a few letters from the Financial Department of the Colonial Office; and he advised the dividing of the surplus in two financial balances, the Revenue Balance and the other one to be called the Revenue Equalisation Fund. The whole idea of that last fund was that it should be put away for a rainy day.

When I was a member of the Government's Party, I pointed out that instead of toying around with these funds — you put one set in Barclays Bank and the other in the Government's Saving Bank — you should not in a country like Barbados, take money out of circulation. You were taking \$3 million out of the taxpayers' pockets year after year and establishing these two funds; and in view of that fact, there was a shortage of the effective purchasing power in the country. When there is a shortage of the purchasing power of a country, you must get unemployment.

It has been said that you have a propensity to consume and a propensity to save in an under-developed country; and the propensity to consume is much higher than the propensity to save; therefore, you have to increase the purchasing power in a situation in which you have an under-developed state of affairs. Of course, you do not necessarily do it by way of the dole. As a matter of fact, the dole is the one way which some economists would not recommend for that unhappy state of affairs; but you increase the purchasing power in one of several ways. You can refrain from taxing the investors so that they can manufacture more and increase their capital holdings by extending their factories; and that kind of thing should directly pave the way whereby the working people of the country would get more employment.

I did not think that I would have to go into that in 1961, except when I am talking to students; I never thought that I would have to repeat in the House of Assembly that in an underdeveloped country like ours that you would not be able to expand with that idea and rectitude in the way the Hon. Premier is continuing his principles of finance.

From 1951, when our Government revenue was nearer to \$10 million than anything else, this Government with its serious problem of unemployment was over-taxing the people of Barbados and taking the money and putting it into two separate funds, and glorifying these funds by the name the Revenue Balance and the Revenue Equalisation Fund. The very rationale of this finance has been defeated because these funds have been used in ways that we have never contemplated; these funds have been used in ways which are highly questionable, and certainly in ways which were never contemplated.

One of the members on the other side said in public not so long ago — certainly since the last meeting of the House — that we are going to give the displaced workers, as a result of the Deep Water Harbour coming into operation, \$1 3/4 million. I understand that he said so as though

members of the Government were going to put their hands in their pockets and distribute largesse. They have also said that they have raised a \$12 million loan; and not all the money went to the Deep Water Harbour, while the people in London have in hand \$12 million waiting for them. That is the biggest joke I have heard for a very long time.

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

Sir, there are so many inaccuracies in the presentation of the Estimates that I cannot glorify this speech by the name of "A Budget Speech". There are so many glaring inaccuracies and inefficiencies that I will take a very long time in speaking on it. I want to go on record, as I did last year, of stating my views on this matter and the views of my Party. I will be the sole person speaking on behalf of the Official Opposition.

Now, imagine what has taken place during the past ten years! There was a certain amount of money in 1951, about \$52 million circulating. I do not mean as currency; I mean as the gross national product. Out of that \$52 million, roughly about 25% was taken out of circulation by Government because that money did not stay in circulation by way of taxation. Out of \$10 million or \$12 million about \$3 million never went back into circulation at all; it went up to the Crown Agents for the Colonies, or was just lying there dormant in the Treasury because at that time — just a few years later — came the Revenue Equalisation Fund. At that stage we had much unemployment in Barbados. Therefore, what I am suggesting is that when you take money out of circulation, there is less money to spend. When you overtax companies, business-men, middle-class men, Civil Servants and such people, they have less money to spend on consumer goods, luxuries and things like that which would generate and keep the level of employment fairly stable.

4.05 p.m.

Now we do not want a stable level of unemployment at all; you only need that in a stagnant community. What you want is a dynamic state of affairs. (ASIDES) When I mentioned that the community should always be in a state of dynamic disequilibrium, the hon. member did not appreciate that that was a specialised branch of economics. The economics of disequilibrium is what we need in a country like Barbados. We do not need things with adjustment, we need things snow-balling and moving forward all the time. If a country is in a state of rest it is not moving forward; and if it is moving forward it must be in a state of dynamic disequilibrium. You have the kind of people put in the House of Assembly who could be far better employed by looking after a kitchen garden.

The Premier has mentioned how the Government revenue has increased over the past ten years due to an increase in the guaranteed price of sugar; formerly it was with the Ministry of Food and now it is with the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. Even if you keep the same level of taxation, the Government Revenue must increase, not through any fault or device of theirs; therefore we should calculate the way in which revenue would increase or decrease and make proposals for a greater increase. If too much money is taken out of circulation and the economic pump needs to be primed, you want to leave more money in circulation; you ease the burden of taxation. That is a very simple matter.

Taxation is one of those evils with which you put up through motives of self-preservation. If you have pestilence and disease around you and have no central body looking after these things, you would be afflicted and the bell will soon be tolling for you. We pay that taxation from a mixture of the self-preservation principle and the hang-over from the Sunday School teaching which we get: that we do not like to see people begging along the road and so on. If each of us had to repair a stretch of road-way in front of his house, naturally you will get a large disparity in the standard of road surfacing when you drive four or five hundred yards; it would be an almost excruciating experience for any householder getting to his backyard or to anyone coming into this island. Those are elementary things. We recognise that certain things are best provided

for by a central authority, but the individual has to retain his individuality. There comes a time when he says: "I think I have provided sufficient for the generous services of the community and it is burdensome to me that I should make the contribution which I am making."

An investor recognises the necessity for free education because having educated people at a machine or doing any other job, it means that he will make more money. There is a certain amount of taxation with which there is no dispute but it must be taxation for a purpose. What they have done is to use taxation as an offensive weapon to put other people in their places. Hon. members on my right would be afraid to say that. They have used taxation as a threat; they do not use it to increase the national income. You find this unholy support with the people who have money in this country, the people whom I used to describe as Jacobins. They are the Jacobins and Bourbons of Barbados and the distinction between the Bourbons and the Jacobins is one which I have never been able to appreciate.

There is an attitude of mind among people who live in a certain restricted atmosphere and who talk about infringement on the sacred rights. Let us keep to our premises and we will understand what we are talking about today. The idea that nobody should be taxed went out with Mr. Gladstone who said that God intended people to die and when they got at a certain stage they will die out like flies. All that went out in the early nineteenth century.

Everybody recognised all over the world that a Government must interfere with your freedom of operation even to the extent of interfering with the way in which you spend or earn money or what is inherited. That is the justification for the Government interfering and taking money out of your pocket or out of mine. I know that there are certain people who do not pay electric bills; they do not pay income tax. There are some of us in this community who consider ourselves beyond the reach of the law; for political reasons, nobody would put them in Court, not even the Income Tax Commissioner. With those few exceptions, everybody in this community as soon as he eats a piece of bread the price of which has risen 25% in the last few months, realises that he should pay taxes to the Government. What then is the function of Government? Is it to take people from, let us say, Carrington's Village and put them in the Pine? Is it to allow a man to rent out his house and live in the Pine and form a little cell up there? Your Honour knows what I am talking about.
4.15 p.m.

By so doing, you widen the influence which you have by using the taxpayers' money to give certain sections of the community and certain chosen people special rights and privileges so that you can fortify your position when an election comes around. The Government spends all its time between one election and another widening its influence and writing to Heads of Departments telling them that they must get a job for this man or for that man - let us hold a Commission of Inquiry if you doubt me - or you must find a house for this person, or the person you put in that house can rent out the house he was living in; but there are other people all over the place sleeping on park benches who have nowhere to live, or who do not have a roof over their heads, while some of them do not have a bed on which to lie down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the function of a Government? Is the function of a Government to use public funds for digging holes in roads and sending and giving jobs to people and saying "you go down there and dig a hole in the road, and remember when it comes to election time that I got this job for you"?

The whole theory of inequality is inherent in the Capitalist system; and therefore we have had the emergence of a socialist and democratic Government where even the capitalists themselves expect that there must be some re-allocation of the income of the country, because we were not born equal. Do not let anybody fool you that all men were created equal. I do not see how a man like President Kennedy was born equal with me, inasmuch as he does not have to be burdened with the problem of earning his daily

bread. He was obviously born unequal to me; I would not say he is inferior or superior in intelligence; but when you talk about being born equal you have to realise that some people from the day they are born until the day they die will never eat three square meals a day as long as we have a Labour Government in power in Barbados particularly. So how can these people be like somebody like the hon. member for St. Lucy far less the member for Christ Church?

I see the hon. junior member for St. Joseph writing, but all that I am saying is that there is no such thing as people born equal because we get the same amount of food or go to the same colleges or the same Universities. That is the kind of ignorance he gets on with. It is because of these basic inequalities in the system itself that a Government has to re-allocate the national income of the country so as to iron out these inequalities. When you are taxing people therefore, it is necessary that you bear that objective in mind; and do not use taxation as a kind of reprisal; you yourself were born underprivileged. Now that you have got into power, you will do what the Premier of the West Indies said, that is, soak the rich, but what you have actually done is to drown the poor, create more unemployment all the time, and throw them in the Careenage.

There is no point in soaking the rich unless you know what to do with the money you get from them when you soak them. What has the Government of Barbados done? They have put aside money in the general revenue balance and in the Revenue Equalisation Fund year after year thereby increasing the volume of unemployment in this country. You will see the relevance of my arguments in a moment. Government overtaxed the people by a couple of million dollars, inasmuch as Government had budgeted for a deficit of \$1/4 million and had got a surplus of about \$2 1/2 million in the year 1959-60. In the year that they budgeted for a deficit, a principle which the Hon. Premier denounced, they got a surplus; they have never had a deficit from the time I have been in this Chamber, that is from 1951 until now; which means - if I may say this parasitically - that it is obvious to all and sundry that you cannot say with precision that you are going to budget this year for \$25,257,000. 68 and collect that exact amount of money. Naturally some people do not pay their taxes. A few tourist ships may not come in that were expected and that sort of thing, and you expect to be out \$50,000, \$60,000, \$80,000 or \$90,000 at the most.

You are paying two men and two complete Departments; you have the Statistical Department inside the Customs and you have the Income Tax Commissioner and the complete staff there. You have the Government Statistician and those people; and then super-imposed on all that with the Accountant General and the Auditor General, you have the panoply of the law to ensure that you get the money which one owes if he is not a politician; and on top, you have the Financial Secretary. On top of that pyramid you have a man who is guilty of addition and subtraction, the Hon. Premier. So you have this panoply and pyramid to make sure that when you make calculations they are not only estimates, but a fairly accurate assessment of your revenue and expenditure; one would not normally expect them to be out more than \$300,000 which to me is a lot of money to be out in an Estimate, because when you are trifling with the taxpayers' purchasing power, you have to be very careful.

When you say that you are going to get more money from a man by increasing taxation in certain respects, by increasing, let us say, customs duties, the duty on motor cars - or to come down to the public and general level - package taxes or the price of a pack of cigarettes, you must do it only when you are going to use that money better than the man would have used it himself; that is, better from the point of view of generating employment in the community.

One of the main things that I could never understand when I was over on that side was that they seemed to be completely innocent of the fundamental principles of Government financing.
4.25 p.m.

When I talk of a dynamic disequilibrium you get an amount of laughter from the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas; and they appear quite happy but blissfully unaware of what is happening. One of these mornings the Hon. Premier is going to wake up and find that he is sleeping on a keg of gunpowder.

I am sure that a lot of members were shocked to hear that President Kennedy has said that there are 17 million people who go to bed hungry every night in the United States of America. That country has a population of 170 million people which means that 10% of the population go to bed hungry every night. What percentage do you think goes to bed hungry in Barbados? Do you think it is only 10%? With the national income of America being well over \$200 U.S. you get 10% of the population going to be hungry. What percentage do you think goes to bed hungry in Barbados where the average national income is only about \$40 W.I. Sir, I ask you to draw and figure out what percentage of the population of this island goes to bed hungry every night. I would say this without fear of contradiction. The 26,000 unemployed which we have in this island is about 10% of the population or just over that. What about their dependents, what about the children, the wives and the housekeepers, if I may use a neutral term by saying "housekeeper" who are dependent on the 26,000 unemployed? Bear in mind that I am talking of 26,000 people of working age.

If there are 2 1/2 persons depending on each of these persons, that is to say the people who want jobs and cannot get jobs, then you can figure it out that way; although the average size of the family unit - legalised and non-legalised - is five, I cut it in half and put it at 2 1/2. Does that not demonstrate to you that there are nearly 100,000 people who go to bed hungry every night out of our population of 250,000 people? If in the U.S.A., which next to New Zealand has the highest standard of living, followed closely by Switzerland and Sweden, 17 million people go to bed every night hungry and the President of the U.S.A. during his election campaign chose not to neglect that factor, do you think any Government in a place like this has any right to neglect the fact that pretty close to 100,000 of the population go to bed hungry every night? Along with that, I am sure that of the 250,000 people whom we have here, not more than 50,000 get two hot meals per day.

America has a deficit, not of \$1 million, but of a few billion dollars. The Hon. Premier talking about recession, quoted certain economists who are divided in opinion as to whether there was a recession or not. That is the kind of stupidity which I cannot tolerate. The Hon. Premier said that, since the American economists are divided in opinion as regards the possibility and the probability of a recession at this time, and some thought that there was no need for alarm and that it would straighten itself out, he was not going to take the view of the pessimist but the view of the optimist because he does not know which to choose between them. He is talking as if there are a nexus with the two things.

There may be a slender thread of action between a world-wide recession and a state of growing unemployment in Barbados, as we had in 1935; but that is only because it not only affected the U.S.A but also the sterling areas. A recession in America does not necessarily mean a recession in Antigua. As a matter of fact in Antigua there is no unemployment. The term "unemployment" is unknown in a little island like that because nobody up there talks about unemployment. People there go in to the Government and ask for five acres of land and when they get it and work it and find out that it is not doing too well, they go back to Government and say that the piece which they were given they do not like and you better give me 10 acres some place elsewhere. That is the sort of breadth of vision which has been engendered by the people of that island. That is in passing.

Sir, my main proposition is that in a country where you have a perpetual state of chronic unemployment you cannot afford, except for a few hundred dollars here and there, to

tax people to raise money as high as 25% more of the money to which you can usefully dispose of; in other words, when we had a Government expenditure of \$10 million we had a Government revenue of \$13 million, therefore, they had no right with a surplus of \$3 million. Of course, it does not necessarily mean in arithmetical progression that if you are over-taxed, that is to say if you take a certain amount of money out of circulation, that unemployment would increase by a proportionate amount. Sometimes they lay more claim on national income and therefore, you have to be very careful about how you go about budgeting.

There is the principle of redistributing the national income by the device of taxation so as to get the maximum amount of revenue. The question therefore of providing services to the community is not a routine job, except for the periodic raids which the Civil Service makes on the Treasury.
4.35 p.m.

Government has another function to perform in addition to merely doing caretaker work such as collecting money and paying it back out in the form of salaries and the provision of services such as lighting or highways. That is a very minor part of the function of the Government. The major part of the function of Government is to generate, whether by the devices of deficit financing or budgeting for a deficit, purchasing power so as to stimulate economic activity in the community. The Government can do that in one or two ways; you have unemployment, therefore let us see if we can generate more purchasing power and increase the number of available jobs. All they talk about is emigration and birth control; two factors that we have very little control over, even if we put a policeman in every bed, or if they went back to the days of the slave trade when you took human beings on ships and sent them overseas. Every Government is getting down to the problem and tackling it in a realistic way.

The other device is the question of Capital Expenditure. Your Capital Expenditure must not be merely putting down a road in a tenantry every year or erecting a house at election time. I commend any scheme like the soil conservation scheme, although it will be a very long time before we reap any economic benefit from it. I think you will agree Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the benefits are very much in the distant future, benefits which will inure to the community from the vast amount of money which is spent in that direction. The Tennessee Valley Authority, set up by the late President Roosevelt, by electrification of the farms in the country South and West is reaping tremendous benefits from a long-term scheme like that; therefore nobody would run down a Soil Conservation Scheme, if you can afford it. The more long term a problem is, the more you must wait and consider carefully whether you are going to spend your money on a long-term project such as this Soil Conservation Scheme; and you are not building some amount of capital investment on projects which have more immediate and permanent effect.

The problem which you have to face is this: we come down the years from 1950, there is the mention of the unemployment problem and there is the sort of *laissez faire* attitude about it that the population will continue and we have the biblical injunction that the poor is always with us. You have the inference that people in a highly poor community are very respectable, but they are starving all the time. They are so benighted with the respectability that they do not have time to tackle the economic problems which surround us from time to time. You have the Government unconsciously solving economic problems by driving away the people. They are tackling the unemployment problem by not planning for it; so that the people have to sell out their pigs and sheep and chattel houses and pay \$360 to an airways or steamship Company and that money goes to Italy or America. That money leaves this country and not one cent of it is spent by the shipping service.

If four thousand people emigrated last year, you can consider that, in a country like Barbados, over one million dollars was spent which will never come back into this country. If there is one thing which goes to the wind it is

this money which is going to the shipping company; it is not a capital investment.

The people whose guts cannot take the system any longer - the best people with the initiative, with the get-up-and-go - leave Barbados and go to England. We spend money in educating these people. The parents of these people lavish attention and care on them, and just at the time when they are ready, when Barbados should be reaping the benefits of the investment which we have put into the children up to the age of 18 or 20 years, they go to England and give the benefit of the money of the taxpayers and that of their parents to inure to the benefit of the people in England who tolerate them because it is a cheap way of getting labour at no expense to themselves.

Are we going to allow Barbados to be perpetuated as a stud farm? To go on, providing labour at our expense for the people in Canada and England to enjoy the benefits of our investment? I do not think that the Ministers are capable of appreciating the necessity for this social disinvestment in Barbados. Those who have pride and self-respect cannot think in terms of the Government spending money to train people to send them out of the island all the time. Instead of this idea of *laissez faire* and throwing out your arms in despair, the Ministers should get out and allow young people with integrity to take their place. Do not talk about training so many people to go out, one hundred and thirty years after slavery was abolished. We have had people in Barbados in the 19th century like Samuel Jackman Prescod; and the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour talks about people's grand parents being black, as if it is a crime to be black. All he can talk about is how many domestic servants he has sent out to England.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I know that the hon. member could not finish his speech without referring to me. I would like him to say when I criticised any black people as if it is a sin to be black. I did not worry with the hon. member when he was lying; he cannot help for being twisted.

Mr. BARROW: Will the hon. member withdraw those remarks?

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not withdrawing anything.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the House of Assembly. If you cannot control the House then let us send for His Honour the Speaker.
4.45 p.m.

You are not the Chairman of the Labour Party, you are the Deputy Speaker of the House. Let me tell you that the greatest indictment that the member can make on a political platform in any campaign against any person in Barbados is that their grandmother is black. I can recall that in the 1956 campaign.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order,.....

Mr. BARROW: Make sure it is a point of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: He is getting up and trying to defend somebody else. I have never had to refer to anybody's grandmother until Friday night in the Park; and I will do it many more times because some people do not know where they come from, and they are ashamed to admit it.

Mr. BARROW: I am not defending anybody. You knew the hon. member fairly long. Have you ever heard him say where he came from? Does anybody know to what school he went or whether he pitched marbles?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am appealing to the hon. member not to go on with this talk about one's grandmother. Please get ahead with the debate.

Mr. BARROW: I am not defending anybody; I said we want people now in this community who are thinking about its problems, and not thinking about what one's grandmother was. I do not see anything offensive about one's grand-

mother being black; it is a compliment to certain people in Barbados that they have black grandmothers. The whole world knows the hon. member, and yet he talks about where somebody comes from. Nobody has ever heard where he went to school, whether he had brothers or sisters or pitched marbles.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Again I am appealing to the hon. member.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member is the only person who never had a school friend, or pitched marbles. I would just like to say that the only thing about democracy is that you have to tolerate people like him, since you cannot put them up against a wall or in a gas chamber and get rid of them one time.

One hundred and thirty years after the institution of slavery was abolished - the bringing of people from one country to another - you get a Socialist Government, a so-called Labour Government, talking about how many domestic servants they have trained and sent to Canada; how many are going to be street cleaners; and how many are going to work with the London Transport Executive. They are not talking of people eager to take their place in the comity of nations; nor have they increased the scholarships for engineers, chemistry and technology and that kind of thing.

Right here in Barbados even the standard of public service is lamentably low, but we are not talking about that at all; we are not talking about increasing efficiency; we are imbued with this domestic mentality. You have introduced a Bill for domestic servants. Have you ever introduced a Bill to prevent children from going to school hungry or anything like that?

People should be flocking to Barbados because, if you remember the Report written by Professor Arthur Lewis way back in 1946 or 1948 on the industrialisation of the British Caribbean, the gentleman who is now the head of the University College of the West Indies, it was said that Barbados was one place which was ripe for industrial expansion; and that in the West Indies at that time, that is fifteen years ago, they needed basically 166,000 jobs primarily which in turn would generate another 300,000 or 400,000 secondary jobs. Professor Lewis said that the one place where that kind of expansion could take place would be in this island; he is the first man in the West Indies who realised that you do not fight certain people today; you get in with them and get concessions and become millionaires. I have heard the Ministers refer several times to Professor Lewis' Report on industrial development in the Caribbean, but they only do that when they want to score a point.

When they talk about birth control, they cannot do anything about it. We have a population of 250,000 people; and we have to face that whether or not we put policemen in every bed or take up Government revenue and spend on contraceptives, the population of Barbados is going to be 400,000 in ten years' time, and we have to find jobs for them. Whether or not we like it, that is a legacy that will be bequeathed to future generations; but Government hopes to ignore the problem now; they do not start tackling the problem with the 26,000 unemployed people they have. You must not mention these things, but these are problems of the Government and of the representatives of the people.

You have a nation of people who go around depending on their great-aunt, cousin or somebody who has got a job somewhere or the other as a mason, a bus driver or in the Government service; and these people go like travelling pilgrims from one relative to the other spending two days here, and three days there, getting a breakfast and coming back in town and begging somebody for a grog. Nobody frowns on that in this community. People have been driven by those Ministers over there to the condition where they almost do not have their self respect anymore.

There are grandmothers who go into the fields and work until they are 60 and 70 years. These grandmothers cannot afford the luxury of an old age pension under the Minister of Finance, the Premier of Barbados. I have met

old ladies, grandmothers and greatgrandmothers of 80, 81 or 82 years who are still working in the fields, because after all these years the Government is not considering them. As Mr. Griffith the former Secretary of State under the Labour Government said on Bank Hall pasture, if you do not pay attention to these people, it shows that you do not recognise your duty to the community, or words to that effect.

So the duty of the Government now is not to get up and abuse people, to put people in housing schemes and ignore the fact that you have colossal slums all around the Theatre district and all around the business districts. The whole hinterland of Baxters Road is one colossal slum. No effort has been made at slum clearance, but you are selecting people and putting them in little cells, like communist cells, in the housing areas, hoping that they will remain faithful to the Minister and the Labour Party. If a man wants a job, is that not something to which every Barbadian with self respect is entitled as a right?
4.55 p.m.

Up to three days ago, down Black Rock down by Danesbury, down by Pile Bay, the Ministers turned up with the Head of the Department and got everybody to come down there and say to Billy and Sally: "Look, we are making a road for you down here." They did that because the election is coming on; that is what Government has degenerated into. Of course, tenantry roads are parish pump politics.

You have a community which is expanding and bursting at the seams. Anyone who knows what the science of economics is, knows that all the women in Barbados who are going to have children during the next fifteen years are already alive and under the Queen's peace. We also know the productive rate and what the population in Barbados is going to be at that time. It is very simple; just try and figure it out. Here you have people talking, like the Hon. Minister of Finance, about an economy catching its breath when we are not in the race. How can we catch breath? He is a man who has not been exposed to certain influences; he is different from the hon. member on his left; and the trouble with the hon. member on his left is that he has survived all these exposures and nothing has happened to him at all. They are exposed to it all the time and they come out just as spotless as the day they went in! (*Laughter*)

The Hon. Premier says that they are not taxing people more this year, not because they feel that the people are taxed sufficiently, not because the state of the economy is healthy and there is very little unemployment, not of course because the budget deficit which they anticipate would not be a deficit at all, but because it is time to catch your breath. I have not heard that enunciated as a principle of Government financing at all. What the Hon. Premier means is that this is election year and we are going to catch our breath this year but bathe you with taxes next year. If it is a Budget based on the gross national product although he has not prescribed it in those terms, it means that the gross national product is not going to fill the number of mouths which they have to feed and therefore, it means that the cake would be smaller. What I think he means is that after the elections they are going to soak the rich and drown the poor.

Do not let any member of the public be fooled about this catching of your breath. I have never heard any Financial Minister, either in England, in any civilised country, or even in any of the West Indian Colonies ever talk about catching your breath. How can you win a race if you stop to catch your breath; you stop to catch your breath when you have burst the tape; you then free yourself after that so that you do not get muscle-bound.

Stop talking this nonsense of how many domestics you can produce. Do you mean that you are going to be a nation of lackeys? The people who even now use domestic servants would be glad not to use them if you generate a higher standard of living; they would be able to enjoy a higher standard of living and would be able to provide for themselves modern apparatus for their household chores as well as domestic servants would be driving to work in a

Vauxhall or a Kapitan. Are we going to concentrate the whole productive energies of the people of Barbados into training domestic servants or bus drivers? Do you mean that we have resigned ourselves to the inevitability of stagnation in Barbados? That is the difference in the outlook of the Labour Party and almost the rest of the progressive people in Barbados.

To pay low wages is a system which the Hon. Minister of Trade is almost daily fulminating against, but yet people are still allowed to make fantastic profits in Barbados on consumer goods particularly. It is better that they do not have any new taxation because if they put it on, they may end up with a riot. The people are aware that the Ministers are misusing the money which is entrusted to them. That is my statement; and I am prepared to stand by it because they have done it consistently for the past ten years. They have misspent the money which comes in by way of taxation. We would not mind if they had used it; but they have failed to use it at all. They have taken it up and sent it to the Crown Agents for the Colonies.

Sir, I am going to deal with another aspect of it. Here in Barbados we are an impoverished community with this low level of employment and high level of underemployment, yet we take up money and send it to New Zealand, South Africa, Australia and all over the world. If you look at the financial state of our investments in any one year, you will see the fantastic amount of money which is taken up and sent away instead of being invested in this country. It is sent to all those other places and invested in Government's securities.
5.05 p.m.

How long can underdeveloped territories afford to be a capital exporting country at the same time? We are inviting people to invest money in Barbados, but we are sending money outside. We have no restriction on the export of capital. If a business man has made a profit of a million and a half dollars he will send the money to New Zealand, Nyasaland or any part of the world to invest; there is no restriction on him. You will find that some of the wealthy people in Barbados are investing their money in New Zealand. We are not stopping them, but we are trying to stop capital from coming in. The Premier did not give any statistics about capital exported independent of Government investment overseas. At sometime it was in the vicinity of \$19 million.

If you look at the figures for the market value of the money for which they have overtaxed people and sent to the Crown Agents of the colony to invest, you will find that in relation to securities of the Barbados Government today, for every hundred dollars they have invested there is hardly one of these securities. On page 205 of the Estimates you will find a general statement of the Annexed Estimates; you will find the investments at the 30th September, 1960. You will find that the total depreciation for the Barbados Savings Bank alone under the Crown Agents is \$2,885,729.80. If you want to release that \$14 million in the Crown Agents' hands you will only get \$11 million, and the depreciation is over \$2 million. That gives you an illustration of what I am saying. You will find that from 1951 I was warning this Government about this matter. When the rate of interest went up to 6% or 7% there was a splendid opportunity to raise money for the construction of the Deep Water Harbour; and they would have got capital for these things which have depreciated.

Mr. Speaker, let me put it in this way: things for which they have paid a high rate of interest they could have got at a lower rate of interest. When the investment was around 98 and 100, the Government could have called in that money, but they left it with the Crown Agents. You would only leave money with a neighbour if you had nothing to do with it.

We cannot afford to invest money in those countries. There is nothing in the Premier's Budget Speech which is supposed to be an amalgam of an economic survey and a Budget Speech; it is neither fish, fowl nor a good red herring. They want to attract capital in Barbados, but there is nothing about what they are doing about the export of capital

from this country. When you allow business houses to take up money and send it out to New Zealand you are aggravating the unemployment situation; you are taking money out of circulation and putting it outside the island where it cannot be of any value to ourselves.

On page 22 of his Speech the Premier says this: "I am not an economist so that I cannot speak with any authority; I can only add and subtract money.....I cannot speak with the authority of the economist, but opinion is divided as regards the possibility and the probability of a recession at this time. Just last week I was reading TIME, an American weekly publication, and I saw that there was an expression of opinion by several economists as to whether or not a recession is in the making....."

Then the Premier goes on to quote the opinions of American Economists, not as to whether the economic situation in Barbados was in a desperate state, or as to whether there was the position in Barbados where there was chronic unemployment, but of the economic situation in America; and after quoting these opinions *in extenso* he went on to say this:

"So, Sir, when I read the opinions of these eight or nine people, who are prominent economists in the United States and balanced them against mine which is nil — and some thought as I said before that there was no need for alarm and it would straighten itself out — I thought I would take not the view of the pessimist but the view of the optimist; so as I said just now, I do not propose any new taxation."

In other words, having read the American Economists on the American economy he feels that they are writing about Barbados; and as they are supposed to be diviners, he said the position would straighten itself out. The Hon. Premier is like Micawber, waiting for something to turn up. They do not think that the Government should take the financial destinies of the island into their hands and guide it towards greater prosperity; in 1961 even the most die-hard Conservatives or Capitalists are doing something about economic planning. They can pay a man at the Development Board a few thousand dollars, they can give the Tourist Board a few million dollars and they are giving the Family Planning Unit something which will go out into wash. That appears to be the economic policy of the Government. 5.15 p.m.

Now, in his speech the Premier said that the trade gap is widening and that it was \$28 million in 1959. You will note that when he said that — I think you will find it on page 3 of the printed report of the speech — he did not deal with the question of visible or invisible trade, or what they intend to do to lessen this trade gap, the balance of trade, whether it is visible or invisible trade, whether it is visible trade like exports or imports, or invisible trade like tourist receipts and remittances from abroad, and the transfer payments from other colonial Governments and matters of that kind. The overall picture is that there is a substantial gap between the balance of trade on both accounts in Barbados: the difference between imports and exports together with visible and invisible trade.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot go on like this indefinitely. The Premier said that if we budget for a deficit, we would soon become bankrupt. That is pure, unadulterated, stupid, untarnished ignorance on his part. I am sorry that I have to say these things about a man who has now been living so long that he had time to read a few books or study what is going on in the outside world; but our situation here in Barbados is much too grim for us to indulge in this kind of hypocrisy. Quite apart from the capital export, if they go on with that kind of difference in the overall balance of payment situation, that is the way to bankruptcy, because where is money going to come from?

The fact that you budget for a deficit does not mean that you are going to go bankrupt. Obviously, in a year when you budget for a deficit, you increase your capital expenditure; and when you put out money in that year you subsequently earn your interest payments on money you have borrowed to invest in order to generate employment; but

perhaps I am talking in shorthand terms which will only befuddle the Hon. Premier, so I want to pass on. The Hon. Premier went on to regurgitate on the Peasants' Loan Bank, the Approved Estimates being so and so, the revised estimates being so and so, and old age pensions being so much, without any kind of analytical effort brought to bear on them at all.

Mr. Speaker, what is the point of reading out or saying something which we cannot only read but which we have right before us. Let me try and get the issues straight. For the Sugar Producers' Association and the exporters of sugar you have built a Harbour costing over \$20 million and probably more than \$30 million. The Captain of the first ship that comes into that Harbour says that the Harbour is too small, so you can see right away.....

Hon. M. E. COX: He did not say that.

Mr. BARROW: You can see right away therefore that the *raison d'être* of the Harbour is to save labour cost by shipping sugar in bulk. Go all around the West Indies, starting in Georgetown, British Guiana, and travel all the way to Kingston, Jamaica, and see if you find one Labour Government which has done what the Barbados Government has done.

You talk about progress. The price of sugar is fixed until 1968, Sir Robert Kirkwood and Mr. Campbell — I believe they are two knights now, or sugar barons as it were — Sir Archibald Cuke and Sir Harold Robinson go up to England and negotiate with Czarnikow Ltd. the price of food for the West Indies. They come back then like Mercury on Mount Olympus and then the price of sugar is tacked on. I have always been an opponent to that system.

There is no one year in which the Barbados Government or any Government was represented at these sugar talks; there is not one year in which the Labour Trade Unions of the Caribbean have been represented at these talks; but be that as it may, we know that year after year they go to the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement for talks and arrived at sugar prices. They put up to the Czarnikow Ltd. and the Ministry of Food that we can tack on 2% for wages, but we expect the cost of production to rise by so much. However, a formula is arrived at when they arrive back here without any active participation by us in that stage of negotiations; and the level of wages in Barbados is predetermined by what they have got in a corner up there clandestinely and agreed on; because if the price is going to be \$213.70 a ton, then you will see, Sir, that there is a particular limit beyond which the workers in the industry cannot participate in this price. The cost of production, profit and labour are the three factors to be taken into consideration.

If you put up a bulk installation to ship sugar, until 1968 we know there is a level below which, with a slight cost variation of a few dollars one way or another, the price of sugar is going to fall. It is not going to fall before that. How then can you say it is an economic saving to the community when the price is already fixed and all you are doing is putting out of work the men who used to sew up the bags by machines, the men who used to send the sugar down the chute, the men on lorries, the men at the bonds in Roebuck Street and everybody else barring three or four men pressing buttons and walking about on gang planks on the top of the roof with their hands in their pockets? Even the men who used to push the thing in the bags to sample the sugar are now white collar workers like plantation managers sitting down taking samples. So in an undertaking which would normally employ 700 people you now have a few dozen people doing that job.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot justify this on the grounds that this is like bulk shipment of molasses. Molasses is something which was not subject to an agreement; molasses was subject to periodical fluctuations in supply and demand with the Canadian importers. When Sir Grantley Adams, Sir John Chandler and Sir John Saint went up to Montreal and completed their business, their justification was — a few days after Sir Grantley said we would never see it shipped in bulk — that this was to give a certain amount of leeway in negotiations with other people who could produce

cheaper than Barbados. How does the argument apply to the Deep Water Harbour bulk shipment? Why has it not appealed to the people in Jamaica, British Guiana, Trinidad, Antigua, St. Kitts, Nevis, Montserrat and all the other West Indian islands?
5.25 p.m.

Is it because the Barbados Government is gifted with more omniscience than all the other people put together, or is it because they have the interest of Barbados at heart? If you are a Socialist Government you should say to the Sugar Producers: "You are calculating the price of sugar based on the cost of handling by all those workers who have this work to do, therefore, you are losing nothing. A minimum of eight years from now, you may be confronted with a situation where you may have to take your chance in the world market. What you should do now before you innovate this technological change is to go about creating alternative employment for the people of this island who are going to be displaced." You should not kick them out now, and say we do not need you anymore, and then make these people think that the \$1 1/2 million which you are giving them is coming from your pocket.

I wonder what the exporters of sugar are saving by the use of bulk installation. Do not tell me that they are not saving money; they are bound to save money by this change-over. The whole idea of this technological change is that it allows them to compete with world market prices; and they are catering against contingencies which may arise but may not necessarily arise. Are they losing money? Would the \$1 3/4 million which they say they are going to give these displaced workers be coming out of their pockets or out of their winnings from the football pools? Let us not be hypocritical about this. The amount of money which would be left back in the sugar workers' pockets is insufficient to cushion the shock or to prevent a riot in this election year. That is the position, Sir.

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

Sir, I will not worry to say anything about the benefits due to these displaced workers; I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. Peter can handle that situation adequately. What nobody in Barbados, I think, would say is that it is not nice to have a Deep Water Harbour; as a matter of fact, we should have had one years ago but planning should have been made to make sure of this. The first thing you should consider is not that you have a Deep Water Harbour but to see whether you have people who are gainfully employed; therefore, all the prettiness of the harbour or the clarity of the water are completely subordinate to the welfare of the people of this island. If you are the peoples' Government, that must be first.

You will remember away back in the late twenties and thirties when the Democratic League was talking about Scramblers for sugar factories, and when that piece of equipment minimised the taking of sugar cane into the factory, the whole gravity of the attack which the League made on the factory owners was that people were being thrown on the scrap heap, in the same way that waterfront workers have now been relegated to the scrap heap.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. Will the hon. member say who really blazed the trail on behalf of those people? I was a young fellow at the time, but I think I am older than he. Not one word was said on behalf of those people who worked on the mills at that time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member rose on a point of explanation but I think he is asking a question.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, that is the one thing which you can take him into the privacy of your office and explain to him. The whole trouble with him is that nothing happened before their time; history started with the day they came into office. They do not draw on the long annals of their predecessors; and that is why they continue to make mistakes because they are like new-born babies. From the day they came in here, they think the whole world started. However,

Sir, I will leave that out because there are people here who know better.

Right down on the harbour you have the same principle operating. You have something which is a technological innovation. You have to study the sociological and economical effects of such an innovation before you introduce it; and my criticism of the Government is that they only go in for a thing once they are susceptible to the blandishments of a few exporters. They have the effrontery to say: "Look what we have done; we have put down a sugar bulk installation store." But what has happened? There has been no planning done before the installation of it.

No mention is made of savings which are going to come about as a result of that sugar bulk installation store. The business people have amortized the cost of their lighters, so we would have to pay a much higher rate of interest. From the time of the Ritchie Report we had to pay an interest of 6 1/2% and 8%. This is the economics of the Barbados Labour Party.
5.35 p.m.

The Ministers consider that the duty of the Government is to get up on platforms and abuse people and say: "We have got So-and-So living in a Housing Scheme". (ASIDES) Only a member with the mentality of the hon. senior member for St. Michael could be so completely unaware of what I am saying; or to say that I do not want people to go into a Housing Scheme. Where is the slum clearance scheme in St. Michael? We have not had one slum clearance scheme in the last twenty years. What is the use of providing houses if you do not abolish the conditions provided by the slums?

The Premier has said that he had anonymous letters from the public asking him to remember the Old Age Pensioners now that the Budget is being considered. When you say that you have received anonymous letters it is the connotation that you have had a poisoned pen letter. That is the most poisonous insinuation which could be made by him in his financial innocence. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy has dealt with the question of the Old Age Pensioners.

In 1954-55 Professor Richardson came down here and recommended that the Old Age Pension should be \$2.40 rather than \$3.20 a week. He said that there was abundant cause for that. That report has been circulated but it has not been debated in this Chamber. The Government has Five Year Plans, and more than one five-year period has passed since Professor Richardson made his report.

The whole rationale of a Five Year Plan is that you make provision for things which call for long-term planning rather than having an allocation for an annual expenditure. Five years ago, in close consultation with the Government Party, Professor Richardson made these recommendations. It is also significant that five years ago was the eve of a General Election as well. From platform to platform throughout this island the Labour Party paraded Richardson's Report about. They said: "We have brought down this expert and he has recommended this." What have they done in 1960? They are to bring another expert. This is like a donkey cart and you tie a long stick with a carrot on it in front of the donkey. The donkey is galloping all the time in front of the carrot. The carrot is something in the Five Year Plan which is gangling in front of the electors.

I want to say that the more money a worker gets, the greater amount of spending power he will have at the end of the week. An Old Age Pensioner is supposed to live on this \$1.80 per week with the assistance of other members of his family, or he is supposed to go into the Almshouse if there is no other person in the family. I do not see how anybody can live on \$2.40 per week. The average person in the United States of America under the New Deal is getting something like over \$100 West Indian dollars per month when he retires. Suppose it was twice as expensive to live in America as it is to live in Barbados, which I doubt very much; I have purchased goods in Pennsylvania within the past two years, and I do not see that it is more

expensive to live in the United States of America than to live in Barbados. It means that the average Old Age Pensioner in America is getting \$12.50 per week purchasing power and that is considered as a minimum. The same person in Barbados is getting this Old Age Pension after a "means test" and not as of right.

If the "means test" means that you are already in receipt of income which is no more than \$15 or \$18 a week, I would understand that; but if you tell people that because they are getting a small pittance which a lot of school teachers are getting and people who worked in the Barbados Government Railway are getting, you are telling them that they must qualify by means of a "means test". Now they have the effrontery to tell people that they are getting another expert; and if the people are foolish enough to vote for them they will have another expert and the Old Age Pensioner will still be getting \$1.80 per week. Even the Civil Servants say that they do not need any expert. We had an expert five years ago to tell us that the amount for an Old Age Pensioner should be \$2.40 per week. The Premier goes on to say this:

"I want to say that there is nobody in Barbados who would be more willing to grant the old age pensioners an increase than we who form this Government. We would be glad to do so; but those members who have been listening to the figures which I have just quoted testifying that there is a steady climb up for the past two years - and so far it has reached the astounding figure of \$3 million - ought to realise if they have any conscience, that the Government at this stage cannot increase the old age pension."

I want to ask this question: Are they suggesting that Professor Richardson did not have a conscience?
5.45 p.m.

Are they suggesting seriously to the people of this island that they are going to fall short of their expenditure this year after they have gathered in their taxation and revised the Estimates of this country? They cannot afford an increase in old age pensions, but do they consider that the fantastic amount of money which is being drained away by the Transport Board is justified? Is it important that they should have this top heavy administration in the Transport Board and that they should have these high-costing buses and that kind of thing, while those people who have reached the age of 68 years should not get more than \$1.80 a week? I do not understand that at all.

What surprises me is that people in Barbados put up with these things. It is perhaps that the organs for the dissemination of information keeps certain things quiet and do not really let the people know what is going on. It may also be that the people of Barbados have become so brain-washed that they believe they are not entitled to anything more than to be starving, second class citizens looking for jobs, and they must fall back to the beneficence of Government Ministers to find jobs for them. We do not demand anything; and our basic human rights, human dignity and self respect appear to have disappeared with the coming into being of this Government. Or is it that they so despise the people that like the Federal Prime Minister they feel that the people have short memories; and that if they hold back \$1 1/4 million for shortly before the election and then dish it out to the waterfront workers, they will vote them back into power? We are not having a war, so imagine hearing about displaced persons. I have heard of displaced persons being driven from Poland and Greece, but now we have displaced persons in Barbados. They feel that if they hold back this money the memories of the people are so short, or their fears about the future are so shallow, that they will vote them back into power; so they say you can catch your breath now, but they will catch up with you. That seems to be the general tenor of the speech made by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

The hon. member went on to say "we either reduce these services and put up old age pensions, or continue to give the services which we are now giving and let the old age pensions stay until a little later." Does he mean a little later this year just before elections? The Minister said he is spending \$3 million a year on social services. He did not

give the House the figure which the additional 60¢ per week would involve the Treasury in when he made all of these broad and general statements. What the members of the public would like to know.....(Hon. M. E. COX: 10,000 by 60¢)... I heard the hon. member say there are 8,000 old age pensioners at 60¢; I am not very good at arithmetic. I like analysis so I will leave the arithmetic to the members on the other side who are only capable of arithmetic - addition and subtraction. Let them come out and say this is the amount of money and where they got it from. The Government which budgeted for a deficit of \$1 1/4 million last year had a surplus of well over \$1 million, and this increase would not involve \$500,000; I think I can say that without fear of contradiction; but in any one year they can find \$1 million to fritter away and disappear up Roebuck Street.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Did you hear what the hon. member said?

Mr. SPEAKER: He said the Government can find \$1 million to fritter away and disappear up Roebuck Street.

Mr. BARROW: So what? Do I have to go into detention now? I do not know if I have to go to the foot, to the bottom of the class, or in detention. Does he think that private lessons make him a school teacher?

As I was saying, they can budget for a deficit two years running of less than \$1 million knowing full well, and being told on this side, that they are going to get a surplus; and it was proven by what happened in the last financial year by having the fantastic surplus of \$2 1/2 million. Yet they say they cannot find enough money to give an additional sixty cents a week. Suppose there were 8,000 pensioners as the hon. member said at 60 cents; that would be \$1,000 a week for fifty-two weeks or \$240,000. I do not know what the figures are because I have not checked them. If there were 10,000 old age pensioners, it would be \$6,000 a week and just over \$320,000 a year.

There is no year since I have been back in this island that they have not had a budget surplus of over \$1 million; and most of the years it has been in the region of \$2 million or \$3 million. Can they honestly and seriously say that after capital expenditure, after they have gone in for servicing of loans and that kind of thing and expecting the same kind of deficit they had last year will more than likely turn out into a surplus of \$1 1/2 million, that they cannot find \$200,000 for old age pensions?

If they cannot find money for old age pensions, since they have promised Civil Servants an increase, where are they going to find that money? Or are they only fooling the Civil Servants now it is election year? There is no provision in the Estimates for any increase of backpay for any Civil Servant; there have been no agreements or concrete proposals about increases for Civil Servants. Let us say that there are 10,000 pensioners at 60 cents; that is roughly \$320,000 or whatever it is. What about the 3,000 Civil Servants? I am sure you do not intend to give them a dollar a week increase to bring the figure to \$3,000. You must be giving them more than that; so where is that money going to come from?

5.55 p.m.

There is no one Treasury for Civil Servants, one for Old Age Pensioners, another for displaced persons and another Treasury for Family Allowances. If you cannot find \$300,000 for Old Age Pensions, where the money for the Civil Servants is going to come from? I use those figures hypothetically, but I am sure the amount could not be more than that. Ten thousand old age pensioners given a 60¢ increase per week would mean an increase of \$6,000 per week, about \$312,000 a year. Where the money for the Civil Servants is going to come from? The Hon. Premier has not said anything about that in his Budget Speech.

Stop fooling the Civil Servants that you are going to give them an increase. You say that you are getting a Commissioner for that, but you are putting forward to the people of Barbados that you cannot pay any more towards old age pension. This is a case where you are not honest to the people. I am charging the Hon. Premier with not being

square and honest. You are incapable of being honest and square to the people of Barbados. Where are you going to get the money from to pay Civil Servants if you are not able to pay the Old Age Pensioners more. Put me in detention or report me to the headmaster for saying so.

The Hon. Premier said: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that hon. members have heard — and this will testify to the good faith of the Government — that we have now asked the International Cooperation Administration to send us an expert who will stay with us for a period and go into the whole question of old pensions and public assistance and to advise us on how best it can be done on a contributory basis. Now in all other places I know of old age pensions and social security are a contributory scheme. The employee when he is working has his weekly deductions from his salary, the employer makes his contribution and the Government makes its contribution; but in this case, the Barbados Government makes all the contribution. We want to adopt a more modern system and make it contributory. That gentleman is likely to arrive during this year, but they did not give any fixed time."

What the Hon. Premier is saying is that he wants a contributory scheme, but who would the contributory scheme benefit? He had a comprehensive scheme put forward by Professor Richardson and he has not sought to avail himself of the advice which was given by Prof. Richardson at that time. All of a sudden now, he is going to get another expert.

Let us try and analyse what he is saying. He says that in all other countries you have a contributory scheme. That is not an old age pension scheme; that is a national social security scheme. In England you have the 1946 and 1948 Acts which give you these kind of benefits. You get sickness, unemployment, maternity, widow and orphans, retirement and death benefits. The National Insurance Family Provision Act was a different Act from the National Insurance Act. That is a comprehensive system of social insurance which was introduced in July 1946 in England, and it is still operative. It is called the Beveridge Report on full employment.

Now, Sir, in order for a person to benefit under a limited insurance scheme, that person would have to be a contributor; and it stands to reason that the 8,000 or 10,000 old age pensioners were not contributors to any such insurance scheme. It would be left to the people who are now working to contribute to such a scheme of national insurance. It would surprise the Hon. Premier that there are many business houses and business undertakings in Barbados who have contributory insurance schemes operating right now. As a matter of fact, the tax has become very universal. However, the granting of old age pension cannot be restricted to people who contribute to it; the reason why you give old age pension is because those people are not able to work for themselves; and in a community like Barbados, you will find that a lot of people who reach the age of 68 years, particularly if we go on at the present rate, would never have had a full year's employment in a job at all.

Now, Sir, when Sir William Beveridge wrote his full employment thesis and when the famous Beveridge Report came out, he pointed out that in order to introduce a satisfactory system of social insurance that you would need a high level of employment in the community. That is why I say that employment is a most important economic problem, and you can call it a problem of employment or a problem of unemployment; it only depends on which side you look at it. He said that you needed a high level of employment; and the big quarrel which went on with the Socialists and Liberals like Sir William Beveridge and the other people who contributed to the idea of national health insurance and the Conservative Party, was that they could not agree as to what constituted full employment.

Sir William Beveridge said that between 96% and 97% of the people should be working. The Conservatives said that full employment was 93% because they like to have a reserve of people whom they can call upon. Then they averaged from that that full employment was roughly 93%

of your population. Sir William Beveridge said 'no' to that and that it was 96% or 97% and the Conservatives said that they could not agree to this because with 7% of the people unemployed, the Government would be bankrupt or that the contributions would have to be so high that you would not be able to collect taxes.

Sir, it is not a question of bringing down an expert, so do not try to fog us off by telling us that you are going to bring down an expert. In Barbados you have these 10,000 old age pensioners who are beyond working age, and they have nothing to do with the 26,000 people unemployed. Let us try and get this straight. These figures are not relative to the number of people alive who want jobs; the number of people of working age.
6.05 p.m.

All of these problems as to how much you allocate to social services, how much to administration and so on, are all bound up with this question of raising the standard of the community. Unless you are tackling the problems to see that every opportunity should be made to make it possible for people to achieve self-respect in the comity of nations, to achieve the same standard or that nearly as possible as that enjoyed by people in other countries, you are merely keeping yourself in power by window-dressing schemes to make people beholden to you for ever and ever Amen. One member of Parliament of a neighbouring colony said in relation to the Federal Prime Minister who was then Leader of the Government Party, that he adopts an interminable policy and he pursues it interminably. You hold out the carrot at the end of the stick and tell people that the Colonial Office will give them \$40,000; you will go on telling them that from time to time and then you say that they have short memories.

I do not think that people have so little respect for themselves that they will tolerate this state of affairs indefinitely. In addition to these 10,000 Old Age Pensioners you have between 26,000 and 28,000, it may be 30,000 unemployed. You should not discuss these people too much or tell them that they have short memories, because, on one of these days, something will blow up. I have never seen one of them over there do anything in an emergency in this country; they may be looking for shelter but it is a very serious state of affairs. They ought to see the danger signs and recognise that they cannot go on producing this sort of budget every year and tell people that they must have a conscience.

The Premier says that anyone who has any conscience will realise that the Government cannot, at this stage, increase the Old Age Pension. I really do not understand this. If you have any kind of conscience at all, well then you will realise that the Old Age Pension can be increased; but if you are unconscious, you will agree with them that the Old Age Pension cannot be increased. That is the only way in which I can read it. If they have promised Civil Servants an increase in the Election Year, I hope that the Civil Servants will not be so stupid as to allow their votes to be influenced by any salary increase. I want the Civil Servants to tell them where the money is coming from and then they will start with the figures.

For a very long time I have been arguing that the Ministers should be the last people on earth to attack the Mayor of the City of Bridgetown. Attack the Chairman of the Northern District Council; he has got to go cap in hand and get a subvention; but you have concentrated in the corporate area something like 80,000, 90,000 or 95,000 out of a population of 250,000 in this island. Half of the Budget of the Bridgetown City Council is spent on preventing a riot in Barbados; the City Council is doing the Government's job. At any time that they are in a crisis, the Premier will try to smooth over things because he in his ignorance, and the Mayor of Bridgetown.....

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member makes reference to the Government he is impartial, but if he is speaking of any member in Parliament, he must not mention any individual.

Mr. BARROW: I want to talk about the Premier. The Premier in his abysmal ignorance of finance and his lack of planning, and the hon. senior member for the City, are as indispensable to each other as Tweedledum to Tweedledee! This Government could not survive without the hon. senior member for the City because, taking from the taxpayers of St. Michael over one half of the revenue of the Bridgetown City Council to spend on unemployment relief, is preventing people from rioting and throwing the Government out of the office. Out of a Budget of \$2 million in the Bridgetown City Council, over \$1 million is spent on unemployment relief. Therefore, when I hear them attacking one another, I take that with a grain of salt. I say that they are indispensable to each other; there is the right arm and there is the left arm, but sometimes the left arm does not know what the right arm is doing! (*Laughter*).

The Premier says this: "Now it is generally known, I think, that the old people need not suffer; they get the Government contribution and according to the law they are also entitled, if they prove their case, to public assistance. If it can be proved that they are in need of certain essential elements of life, public assistance has to come to their aid; so, Sir, I am very glad for this opportunity to make a pronouncement at this stage on the question of Old Age Pensions. If we could do more we would, but we are trying to get some expert to come to us and advise us how to do it on a contributory basis."

Therefore you have the Premier disclosing the full set-up here in Barbados. Public assistance is run almost exclusively by the Bridgetown City Council; public assistance in the Northern district does not amount to a row of pins, but down here you have one million dollars for public assistance.
6.15 p.m.

You have hereditaments taxable annually to the tune of \$3,830,000, so trade is accountable on a *pro rata* basis to twice as much as householders in laying the rates of trade tax. So what you do is to allow the merchants to make a lot of money, not minding that the consumer pays through his nose, because you get it from the merchant in trade tax. You say there is So-and-So, the member for the City, he will tax them; they do not mind paying him \$1 million in trade tax, but that will keep the people quiet, and it is true you do not have to look after that end; he will be bowling from the southern end and you will be bowling from the north! The Premier comes out — he is very ingenious in his presentation sometimes — and discloses matters which other members would probably like concealed; but it is down here in the Budget Speech. Not only did he say it, but it is down in Black and White: that they do not administer public assistance.

The Public Assistance Committee is under control of the Bridgetown City Council. What I have discovered is that country people who rely on public assistance prefer to come to Bridgetown and set up residential qualifications sometimes for a night. If Wednesday is the meeting of the Public Assistance Board, on Tuesday they take the day off to set up residence in town. Ask any member who has served on these Committees and know about it. Ask the member for St. Joseph, the Chairman of the Northern District Council whether public assistance cases do not come down to Brother So-and-So in the City. They come down on Tuesdays and establish residential qualifications, go to the Committee on Wednesday and say they live at 8th Avenue, New Orleans, Westbury Road; then they make sure they are home on Thursday when the Inspector comes around, do not put on the cleanest clothes and then collect pension, and by the week-end they are back in the country again.

Fortunately, Sir, this is not very prevalent; but you see they do not have much confidence in the Northern or Southern District Councils when it comes to matters of public assistance, so they resort to the City. Those are things which anybody knows go on. The hon. junior member for Christ Church was Deputy Mayor of Bridgetown, and I am sure that if you call him into the sanctuary of your office that you would be able to get some information from him on that point.

Mr. GODDARD: Not only am I a member of the City Council, but I am Chairman of the Public Assistance Committee. It is not absolutely correct to say that people leave the other parishes and come down to the City to get public assistance. They may make application, but before they succeed in getting assistance, we have inspectors who visit their homes to see that they have proper qualifications. If they are in need, by all means they get it. (*Cheers*)

Mr. BARROW: In other words, what the member has said is that they do not turn anybody away if the persons are really in need. That is what happens in a community like this. If there is no national insurance scheme in Barbados, or a social security scheme, this is the cord to be dangled in front the electors at election time for votes, as it stands to reason that there must be some safety valve. The safety valve in this instance is the Public Assistance Committee of the corporate area of Bridgetown.

Now the other thing which I think perhaps we have to consider very seriously, is this: The Premier said that they are considering increasing the retirement age from 55 and 60 years to 60 and 65 years, and he went so far as to make the invidious comparison that the hon. junior member for St. James, who has not displayed a great deal of figure since he has been a member of this House, is as alert as a young man of 35 or 40 years, and people like them should not be put out to pasture. That is a highly debatable point; but they still have a lot of useful service to render this community. It is true that here in Barbados a lot of people who are drawing pensions are back working in the jobs and drawing their pensions; and in some cases, the highest possible emoluments that the office from which they retire carries; so they are getting it both ways. Government probably gets back a little by way of taxation, it is true, but I wonder if it is any incentive to the younger people in the Civil Service if they have to wait five or ten years longer to get promotion.

What I think the Government ought to be doing is this: As long as you have a plentiful supply of recruits in the lower and administrative branches of the Civil Service, the Government ought to make sure that when a man retires from his job a younger man gets a chance of promotion and not bring back — I would not like to call them old foggies — these old horses as it were, and put them in the race again; they are preventing other people from getting on. The Hon. Premier has only thrown out this suggestion, but I wonder how much money he would really save. The disservice which it would do to the younger people in the Service by keeping people on at 65 must far out-weigh the financial consideration of saving money, because after all postponing it for another five years, you still have to pay out the pension, but you probably hope you will not have to pay out the pension for such a long time.

There is one part of the Hon. Premier's remarks which has left me a little nonplussed, and it is this: in talking about the Deep Water Harbour, he said: "The cost of the Harbour is being paid from loan funds, \$12 million of which have already been raised in London. Pending the raising of further loans to cover the balance of the cost, temporary finance is being afforded from available funds. By the end of the financial year 1959-60 approximately \$14 million has been paid to the contractors; and it is expected that most of the remainder of the cost will be paid by 31st March. We had already borrowed from the United Kingdom one half of that, and the other half is still, so to speak, owing to us. Meanwhile we have been advancing payment for the further cost of the Harbour loan funds. When the £2.5 million is recovered it will be used in other directions."

Now, Sir, this is something which I want to get absolutely clear. The Hon. Premier has said that the Harbour is costing \$5 million, that is \$24 million, all of which will be paid by the end of March. Having suddenly decided to apply the cost of the Harbour into sub-divisions, you have the Harbour as Harbour, bulk sugar store, and cost of the roads to the Harbour in order to allay the fears of the people of Barbados that they have long since exceeded the estimate which they have. They say it is only going to cost £5 million now, but then we have to pay for the other things as *ad hoc* items as it were; so that the estimated cost of

the Harbour is \$17.67 million, bulk sugar store and equipment \$4.6 million, roads to the Port \$1.3 million and so on. It is just like when you go to buy a new car. The gentleman at the garage tells you that it cost \$3,000 plus the 10% which the Government wants making it \$3,300. When you go to drive off the car, he tells you that the engine will cost another \$1,000; when the engine is put in he will tell you that if you look on the bill you will see that if you want tyres from them, you would have to pay \$160; and then when you feel everything is O.K., he will ask you about the upholstery and the seats.

6.25 p.m.

In the end, the car would cost you \$5,000. That is counted as good salesmanship; and I think that is the Government's approach. The salesman feels that if he tells a prospective buyer the full price one time, he will get frightened and would not buy; so he gives the price in bits, the price of the upholstery by itself, the price of the body and then the price of the tyres. That is all the Premier is doing.

If you look at the Ritchie Report, you will see that it had plans on everything considered; it even dealt with access roads. When they came down to the House, they gave an estimate for the Harbour and access roads included. I remember well that the then Premier said that if the Contractors had made a mistake of going over the price in the contract that he would levy on everything that Richard Costain Ltd had down there. He further said: "Do not think that we are fools and have entered into any contract with these people foolishly," I think it was the hon. junior member for Christ Church who asked him if this was on a cost plus basis because he felt that with materials, labour costs and all of that, you must expect that in five years the cost would go up. The then Premier repeated that if the contractors went over the price that he would levy on every truck and every piece of equipment, or what they had in Barbados and in England. He said that it was a water-tight contract.

Now we have his successor coming into office and saying that the cost of the harbour is \$24 million but the access roads would be so much more and the alignment or roads and other relative works \$2 1/3 million and so on. We do not know where we stand. That is what I talked of being honest with people.

As far back as 1954, I had reliable information that they would be lucky if they got it built under \$33 million; but by dividing it up in bits, they want to prove that I am wrong. The Ministers are like the agent selling you the motor car. That is the same technique which is now employed. I know very little about engineering, but I know that the contractors appear to have managed to get a couple of ships in there; but I would ask, at what price?

But far from that aspect of the matter, what alarms me is this: The Hon. Premier says that the people in England owe them £2 1/2 million. That is news to us. What I remember was that when they owed Richard Costain \$11 million, and they borrowed that money from the Labour Welfare Fund, they went to England to raise a loan through the Crown Agents at 6 1/2% on 98 and they were supposed to have raised \$2 1/2 million then. At that time they never put in for a loan of \$5 million on the market at all. It is therefore news to us that they have \$12 million lying down in London for them. This is what the Premier says: "Meanwhile, we have been advancing payment for the further cost of the Harbour from loan funds. When the £2.5 million is recovered it will be used in other directions." That money could only be owing to the Government of Barbados if the Crown Agents had \$12 million lying down in England for them. I wonder if the Hon. Premier is aware that this is not so; if he so thinks, he would have to explain how it is that \$12 million is owing to the Government of Barbados from the flotation of this loan and yet they go into the Treasury and take money out of it in order to pay Richard Costain and the other people working down there.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is fulminating all the time. I have not heard anything which I consider worthwhile to desire an answer. But as far as this money is concerned,

all I meant was that the Colonial Office knows that we want £5 million. We took £2 1/2 million then and they know that sometime later we are coming back for the other £2 1/2 million. That is why I said "so to speak."

Mr. BARROW: Sir, I would like to say something strictly confidential. I can use, say about \$2,000 right now, so I will consider that you owe me that money and I hope I will be able to collect it from you tomorrow! I mean if you had it for this purpose!

Now, Sir, the hon. member said what he meant; he did not say what he said. Suppose this statement had gone out to the public of Barbados! The Hon. Premier knows that I know that they do not have \$12 million down there. They do have money down there in General Colonial Funds and so on, but they know that they cannot get it back because it is not worth 68% of what they invested.

This is what the Premier said: In short, the first estimate was £5 million. We have borrowed from the United Kingdom half of that and the other half is still so to speak owing to us. If you say that somebody owes you money, are you not trying to give the people the impression that the money is there and all that you have to do is to call for it? What does he mean when he says that the money is owing to us? All that he meant is that somebody owes it to you.

I say that that sort of thing is not being honest with the public because the people get an entire wrong impression if I did not say it here, the people would go away with the idea that they had \$13 million owing to them. If we go on from there, I would say that they have been advancing payments for the further cost in the harbour from loan funds. The loan funds would be \$12 million. They have been advancing these payments from the Treasury pending the raising of this loan; and they have also been raiding a lot of other funds, like the Labour Welfare Fund which is being used for building houses, the Revenue Equalisation Fund and so on. Where is the \$12 million going to come from?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member knows that he is not true when he says that we use money from the Labour Welfare Fund to finance the harbour.

Mr. BARROW: Is the Hon. Premier telling me that they have these different things marked in the Treasury, and that they have not used any money from the Labour Welfare Fund? I will sit down and let the Hon. Premier tell me this. Occasionally, we have been advancing payments for the further cost of the Harbour. I would like him to tell us where is the money to come from by the 31st March, which is only fourteen days from now? The amount was \$14 million up to September, 1960. Ask the Hon. Premier where that money came from.

6.35 p.m.

He said that what I am saying is not true. It cannot come from Loan Funds because these funds have not been raised on the Money Market of London. I invite the Minister of Finance to say where the money came from; why has he gone silent all of a sudden? If something which I have said is not true, well, what is the truth? Did somebody lend them? (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: You must find that out.) Then it is a mystery! Well, I am entitled to find out where the money came from! If the Premier does not know, let him say that he does not know; but do not contradict people and say that they are not telling the truth. They appear to be like a pack of disgruntled sitting fowls to me.

The Premier went on to talk about the Harbour, the rates and so on. I have commented on that already. There is another aspect of the Harbour with which I want to deal before I am finished with that aspect of this Speech. I do not know if Your Honour will remember this, but during the second World War, thousands of West Indians from all parts of the Eastern Caribbean went to Bermuda and were able to get work and acquire certain technical skills by working in the dockyards of Bermuda. It is a matter of public knowledge that on the Main and in the Eastern Caribbean there is a need for proper docking facilities, for the manufacture of ships, ship-building, ship-chandlery and so

on. Cement is declared to be a pioneer industry but we have not got any cement industry. If there is one field left over for Barbados to explore, it is the field of ship-building and docking facilities.

We have spent all of that money on a Harbour which cost £3 million. We could put down somewhere in that area, proper docking facilities and get a lot of trade not only through these ships which are in transit, but from Bermuda, British Guiana and Maracaibo. If there is one industry which has not been exploited in the Eastern Caribbean it is that of docking facilities. We have had a screw-lifting dock for many years and there is always a ship on it. One would have expected that they would have been doing economic planning on a project such as this.

When you are spending a sum of money as large as \$25 million, it pays you to set up a team of experts. You get people who are experts in sociology and anthropology, things which appear to be unrelated at the first inspection, and you set up a team to go into the ramifications. Alongside of this Harbour Development, one would have thought that we would have tried to get something by putting down docking facilities there so that you would be able to dock even small destroyers. We have all of this traffic and we make no effort to advertise for a firm of experts. Today there are firms who are willing to put down docking facilities provided that they get a franchise; and we could cater to this traffic. The situation which you have now is that there is this latest increase of the industrial reserve army of the unemployed; and the only prognosis for their future is that they will be able to get a little dole between now and election time. The truck loader or whatever he is would not look to the Minister for largesse; what he is looking for is employment. I said last week that it is a pity that members of the Government do not read poetry or they would know this:

"Till fares the land
To human ills a prey
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.

That is exactly what you will find happening. They do everything in their power to make sure that they remain entrenched in their unassailable position until the end of time, and get as wealthy as possible. I would challenge any hon. member to get up here and say that any member of the mercantile community is not immeasurably better off since this Government has been in power.
6.45 p.m.

I challenge any member to say that, despite the rise in the level of wages, you have a large number of people in Barbados at the working level enjoying a greater monetary income than they were enjoying before they came into power. I do not think anyone will dispute what I say. So far from soaking the rich, all they have succeeded in doing is drowning the poor. What I am saying then is that the Government should do something about docking facilities, and it is not too late if they have not made any provision for the establishment of dry docking facilities, to advertise in all countries in the world interested in this kind of enterprise for a firm to come and operate docking facilities at the Deep Water Harbour site or close thereto.

I must say that this is a remarkable Budget Speech. It is the first time that I have heard the Budget used as a means of appealing to people to stop watering their gardens; but the Hon. Premier was probably trying to fill out the figures he was quoting and said that he had asked people to stop watering their gardens. I really do not want to say too much about that. If I sort of pick on every little deficiency in this Speech, you would not be able to get on with the Committee of Supply.

Now the Premier said that during the last five years approximately \$50 million have been spent on capital projects - this will include the Deep Water Harbour - and they have carried out successfully the largest programme of loan raising in the history of the island. That that has been done without affecting adversely the general financial standing of Barbados is an achievement of which we can be proud. Just before that, the Premier started by saying that they were

able to raise a lot of this money by local loans. Now I want to make this abundantly clear: I have already said time and time again that there is absolutely nothing wrong with raising local loans; but when you have heavy capital projects to carry out in view of the fact that the money is re-invested from the net saving after taxation out of profits to firms and businesses and that kind of thing, that money should be used for depreciations, for capital improvement and things like that within industry itself; and that money should be also available to middle and lower income groups. That investment capital should be used for mortgage to help the building industry. There is nothing at all to be proud of in the expansion of business locally. There is nothing at all to be proud of because you intimidate the few insurance companies and tell them that they must send you a prospectus although they must invest money under our local Incorporated Loan Act.

If we carry out tremendous capital development, we should try and get as much money as possible from overseas and leave the local money market free to service mortgages, the building programme and the expansion of local industries and so on; it is far more difficult for local businessmen to raise money overseas than it is for Government to raise money overseas. What the Government did was this: they said, give the people of Barbados some sense of taking part in this thing; they came to the people of Barbados for a part of the loan which they have raised during the past five years, but that is bad financing, because the more money which is injected into the economy from outside to prime the economic pump, the more investment capital is released or available locally for building and so on.

Now the Hon. Premier is surprised at the effect which the expansion of credit facilities has had on the economy of this island. He has now become alive to that; but if you look back in the Budget Debate of last year, you will see where I drew attention to the fact that the extension of credit facilities will make people pay these enormous sums for consumer goods by way of interest payments, and that was going to have a very severe effect on the economy of this island. Most of the money would be going overseas to the people who, by virtue of the amendment to the Usury Act, are now able to charge more than 6%; while local Barbadian capital is not able to get anything more than 6% for investment, so it has a two way effect on the economy. This is a matter now in which anybody who has to handle mortgages of the Banks can tell you about.

Let us take an illustration - I am not afraid to call names - of Olds Discount in Trinidad. Olds is a corporate body and they can charge any rate of interest they like; the sky is literally the limit. As you know, on furniture it will be 14% or 15% and on bicycles 19% or 23% and so on. The Usury Act was the saving grace of the economy of Barbados for all these years; it meant that small people could get mortgages even on a chattel house. A chattel mortgage is unheard of today in Barbados. No Solicitor is going to accept a chattel mortgage. If you have a daughter or a niece going away, you cannot say to him that you have a chattel house on Mount Pleasant land and it is worth £200; he would laugh at you. Chattel mortgages are virtually unknown in Barbados today, except where a Roebuck Street merchant will mortgage the stock and trade and the shop of a man to whom he is supplying goods. That is normal business security in that way.

People who have spare capital take up that money and send it to Trinidad and other places overseas. By virtue of this one lopsided repealed amendment to the Usury Act, whereby only people who are resident abroad or foreign companies can charge more than 6%, the money goes out and the interest payments also go out. People in Barbados pay money for these goods, and what they call discount charges - they do not call them interest anymore, but a rose by another name to me would smell the same way - go out of the island.
6.55 p.m.

When the interest goes out of the island it is not necessarily brought back or sent back by way of payments, because they invest that money and it stays outside. When at the time of the amendment to the Usury Act we pointed out

the effect which it would have on the economy, the Hon. Premier did not see it; and it is only now that he thinks that he is getting a bit alarmed by the extension of credit facilities but he does not quite know what he is going to do about it.

Sir, I want to say in winding up my speech that I cannot take the Hon. Premier seriously, when the one thing which he has to comment on with respect to the whole economic situation in Barbados last year was the fact that the people had drunk more rum. He said that he found it extremely commendable. He could not say that he found it commendable that the productivity of the country had increased; that the national income was expanding at a pace which it could keep pace with the growth of the population; but the one thing which he found very commendable about the whole economy was that the amount of rum drinking had increased. I do not know if he hopes that he can get the people of Barbados so besotted with rum drinking that that Party would have a chance to get back in.

I thought that the *rationale* of taxation on commodities such as alcohol is that you suppress it; because it serves as a repressive factor in controlling the quantity of rum drinking. However, the Hon. Premier finds that very commendable. He can say that it did a good thing by bringing in a little more revenue.

I think that Treasury Deposit Receipts system should be introduced; but in view of the fact that you do have Pay-As-You-Earn, I do not think that you should have Treasury Bills at this stage. I would say in conclusion to this Budget Speech that this is Election year and the Premier is waiting for people to catch their breath. If by that he means that he is going to raise taxation next year, I want to tell him that we will spare no means at all to let the people of Barbados know what the Government means by catching their breath. I really do not know when they talk of giving people a breathing spell if they mean that they intend to make up for all their deficiencies next year if the people are so foolish as to put them back in power.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: I now being 7.00 o'clock p.m., the sitting of this House now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. 7.00 p.m.

On resumption,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw to Your Honour's attention that there is no quorum and ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, the remarks which I am going to make pertaining to the Budget would be chiefly on my pet subject of social development; but before I get to that, I want to say that it is a pity that the hon. junior member for St. John who is supposed to have been the main speaker on behalf of the Official Opposition, missed the golden opportunity that was given him. If he wanted to expound a development theory, then he should have spent a little time in studying it so that his speech would be genuine opposition in the correct sense of the word. Rather than that, and it is not unknown to all of us, we were treated to multitudinous repetitions; just like a man of few words who keeps repeating the same thing all the time.

I do not remember the last time the hon. member said so many contradictory things. Any number of times in his remarks, he spoke about how Government formerly taxed people; and yet, in this particular Budget, he said that they were not taxing them enough to get in more revenue instead of budgeting for a deficit. All of it is because of the fact that he did not do enough homework on the Budget; if he had done so, he would not have spent so much time in repeating himself.
7.50 p.m.

One thing which did catch me in his remarks, and it makes me feel that even though most of what people say you might consider irrelevant, was a point to which I be-

lieve we are eventually going to pay much closer attention, if not at Unit Government level, perhaps at Federal Level. That is about shipping. Whereas we have been talking about building up tourism we will have to try, if we want to help our own economy in the World Market, and get in some form of heavier industry than sugar or tourism. The shipping services on a Federal level, rather than on unit level, is one of the phases to which we might give reasonable consideration.

Shipping is one of the bits of investment for which it would appear from my discussion with the oil industry, that you can get capital for investment although it would call for a big investment capital. I was pleased to be able to pick that out of the hon. member's speech because, for most of the time, he was talking about the Premier catching his breath. I think it is good to throw a joke at the hon. senior member for the City because one of the things he said is that this year you will catch your breath but next year we will catch up with you. That is an indication that the present Government will return to catch up with people next year. If this is Election Year, it looks as if the Opposition is quite confident that the Party in power will be the Government returned.

I would like to dwell in a little more detail on the aspects of social development rather than on any other point connected with the Budget. Last year when I spoke on the Budget, I mentioned that I considered that one of the resources in which we should invest is the resource of our people which is the most natural resource. I also said that from the point of view of investment, the average Barbadian was a pretty safe investment from the point of view of developing him in all phases. I am dwelling on this theme because I am firmly convinced that our problems throughout the West Indies today are, to a large part, of a sociological nature rather than of a political or economic nature.

It can easily be seen that where you may make your political changes these changes are obviously more dramatic, and you can notice them more easily. Your economic changes are sometimes along with your political changes or just a little after, but you can notice them. Sociological changes, many of which are the personality of the people themselves, take a little longer to come. Even although you build up your standard of living in other respects you might find that the people for whom you make these changes take much longer to adjust themselves to the changes.

I notice that, from the point of view of revenue, there are things which have fluctuated; and there is one thing which will bear out the point I am thinking about, that is, the Barbadian being the best thing in which to invest. It is a fact that the revenue has remained static from the point of view of fines; it is true that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy would say that if you give a Christmas Bonus the Government will get back the money by way of fines, as he has adumbrated to us.....

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. Did the hon. member say something about the senior member for St. Lucy? I did not quite catch to what the hon. member is referring.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I was referring very much to him.

Mr. TUDOR: Will the hon. member repeat himself?

Mr. STRAUGHN: The revenue from Court fines has not gone up in any way even although the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, in advocating that the Government should give a Christmas Bonus, said that the Government would get back some of that money from Court fines.

Mr. TUDOR: I believe that the hon. member has taken my remarks out of their context. I did mention the word "fines" and I made a general reference in this way: any disbursement of whatever nature from the Government causes something to come back to Government through taxation, fines and in other ways. The records are there and they can be read unless they have been disturbed.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I would not cast any reflection on the Officers of this House to say that the debates have been disturbed.

Mr. SPEAKER: A printer's error will be erased but the debates cannot be disturbed otherwise. All the speeches of hon. members are reported in the debates.

Mr. TUDOR: I cast no reflection on the Officers of the House.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I think that all hon. members know that the records are there; the hon. member can read that part of the debate in which he mentioned that you would get back some part of your revenue from fines.

Mr. TUDOR: It seems to me that the hon. member is bent on distorting that part of a speech which I made. I said that as to any amount disbursed by the Government, a part of it comes back from taxation of all sorts and through fines. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Both hon. members are speaking from memory. Neither one of them has quoted anything yet.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I think that the hon. member has a fine memory! However, that is a small thing! The revenue from fines did not change from \$21,000 during the course of the year. I am dealing with the development of the ordinary citizen and I am saying that you have good material in which to invest, because even in an economy in which there is a high cost of living and it is hard in making ends meet, with all of these things you still have a fairly stable economy. Even from the negative point of view you can see that you do not find people unnecessarily getting themselves into trouble, and that is why you find that you do not get any particularly high revenue from fines. That is a good reflection on the citizens of this island.
8.00 p.m.

I think that we have established, and everybody has accepted, the economic advantages of emigration as has been expounded and shown in the Budget, and the amount of revenue, remittances and so forth that comes back. We do not have to belabour the point. It has an effect on your population, not only from the amount of money that comes back in, but also from the correspondence that takes place with people who remain in the island, which really causes them at some time or other to start thinking of re-adjusting their standard of living. It is not something you measure visibly, but it is there.

That brings me to the point that we are fast becoming a hire purchase community living off borrowed money of tomorrow, and this is because the people themselves are demanding a higher standard of living; and therefore you see the impact which it has on the society of people striving beyond their means to give themselves a higher standard of living. You will find that the average West Indian might have an income of very little more than \$200 per annum, in many cases, but he is probably trying to lead the life of a person whose income is \$2,000 per annum. Those are just arbitrary figures which would be easy to understand because they are round figures.

Even if you might mention economically that a person is living beyond his means, it is not going to be possible to stop him from wanting to do that, and therefore you are going to get the sociological pressure of people wanting to live up to a certain standard. Even though their own individual economies might not justify it, it does not mean they are not going to continue attempting to do so. That shows, I think, the sociological pressures that we are having to face, and they are building up daily. Whether you try to handle them in a bold fashion in this Budget or in the next Five Year Plan, the problems themselves are from day to day; and I think it is just right that we should take note of them; because we are going to have to face them boldly in years to come.

Sir, there is one thing that we notice with pause, if I may say so, and it is that in the figures of the Revised Estimates for last year, we have noticed that some of them have gone up, some of them have gone down and some have remained the same; but one section that was not spent up to what was estimated was the section that deals with Prisons, Government Industrial Schools, Medical, Old Age

Pensions, Social Welfare and Public Assistance Board. We have actually spent about \$90,000 less than we had estimated. Again, Sir, you will notice that these are points which mostly deal with what I consider the social aspects and development of the community; they deal chiefly with the aspect of the problem that I am trying to highlight. It is remarkable and I think Government would do well to take note that their Revised Estimates in this particular field have actually gone down during the past year, which means that they have not used as much as they had anticipated.

You would have heard today, Sir, a certain amount of criticism as regard to old age pensions and whether Government was going to pay more. The Premier in his Budget Speech gave the feelings of the Cabinet on that matter. I do know that that is one of the things about which our Party generally is concerned, and the Premier is well aware of that. In seconding the reply to the Address of His Excellency the Governor, my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. James, made the point that he was concerned with old age pensions; and it is worthwhile to note that we need to pay more careful attention to our administration in that particular sphere. Though from the point of view of policy you might have budgeted for a certain amount of money to take care of these things, you actually spent \$90,000 less than you originally estimated for, and though there is no particular change of amount, you can see that it is something which must be the concern not only of the Opposition or even the backbenchers, but of the Government as well.

In this respect we are looking forward to the time, even before there is a proper social security scheme or national insurance, when we will have a uniform rate of public assistance throughout the island. That is something to which the Public Assistance Board should address its attention. It is worthy to note that we will get an expert from the International Cooperation Administration to help us with this old age pension and security scheme; but do not let us forget that there is a number of persons in Barbados who, I am sure, should have enough actuarial experience. We have enough clever mathematicians; and the head of our Statistical Department was considered one of the genius mathematical scholars of his day, and even though we may get an expert to help us, I am certain that these are things we can really handle.
8.10 p.m.

It is a wise thing to utilise information from international fields because the more varied experience you place at the disposal of the Government, so much the better; but I firmly feel that we do have the ability in our own Civil Service. If people of the Civil Service are commissioned to do this kind of work, and they wish to use their energy and to employ their national feelings, we can get a lot of these things done on our resources.

The whole system of Barbadian society always seem to make people look outside of themselves for solutions to their own problems. It is just the pattern of our social development where you have the particular masses struggling to reach a position; and because of that you find brother struggling against brother and you never look inside to solve your own problem, therefore, you rather bring in the third person. Even in a little family quarrel, you find that the parties rather like to go to the lawyers and ask them to come in and help them solve the quarrel. That is just the pattern of our own society and perhaps, I may revert to this a little later down in my speech.

The hon. junior member for St. John in his remarks mentioned that he thought that it was most sickening and annoying to find that a lot of people were fighting over trivials, and that such things form a great part of court cases. Perhaps, it might have been an inspired moment which caused the hon. member to say that because I do know that lawyers really do enjoy this kind of family bickering and getting the third person to come in and look into these small things.

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

Sir, I am going to touch on the field of tourism, and again, to show what I consider to be a social problem that

is involved there. We have accepted tourism as our second major industry; certainly, one of the industries from which we expect a great lot of revenue. Having accepted it in that field, we must also know that any such industry as tourism does complicate the social pattern of our social community. It is true that we want people to be developed in their hotel training schemes so that they can offer better service; and the Ministries of Trade and Education have shown in their Ministries how they want a better trained type of individual to take advantage of the emigration opportunities at the London Transport Executive; and those two Ministries have collaborated to the extent that they have training schemes for this purpose.

You also have admirable collaboration between those Ministries for your domestic and home economic schemes for people who emigrate overseas and this is another field in which these two Ministries have been showing the value of their collaboration; therefore, by that you can see that the idea of training hotel workers is taken in good faith.

However, on accepting that which is the economic side of it, we have this particular problem which we need to face: and it is from the point of view of complete access to our beaches and the use of our beaches. We know in general why tourists come to Barbados; they come to enjoy our sunshine and seabathing. I want to feel that we do not want to extend our tourist industry at the expense of our own people enjoying the facilities of our island, those facilities which have been bestowed on us by the Almighty. I think we all accept that. However, here we will find particular social pressures operating against the ordinary members of our community if we are not careful and guarded. We must give the people of the country the confidence that, even though we are going in for this big hotel scheme, yet they, the people of this community, can use the beaches without trepidation. Where there is just an open beach, the feeling is that you do not have to look around.

You just happen to put a big massive three or four-storied hotel near to the same beach and the people are not forbidden to pass there; but they do have to pass by this massive building to get to the beach at which they used to enjoy their seabathing, so they get the feeling, even though it may not be so, that they are trespassing. These are just invisible social pressures which operate on people and they do operate on people, it does not matter which Government is in power. It is a definite social pressure which operates on people and I will show how we must be prepared not to let these things go unchallenged.

I have on my right a member of the Town and Country Planning Committee, and we know that in checking with one of the officials of the Sandy Land project when we told him that we wanted a beach of our own for the people of the district, he assured us that on the plans there was this major access to the beach for the members of this community. He said that it was there and that it was finished; and he said so with such gusto and assurance and in such a suave and gentle and diplomatic manner, and with such gracious terms, that you would say that these people recognised that they had this responsibility and therefore, you could be assured that it was there.

8.20 p.m.

If there is one thing from our point of view that we will do it is to press them to carry out their promise. Just as they have it on their plans, and just as the parking lot is already there, the actual access to the beach must be there soon, otherwise the social question will develop again. Nobody had proper access to the Sandy Lane Beach. Whereas there was not this particular access to which we are referring, if you do not get the access early when the buildings are developed, when you do get the access people would get unaccustomed to using such access and they will find themselves not making use of the particular beach which they are accustomed to use. We must be vigilant in safeguarding these rights for our people. You should say that you will get this access there, but if you get it before the hotel is made, you will get it more easily than after the hotel has been finished. Even although you may say that the Government has no Crown lands as such, you have a situation and you must make sure that this access

or privilege of our people is maintained without any blemishes.

I notice that the hon. senior member for the City did make mention about tourist development. It looks like a favourite method of saying that you are attacking the present Government because they did not have the idea of tourism in the early 1940's. The Conservative Party claimed that they talked about it before, and the Labour Government did not accept it; but one thing must be noticed, that is where you can see the social pressures, that the social climate did not appear to be healthy enough.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like the hon. member to tell us what was the social climate and who was in power.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I do not know if the two things are in any way related. The hon. member will get his questions answered in the course of my remarks. I have mentioned that it is not a question of legislation or political changes as such. You can legislate for some things; you can legislate that you must love your neighbour as yourself, but that does not change people's feelings inside. The Government can pass any sort of legislation but that in itself does not automatically make the change. It would be a very blind person to say that by the stroke of legislation you could change people's feelings inside.

Social changes take longer to come than political or economic changes. I consider that the Government in power was quite correct in feeling that the particular social climate of the place was not conducive and adaptable to the encouragement of the tourist trade at that time. We grant you that the man in a particular business would say that if he could get more hotels quickly, the more economic it would be. Public opinion matters; and public opinion elects and governs Governments. If the Government correctly interpreted that the people did not feel that the social climate here was conducive to the encouragement of the tourist trade at that time, they must have been encouraged in their feelings because they were returned to power in 1951 and again in 1956. If it were not so, then the people would have used their ballots, not their bullets, and would have elected a different Party. If a Government is convinced that it is not the genuine feeling of the people on a particular matter, then the Government is quite right to say, even although somebody would show you how you could get a few dollars and cents by a particular scheme, that they do not think the climate is ready for it.

8.30 p.m.

I want to lay waste that type of argument that you sort of throw out as a gibe or criticism at the present Labour Government that they did not at the time in 1948, (Mr. MOTTLEY: Why not carry that in Queen's Park?) I think the hon. member knows that I can handle him on a platform too. (Mr. MOTTLEY: With what?) With the same thing with which you would handle anybody, and with the same logic which you cannot refute right now. I think he would remember that on a point of order he asked what were the social climates and who was the Government in power. Mr. Deputy Speaker, one cannot help hearing asides, and I will handle that aside. My reply therefore, is that you might do the same thing for 20 years doing it wrong and in the 21st year, you are still doing it wrong. The hon. member might produce experience in the wrong field and in the wrong way.

I have mentioned this problem of social development, and I think it is only right now to show how we are going to finance this scheme because this is what it boils down to. How are you going to finance all the development you want? I think it is right that I should make a passing reference to that and show what my opinion on it is and how the Government should develop along these lines. At present, Sir, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Social Services between them spend in the vicinity of a little more than \$8 1/2 million which is really a reasonable portion of our budget. When you consider the resources of the country, you can see that that is 30% or 40% of your budget on things that do not immediately bring in capital. When you train a person, it is not like building a beer factory, because if somebody builds a beer factory, you can get money out of it.

I think it is a reasonable amount of money you are spending under the present circumstances in this particular field, and it is quite obvious that if you are going to take on the whole scheme of social development in your country, you are going to need a terrific amount of finance to put it through. You are going to need much more finance than you have available at the moment.

Indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is very difficult to foresee how you will carry out any sort of development in Barbados unless you are willing to go into large figures, figures larger than you have at your disposal. Therefore you are faced with the situation as to how or when you will develop from loan funds or from deficit budgeting. We are in that position, and I think when we find ourselves there, we can easily use \$20 million on a social development scheme. I feel that we should be willing and interested in supporting a Federation that is strong enough to undertake development schemes of this sort for the whole area. Jamaica, which has a bigger budget than we do, has these terrific problems; as a matter of fact in some cases they are more acute. There is a lot of dynamism in the place and everything is more pulsating, but they have a stream of poverty which you will not see anywhere else in the British Caribbean. I have not seen it in any part of the British Caribbean or Venezuela or the Northern Antilles except in some parts of what used to be called the slums of Caracas.

There is a particular stream of poverty in Jamaica which you cannot imagine; and I am pointing out that though they have a lot more money at their disposal through bauxite royalties, they have problems of social development in their high way, and we in our small way have ours. The problem therefore is a mammoth one. The fact that they have not been able to get the lower stratum of their society developed fast enough to take advantage of the economic power that is being turned out in bauxite and other development, means that your upper and aristocratic classes are going further and further up; and the difference between them and the lower section of the community which cannot take advantage and which has not been so developed to take advantage of their development schemes, is that you find a widening hiatus at that point.

Having mentioned what takes place from the Jamaica economy, I come back to the Barbados scene. I would say that we are not in that abject position where we have the same variation of extreme wealth and abject poverty as there is in Jamaica or parts of Trinidad. Our problems might not be as acute in degree, but where we have our problems, even though we do not have extreme wealth and poverty, is that there is a great mass of our population that is unemployed and underemployed; and therefore you have that problem of trying to develop that particular section of our community that they would be able, even when you get to the point of tackling industrialisation, to take advantage of any industries you have.

I will develop that point a little more when we come to deal with the Deep Water Harbour, displaced workers and dislocation of labour there. The main crux of my argument is that regardless of what industry you talk about going into, you must pay primary attention to the people of the country in getting them equipped to handle this development. If you put down ten of the biggest factories now in Barbados do you think that would automatically take up the people who are displaced through the Deep Water Harbour?
8.40 p.m.

I am convinced that this problem of social development in the West Indies is so big a problem - I would almost say too big a problem - for any one unit be it Trinidad, Jamaica, or any other unit to tackle on its own; and we should concern ourselves and make a concerted effort to see that our Federation is developed in the strongest possible manner and at the fastest possible speed, and that you will be an independent and viable federation.

It may seem strange to raise a loan for educational purposes, but it is not so strange after all; there are many parts of the world which raise loans for educational purposes, but for a small unit it may seem strange. However, if the people must be qualified to take advantage of anything

which you may do for them, I would suggest that as the Government gave us the assurance in an earlier debate that an economic and planning unit was looking into these matters which affect the social and economic matters of the community, that Government will realise that this is a bigger problem than what any unit can handle; and when it reaches that stage, I think that we should show then that we are interested in developing such a national conscience in our Federation - and I do keep saying our Federation because Unit Governments are afraid to tackle this alone - that we want the people who will be educated to the cause of national unity, more productivity and to a better standard of living, to work towards that end.

I hope that I have elucidated on that point sufficiently enough to show why I was at pains to mention all these aspects of our social problem. In the end, in the finance of that, we accept the fact that our present financial resources cannot handle that; but we also must accept the fact that if not next year, the next five years or the next ten years, the problem would get so big that you would not be able to tackle it but it would have to be tackled; and the best way it would have to be tackled is on a Federal level.

I will now try to touch on the Deep Water Harbour from the point of view of social development. You know what the situation is. You know that you have ships coming into the Harbour already; and many of the people who are engaged in the handling of cargo in the way that it is handled now, will not be required for the same job. Eventually, you may need people for other jobs, but immediately you will not need as many to handle it as in the old way. That is known to everybody. If people were as well equipped in their knowledge with other problems as they are with our Deep Water Harbour problems, I think that we would be a well-alived community.

There is no question as to whether we should have a Deep Water Harbour; I think it is well established that we should have one and it is a *fait accompli*. Everybody must be convinced by now not as to whether you could afford to have the Harbour, but whether you could afford not to have it. It would be a very shortsighted politician who would criticise either the Government or individual members about the present situation of the Deep Water Harbour.

The three organisations most directly concerned with the operations of the Deep Water Harbour were the Government, the commercial interest in their own organisation and also the workers in their organisation with respect to matters concerning the Workers' Union. There, obviously, has been consultation with all three of these organisations. Sometimes one listens to the altercations in this House and wonders as to whether the organisations were working as closely and amicable as one would wish on this mammoth problem. It may have been about two years ago when I made my first comments on the Deep Water Harbour and my comments were in answer to remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I think he was criticising the Government on some aspect with regards to what it was doing; and my remarks were that I consider this as everybody's problem.

It is true that the Government has its part to play; and the commercial interest has sent out some of its members abroad to find out what should be done in their interest and they have submitted some memorandum to the Government. I said then in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that Government had their part to play, the commercial interest had their part and it was the responsibility of the Workers' Union to give their positive views to show that this problem must be tackled from a three-fold angle for the benefit of all.
8.50 p.m.

The hon. member might have been a bit peeved when I made those remarks, and he said they were superficial, but the debates will show that the hon. member agreed with what I said at the time. The commercial units want more official handling of cargo if they can get it on a competitive basis, get better revenue and so make profits; while the direct interest of the Workers' Organisation would be to see how it could best take care of the members who are

so involved. I say that in any criticism as to whether these workers or the Government may have missed the boat, it will have to be considered how much better the situation would have appeared if five or ten years ago we had looked at the number of persons whom people say might be displaced from their work. Some say that there would be one thousand persons displaced and others say that the number would be two thousand. A lot of these persons must be young men who must be under the age of forty-five years. Ten years ago we were talking about the Deep Water Harbour and we said that the Scheme was one of the best developments; it was shown how this thing was going to happen and when it happened these people would get the benefits.

If these people were told that they should have themselves equipped, they would have been better equipped to handle the changing circumstances. Right now I hear people say that you cannot get a good carpenter; I do not know whether that is true or not. If within the last ten years there were those who were equipping themselves with brawny arms to throw bags of sugar over their shoulders, if they had said that they could learn to be carpenters or masons or have some other kind of training, we would not be feeling the shock of the situation now; at least we would not be feeling it to the same extent. The shock has come because people suddenly find that they are out of work and they have nothing to do. If I gave you something to do you would not be able to do it, not because you are unemployed but because you are unemployable. I want people to realise that no amount of preaching from one Party or the other could better the state of affairs unless that major fact is realised.

If we provided twenty of the simplest industries or ten of the major industries you will find that people would be at a loss because they would not be equipped with the ability to enter these industries. This is a national problem of mammoth size. I consider that our social development must be handled properly at Federal level; that is a major problem where you have an effervescent community.

We have always said that Barbadians are well behaved, and I have already said that that is a good sign. You invite people to go to Church and they will stand up at the door and would not go inside; and yet you will find that the same community, when something generates them, run into the Law Courts. The same type of people who would be so shy that they would not accept a front seat in a show, the same type of person from the point of view of the social problem, would generate to such a pitch that they would scale the rails of the Law Courts and when the Judge is pronouncing sentence he cannot hear his own ears. Then you hear remarks from all sides that you did not expect that sort of thing.

This is a problem in connection with which I would like to do my own research, and I can see it is one of those invisible things which will get away from you. There are things which are deep down inside of people. We have talked about people's attitude to their work and of how they appear to be so lackadaisical. Why is it that the people were not treating the buses of the Transport Board properly? You have another Manager with the same staff and they are working properly. The public would appear to have more confidence in the transport system of the island because there is an affinity of spirit towards the people who are running the transport.

I go back to the problem in its major scope; I do not expect that this is pointing at the Government. I have said that this is everybody's business. I think that the hon. senior member for St. Peter made a statement in reference to the Governor's Speech and said that he would like to see a whole-sale Government and Union Association, you might say, investigating this problem of the Deep Water Harbour. I was pleased to hear him say what he said when he spoke about the fact that it is everybody's business. I am glad to know that we are now thinking on this national issue in a natural attitude, so to speak. The hon. member also said that if he finds that the Government is hesitant or slow to accept that situation, he himself in his Organisation in contact with international bodies, would be able to get

such a survey made and to see what impact this thing is going to have on the community.
9.00 p.m.

It is a very good idea to get these international surveys; and indeed the Union also had them five or ten years ago. They would be able to tell you how to develop the people and tell you how to develop the people better and how the workers can be more skilled in a variety of things, therefore shifting from one thing to another. I am very sorry to see that there is this unnecessary present-day conduct where people allow personalities to play in a mammoth business like this. You see it all the time in this Chamber. I would like to feel that there is close collaboration between the Government and the Union, but you got the Leader of the Union saying that he does not want to have an interview with members of the Government. I am not attempting to criticise the individual as such, but I think it is a very serious situation; personalities should be dwarfed by the giant problem we have to have.

I speak with very strong feelings on this matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to tell anybody who is so personally involved in this dislocation through the Deep Water Harbour, or any political Party or otherwise who come to tell you to blame 'X', 'Y' or 'Z' that the easiest thing to do is to blame the Government because you have a Deep Water Harbour; but it would be well worth these people's while to study this matter very seriously. A lot of them went to school with me and know me and I know them, and I have talked to them as well. There is such an industrial climate in a place like America that if 500,000 workers were displaced in the automobile industry the fellow who works in an automobile establishment would be able to go and repair tractors tomorrow; he is that well adjusted.

We have to develop a variety of skills in our people; it is a big job and we have to tackle it in a big way, and if our present finances cannot handle it from a unit point of view, let us feel that strongly about it that when we are debating federal issues, we will put this forward as one of the greatest problems. I feel that the Federal Government should be able to handle this type of thing better than any Unit Government, and I only say that this particular problem is everybody's business.

I think it is the cheapest kind of politics, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for somebody to start pointing around saying that the Government put the Harbour there and that is why you do not have any work, and things are going to be very bad with you. If you find you have missed the first boat by not training people ten or five years ago, all you have to do is to get a bigger boat and equip them as fast as possible. The population is increasing and a younger generation is coming up. If I had to take 100 persons to St. Lucia on the "Richwill" which has a certain capacity and I missed the boat and then another hundred persons came along, I could not use the "Richwill" any longer, I would have to use the Antilles or some other boat, because I still have to take the people to St. Lucia. No matter who criticises whom on this problem the job still faces us to be done. People have to be trained and developed so that as individuals in a community they are more productive and more independent personalities than they are now.

I think I have discharged my duties, Mr. Chairman, on the grounds of social development. I did have one other note relative to our Civil Service. That doubtlessly comes under public administration, but I will put the social angle on it rather than the administrative angle. The Premier did mention that they were considering extending the working age of a Civil Servant from 55 years to 60 years, because it is not desirable — and I have heard many people say that — for people to be drawing a pension and then putting people out of work. There are only two comments I want to make on that, and I think the Civil Service will agree with me on this point anyhow. I do not think I can myself criticise a man for drawing his pension because that is what he worked for and it must be his; but the other point is where the person comes back and does the work.

I am not against a man going back and doing a job; but the question that comes to my mind is either there is a vacancy in the job which has to be done, or the younger

people from the point of view of social development apparently are not taking on their responsibilities as quickly or as actively as their predecessors, and therefore they are not filling the higher job. Again it is just possible that there might be unwillingness in certain brackets of the Civil Service to promote young, outstanding and progressive elements who can take care of this responsibility. The fact remains that if a man retires and draws a pension, it is his pension which he has worked for, and if he goes back and gets another job it means that there must have been a job to be filled.

I can see therefore, Sir, that from a financial point of view Government must be concerned about the regulation of this age. I do not think anybody is quarrelling with the Government for that to any great extent, but certainly if you are going to have to handle it from the point of view of finance, from the point of view of the individual, I cannot see any criticism in a man drawing his pension and working again. If he is working again, it is because there is a job for him to do, because if there was somebody else to do it, then the other person should have been doing it. That is really a minor point of which I wanted to dispose, but I consider from the point of view of social development that it is one of our major problems. I do understand quite clearly that we do not have the immediate finances to tackle it at the present moment, and we have therefore to give serious thought as to how we can tackle it in another manner.
9.10 p.m.

Finance cannot be our master; do not make it our master. If we find that we have given it sufficient thought on the unit level and that it is too much of a mammoth task from the point of view of making a loan, then we should tackle it with more forcefulness from a federal level.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker,....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think you have spoken on this already.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was speaking when the official hour came for suspension of the sitting and unfortunately, I was not back in my place when this Honourable House continued to debate this matter. I am therefore, asking leave to continue my speech now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to continue his speech. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hon. M. E. COX: I, perhaps, would have no objection but surely the hon. member must appreciate that we have been sitting down here all the day. The hon. member left the House and, perhaps, must have went home and had a sleep and he is quite fresh now. Perhaps he can wait until later on.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member says later on. I do not think it is customary for any member to object if a member was not in his place.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will give way to the hon. member, but this is what I wish to say: The hon. member must appreciate that this is the House of Assembly and hon. members are not going to sit down here all day long and wait on him. It is not fair to us after the hon. member went home and came back fresh to resume his debate which perhaps would have ended in a shorter time were the hon. member here to continue. The hon. member must remember that he has lost his right to speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not appreciate what the Hon. Minister has said. If the hon. member is saying that I have lost my right to speak, I have only lost my right provided this House takes objection. When the hon. member takes the stand that I left and went home, I am perfectly willing to sit by and wait until all members of the Government speak...

Hon. M. E. COX: We do not want to muzzle anybody.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not begging for any favour. If they want to object, let them object. I do not want the Hon. Minister to think that I am begging the Minister for anything.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have understood all of that, and it is a question for the House. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. If any member raises objection, the question will be put to the House.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall be very brief. I thought the Hon. Minister of Trade would have appreciated that. The hon. junior member for Christ Church made some of the points which I was going to raise and that is why I say that I am going to be very brief. I am going to begin from where I left off. I was speaking on old age pensions, and there is one point that I would like now to make. While the Government had expressed the view that they cannot give an increase in old age pensions now, I expressed the view that there are those of us who would not compromise and who also feel that the age should be reduced to 65 years.

The Approved Estimate on Social Services is something like \$3,994,403 and the actual Revised Estimate is \$3,904,408 which means that they plan to spend \$90,000 less. I suppose the Hon. Premier can tell us what is the result of that. In other words, the Hon. Minister of Finance should say what were the schemes which you estimated upon that you do not intend to go in for now. If your revised estimate is less, what is wrong? Why do you not give an increase in old age pension or reduce the age to allow a greater number to have it?

I will now deal with that part of the Hon. Premier's speech as regards the high rates of interest. To me it is very important. He said:
9.20 p.m.

"The factors affecting the money market are: the widening of the field for trustee investment and fears of irresponsibilities by new Governments on independence. The reputation of Barbados and the West Indies however, will mitigate the last mentioned factor."

I see that the Premier is widening his scope; he seems to have a lot of faith in the other countries, because he says what the reputation of Barbados is and he talks about lending money to a responsible people running the Government. From the point of view of the hon. member who has just sat down, I commend him at least for the views which he has expressed on this matter.

The Premier says this: "The high rates of interest prevailing make borrowing expensive and underlined the importance or undertaking from Loan Funds only schemes from which there will be adequate returns." Surely in a matter like this, in a country where you have a low standard of living, in a country where there is the necessity, as the last hon. member who spoke mentioned, for education along certain lines and in certain fields, I do not know what the Premier means here; I cannot reconcile this with our conditions in Barbados.

It is important that you only borrow money for schemes from which you will get adequate returns. I hope that the adequate returns will be the education of people. A few days I had a talk with this engineer who is out here, with whom I notice the Government had lunched; his name is Sir Herbert Manzoni. I associate myself with your technological school. You cannot argue that you should only borrow money for schemes from which you will get adequate returns and leave out the technological school. You would only measure your immediate returns in dollars and cents but what are you going to get from a future generation?

It must be brought home to the Premier that within recent years since we have amended the Usury Act, the Banks operating in Barbados can all claim to be of a foreign nature. You have Barclays Bank, the Canadian Bank of Commerce and the Bank of Nova Scotia. Originally you could only borrow from the banks at 6% interest; and now all the Banks decide as to the very money which they are using, because their registered business is in London or in

Canada, that they will go from 6% to 7%, 8% or whatever they like, because they say that it is foreign capital. I counsel the Premier to query the financial experts and see how this state of affairs is hampering this country. The money will be going to Trinidad, British Guiana and coming back here through companies with different names.

At this stage Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am glad to think that the Premier is paying attention to this Trust Company. While we realise that there are a tremendous lot of imports and excess of imports during the two or three years, you will have to do something about the interest rates which these companies are charging people. That has caused the standard of living in America to be where it is. Although we agree to the system of hire purchase, we cannot allow these companies to come in and charge these rates. In other places, you cannot charge more than 6%, but we find that a West Indian Company is charging about 20% or 28% and it is time that this Government do something about that. You are really asking people to live in an atmosphere in which they cannot afford.

Most of us do realise that the English people are now starting Banks with the hire purchase system, that is to say, you do not wait until you are old to get the necessities of life; you pay as you go on, but this percentage which is at the rate of 20% or 25% is outrageous. Most important of all is the undertaking of schemes which will bring in adequate returns. As I say, I do not know exactly what the Premier means by adequate returns; I hope he means the extension of the system of education at the Technical Schools.

9.30 p.m.

If there is one thing for which I will give praise to the Government, it is the school for technical education. I was talking only a few days ago to an engineering expert who, I understand, is a Director of Loughborough, one of the great technological schools in the United Kingdom; and he thinks that that is what we need in Barbados. As a matter of fact, I feel that everybody wants to indulge in Arts, Law and Medicine, but we have to face the fact that this is a technological world. I wonder if Government will tell me later why the Principal of this Institute resigned.

I must agree with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that this is a matter which in my opinion could be handled at a federal level. Just as you have a Department at the University College of the West Indies for Arts, Engineering and what not, I think it is absolutely necessary to have the establishment of the Technological Institute for the training of persons in the West Indies. You are going to need these men.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I should remind the hon. member that a question concerning the resignation of the Principal of the Institute is already tabled in this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not know that; but I simply wondered in passing if the Minister would tell us why he resigned.

On the whole question of the Deep Water Harbour, sometimes I begin to think of the Biblical injunction that "the wicked fleeth when no man pursueth". Speaking for my Party on this Deep Water Harbour, I think we have made our position abundantly clear. Government can rest assured that as far as the members of my Party are concerned, there would be no question of throwing any blame on anybody for the Deep Water Harbour. We either had to have a Deep Water Harbour, or perish; but the whole question is how we will approach it. Last Friday night I was in the Park listening to the ranting and tearing of members of the Government at a political meeting. It was the first opportunity I had of attending one of my opponent's meetings; and I heard the Minister of Trade laying stress on the Government. When he came to the names of persons who sat on the Committee, he laid great stress on the name "E. D. Mottley", and rocked back waiting to hear what everybody would say. I smiled.

If the hon. member was reading, he would have seen that long ago, speaking as a Councillor, I said that this is

one of the things we must have. I am not a hypocrite, and when I want to criticise, I fear nobody over there. When one listened to the great emphasis which was laid on my name, one would have felt that I had offered such opposition to it; but it is not my duty to tell you how to solve your problems.

I saw in banner headlines that the workers will get \$1 3/4 million among them, but I will say, Mr. Speaker, that if you have \$5 million or \$7 million, this is something that must be solved in Barbados; and you are not going to solve it by taking money up and giving to people. I have always said that it is not so much the people who have been actually working in the Harbour that I am worried about, but their dependents. The average man working there must feed about five or six mouths; so when you say you have \$1 3/4 million it sounds well, but I do not think you should raise the hopes of the people that \$1 3/4 million will be dished out to anybody. I would support any Government whatsoever in power, on the question of a Deep Water Harbour if we must compete in our main industry with the other people in the world.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that ten years ago you should have started teaching people to do something else. Does the hon. member think that if there were 2,000 people employed in the Harbour that in their spare time you could teach them to do something else, say, carry them to Bulkeley, forgetting that people at Bulkeley are going to be displaced? I suppose you will tell us from what Fund you are going to take this \$1 3/4 million. Of course the hon. member made it clear that those who signed the Report were not interested in what would happen to the displaced workers. That is the usual thing you get on a public platform, but that is not the usual thing when you are asking.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I do not think the hon. member is correct. What I said was that that point did not arise.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is a pity I did not take down what the hon. member said. Mr. Speaker, do you believe that the hon. member on a public platform defending his position would say in that calm, dignified manner those words? I am telling you what he actually said, and when he got to the names..

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I made it clear that I was one of the signatories to it, so what is he saying? If there was any indictment, I was indicting myself; I was a member of the Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must confess that I do not know what the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When the hon. member pointed out that F. L. Walcott was the Chairman of the Committee, I heard one member say that if anybody was responsible for the Deep Water Harbour, it was Frank Walcott. As soon as I saw what the Union had said, I made it clear in another quarter that we must prevent Party feelings from coming in and face this as a national issue. It is true it is for the Government to handle this matter, but a national issue of such a magnitude is something in which all Parties must come together and face squarely. When the hon. member referred to the names and said that he was also a signatory, I told myself that he must have forgotten.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am unable to be of any assistance whatever. Both hon. members are talking about something about which I know absolutely nothing.

9.40 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member understands, so that is quite all right. Anyway, Sir, the figures given by the Hon. Premier in respect of the Deep Water Harbour has still left me at a loss and somewhat rambling. I do not quite understand them at all. Sometimes, it has been said that you cannot take figures which you see in the Daily Press to be accurate, but at one time we saw \$30 million as the actual figure. I am no economist and I will use the Premier's own words, "I can only add and subtract."

I remember well asking on the floor of the House what were the terms and conditions of the contract for building the Harbour. I said: tell us if this contract is a contract for an amount of money or if this contract is a contract for costing charges. You will find it in the records. The hon., now Sir Grantley Adams, said that it was the most water-tight contract that they had ever seen and I asked him: are you suggesting that all the lawyers are on the side of the Government and Richard Costain had none? He went on to say that if they overcharged, he would levy on Costain's goods.

Sir, this is not implying any improper motives at all; this is just saying as a member of this House that I am entitled to know what form of contract Government has given out to anybody. I myself, know that it is traditional and customary for contracts of this nature which are over and above a certain amount, to be given out in costing charges and not for a specific amount, especially in labour. The figures are very confusing indeed.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I rise on a point of order. I do not know if the hon. member is aware but we actually laid the contract on the floor of the House. It should be available. We have nothing to hide.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member never had anything to do with it. Nobody has suggested that you have anything to hide.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: He referred to the fact that he never knew the conditions of the contract; and I am just saying that a copy of the contract was laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When was the copy laid?

Hon. M. E. COX: It was laid.

Mr. MOTTLEY: How many members in this House do you think can tell you the conditions of the contract?

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not my fault.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, are you aware that a copy of the contract was laid?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not aware; I do not trust to my memory. The Clerk of the House has just said to me that he remembers that it was laid.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the Clerk says he thinks it was laid, that is not good enough. I do not want to keep this House back, but the other day, you heard of \$30 million and now we see that over \$30 million has been spent. I am not saying that a copy of the contract was not laid but I cannot find anybody who can tell me that it was laid. The Clerk says that he thinks so. I have asked members of the Opposition but they do not know if it was laid. I am going to be generous and say that it must have been laid when I was out of the island. I go away very seldom. I am addressing my remarks to Your Honour. Did you read the contract?

Mr. SPEAKER: I certainly did not read it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What is the procedure if it was laid? Do you mean that members of this House would not be entitled to read it?

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is a document of the House, they are still entitled to peruse it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We take it that if a copy of it was laid, it would be recorded. I would just like to say again that as far as the figures are concerned, I am not yet able to understand them. If it is anything like \$30 million, I should like the Hon. Premier in due course to put before the House the entire set of figures so that we will know the true position and what the Deep Water Harbour has really cost Barbados. What I would say is this, and I am going to use the Premier's own words: "The high rates of interest prevailing makes borrowing expensive, and underline the importance of undertaking from loan funds only schemes from

which there will be adequate returns." If they are looking at adequate returns from the Deep Water Harbour, I say that there is none to be had today, tomorrow or for the next sixty or eighty years; but it is something which we cannot do without.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask that a copy of that contract be brought in here for us to peruse, at least by next Tuesday.
9.50 p.m.

If it is laid, it must be found. Nobody could carry it away.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know if it has been laid.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sure if the hon. member would look it up, that he would certainly let us know the date on which it was laid and we would be able to assimilate it and get these figures. I was making the point that the Minister has suggested.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been officially informed that the former Premier of Barbados, one day in this House held that contract up in his hands, but it was never made a document of this House.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that the former Premier was discussing it and the then hon. junior member for St. Andrew was on his feet. The former Premier just passed it across to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew and asked him if he did not agree that it was a case of a cast iron, water-tight Contract. Of course, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew could not do otherwise than say "yes" and it went back across to the former Premier. It was not laid as far as my recollection goes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is a revelation to us. I am absolutely certain that I was present for the laying of this Contract. The Government represents the people but it is the right of this House of Assembly to know under what conditions you enter a contract. Suspicion or no suspicion, what has been said here today is a revelation to us. I particularly asked whether it was a Contract for a specific amount of money. Where is this Contract?

Knowing the Premier as I do, there is nothing to hide about the Contract. The Hon. Minister of Communications said that it was laid, and that was partly backed up by the Minister of Trade. The Premier has not said anything yet. Looking at these figures, how am I to know that the experts, the economists, accountants or whatever they are, have not been juggling with the figures in respect of the Deep Water Harbour? We are entitled to say anything. The position is that a contract has been signed by the Government with Costain and we hear that the amount was \$19 million. I cannot understand the position. I understand that the sugar bond, the approach roads, the buying of the land - all of these figures have been given to the Premier by the Secretaries but they cannot make him understand. You buy land from Manning, you buy land running through Richmond, you buy some houses in Fontabelle and there are the over all costs to Barbados. As a matter of fact, the Bridgetown City Council will ask us to reimburse something but that would not satisfy us as to the cost of building the Harbour. How can we know that they are not getting something on the building of these roads and so on?

Mr. Speaker, I have not lost my memory yet; I am not imputing any improper motives to anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not been told that the Contract has been laid. The hon. member has been told that an official search has been made and there is no account of it as having been laid.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I believe that if the members over there had the Contract they would put it in here.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I will promise the hon. member that I will search for the Contract and let him see it tomorrow.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Not let me see it; let the House see it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Minister of Communications and Works will tell hon. members all about the expenditure on the Deep Water Harbour when he rises to speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am finished with that. The Hon. Premier says that he will look up the Contract and let me see it. I say that the members of the House will see it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I said that I will let hon. members see it. It may be in the Ministry, I do not know.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I would like to say that I was under the impression that I mentioned that a copy of the Contract was laid on the Table of the House. Since it has not been laid, I have a copy of it in my office and I will lay it as a document of the House tomorrow.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member very much. That will solve the situation. We will be able to add (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: And subtract.) and subtract, the Premier says! (Laughter)

The hon. member has made reference in his speech to the total deficits in the Government Savings Bank. I would like the Minister to tell this Chamber something at a later stage. This is what the Premier has said:

"We come now to the Government Savings Bank. The total deposits in the Government Savings Bank in 1960 fell by \$260,000 as compared with a rise of \$793,000 in the previous year. It is worthy of note that in the commercial Banks savings again rose by \$900,000. Of course it is felt that the fall in deposits at the Government Savings Bank is probably also as a result of better facilities which are now being afforded to customers of all classes by these institutions."
10.00 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am no economist but I know Barbadian business. This statement was made in good faith and from the purest of motives, but it is an inaccurate statement. It is absolutely untrue to say that a Commercial Bank is giving you the same, never mind more, interest as the Government's Saving Bank; but if as a matter of laziness they did not want to find out what was the truth, it is none of my fault. I think the Hon. Premier should go deeper into it.

I would like to suggest that the answer hinges..... (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: There are borrowing facilities.) There is no such thing. I do not know what the hon. member means by "borrowing", but I would like to tell him what can happen in Bridgetown today. Is the hon. member suggesting that a man must have \$500 in either of the Commercial Banks to borrow money? You do not have to have a cent. As a matter of fact, it is my experience that a name is better than the money. If you have \$500 in a Commercial Bank, you cannot borrow \$500 above the deposit. What a person can do is come to you and say you have a good name in Barbados and you can back a note for him for \$5,000 at the Royal Bank of Canada.

With respect to \$900,000 put in by depositors, whoever put this in should check. You say that \$900,000 from savings were lost from the Savings Bank. You have said that (a) they are now paying the same interest; the answer to that is that it is not true, because they are paying less; and (b) they are giving better facilities. What are the facilities? Is it that if you have a savings account you can go and borrow money? That is not true either. You might be able to borrow \$5,000 without having one cent in the Bank, but the usual practice is to be able to borrow with something there; and their interest is higher. You have stated here that the savings in 1960 fell by \$260,000 as compared with the rise of \$793,000 in the previous year.

I would like to suggest that one of the things that happened is that people who invest in the local Government Bank - it is not through lack of confidence - are people who invest in the great majority for improving their social

conditions in this country; but because of the conditions today, you cannot get any money on the local market at 6% or by mortgage on land. Normally speaking, they would leave a lot of savings there, take an amount to carry on the building of their house, and then borrow; but now they have to borrow all. When they talk about facilities, they are talking through their hats and misleading the Premier and the Government.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want to tell the hon. member that I know at least three cases of persons who came to me to back loans for them at a particular Bank. They got that facility, and as a result, they have continued their savings at that particular Bank; that is why I talked about having a personal experience.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Surely the Hon. Premier must appreciate that it does not make a difference whether or not they had savings at the Bank. If I had to back a note for a man who landed in Barbados tomorrow, the Bank would not be interested in knowing the man; as long as I put my name there, if anything goes wrong I have to pay. It is not true therefore to say that money is drawn out because of these facilities. What is happening now always did happen with Commercial Banks. (Hon. M. E. COX: Not true.) Do not argue this with me; this is my line and you are talking up my street. The Premier has not attempted to add that the Bank would not have loaned the persons the money if they did not have an account there; possibly they never had an account there.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: That is what I said, and as a result they continue to put their savings there.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Do not take that isolated case because that is really not the true state of affairs. Anyway if you do not accept what is being told to you, you can consult your Queens Solicitor who must have his fingers on the general business in this line and he will tell you. I believe that the Minister of Trade will have a tremendous lot to do with the \$1 3/4 million.

All this talk about training men and all that is so much book knowledge; but those of us who understand Barbados know that that is not going to work. Your solution for those men under 45 years is going to be not giving them a few dollars in their hands now and for the next two or three years, but to use a substantial portion of that money to let them emigrate from this country into the United Kingdom. That is going to be your solution.

The majority of displaced workers are men. My Party pledged to offer its maximum support, but as far as the 1 3/4 million are concerned, do not raise people's hopes; because if they sit down and divide that by the number of people who are displaced, they will see what each person will get. Your big scheme is not to take this amount to train them, because in doing so you will put some other people out of work. You have unemployment in this country, and if you train them today you are putting somebody else out of work.
10.10 p.m.

Set aside a substantial sum of this money and say that it is for the purpose of emigration relative to displaced persons as a result of the Deep Water Harbour; and that it be set aside for the purpose of paying their full fares to America, Canada or England or to wherever they want to emigrate. I do know that Barbadians, and West Indians on the whole, are not pioneers. I hate to say it. We had the Surinam scheme and we knew that it would fail; we had the St. Lucia scheme and we knew that it would fail also.

Any community in which you have the majority of persons coming down through the line of slavery, it is a difficult thing to get them to go back to the land. They would like to go back if they owned the land. You would know that you just cannot ask them to go into the hinterland of Guiana and work land. But you will get them emigrating to industrial countries. They are fine workers as you have been told on all sides of England; therefore, I suggest that the Hon. Minister set aside a substantial sum not to lend them, but to

give those who are under 45 years and who would go away. Let them settle in England and give them as much that they will also have a small sum in hand to start with. I think that would solve the problem much better. I remember the remittances through the postal authorities before we had our emigration scheme; and the difference between those remittances then and now is something which reflects itself in our economy today. However hard it may be and whatsoever conditions there may be, Barbadians by the great majority will send back something to their parents, their wives and in some cases to their children.

Looking back at conditions of emigration of our people to Panama and Cuba, what we are faced with today with our people going out to England and the U.S.A., we were faced with when they went to Cuba and to Panama. The only difference is that when they went to Panama and Cuba we did not have people here who looked after the social amenities of the people as they do now. We always had people leaving their offspring and forgetting them causing these children to become a charge on the state; and that is our big problem today. However, that is offset by the fact that they are sending back a lot of money. As a matter of fact, I was told by a big merchant in Bridgetown this: What are you worrying about? Look at your turnover today and see what it is today since people started to go to England. Why are you worrying about your having to support children and give them something. When you were turning over only \$60,000 formerly, you are turning over \$90,000 today. You cannot make all the money and keep all. And that is how I look at it too. I throw out this suggestion to the Hon. Minister who has mentioned the fact that this fund would be made available to the displaced workers.

What I would like him to tell me is from what fund this amount of money would be taken. I have a suspicion from which fund this money will be taken. I see the Hon. Minister looking across at me with the feeling that somebody from their side has told me something, but you only have to follow the running of a country and you will know from which fund this money will be made available. Anybody using their intelligence would know that you can only take it from A and not B, therefore, I know if my suspicions are correct from which fund this money will come.

There is one paragraph which the Hon. Premier mentioned and I will close my speech on that. As a Conservative, I have never heard them making a Budget Speech which would be made by a Conservative member. It is so nice to get up outside and shout and shout, but so long as you hold the reins of Government, then you should have responsibility. The Hon. Premier was dealing with the deficit and he said that if this island were to spend more than it raised in revenue and by loan that we would become bankrupt. He speaks as a Barbadian, and Your Honour can well remember that when he was in Trinidad the other day, he said that he would not be kicked around. He went on to say later in his speech: "We have always been able to pay our way through and we do hope and wish that we would continue to pay our way through."

I have been in politics for a long time, nearly as long as the Hon. Premier. As Your Honour knows, we had our social problems, we had our bad housing conditions but yet we paid our way through. We did so when people from all over the West Indies had to go hat in hand to the Colonial Office and say: "please allow us to do that." and before they could get money from Colonial Office they were asked: "tell us first how you are going to spend it." I remember a brilliant article which was written in a newspaper by the late D.D.M.T. He said that we would be so much better off if we were a Crown Colony. I wondered why he said so and why he was against our maintaining the present constitution which we have. Now, I have lived to hear a socialist Premier publicly proclaim that we have always paid our way through and he has wished that it be continued. That, if the Hon. Premier does not know, is a tribute to the past regime. We always had our criticisms of each other, but what he said is still some semblance of a tribute to the past regime.

Sir, I do hope that whatever Government takes power that we would be able to pay our way through. Barbadians

have been respected because they have always been able to pay their way through. Of course, later day politicians and travellers have now begun to see things in their true perspective. Of course, we have had our slums and we still have our slums; but now that some of them have travelled, they have seen nothing in Barbados when it comes to slums as compared with what slums are in the other countries. Sir, what observations I have made today are enough to focus attention on the social problems confronting us. 10.20 p.m.

There are two things on which I am very strong; one is the Old Age Pension and the other is the question of education. When the Hon. Minister of Education gets up to speak, I want to hear what he has to say about the number of schools, and how he will solve this problem of mothers begging Headteachers to take their children into their schools. In your constituency, Mr. Speaker, I know that 40 children were refused last term because there was no room in the school for them. I hope that the Minister of Education is listening to what I am saying.

I read in a newspaper that the Minister of Communications accused my Party which said that the Conservatives were responsible for education in this country. Was there anything wrong about that? All the Minister has to do is to look next to him and ask the other Minister if that is not true. You have tried to improve the position. I can take them up on that matter, whether it is a question of elementary or secondary education. I hope the Minister will not tell me that he does not know anything about it.

What are you doing about these numbers of children who are coming out of school at fourteen years and are thrown not only on the labour market but on the market of the unemployed? I do not want to go any further into this question of education; I believe that when you talk about constitutional development and sociological development, they are nice words; but there is nobody in Barbados or in any part of the West Indies who would say that with this low standard of living which we have, we do not need economic development. How much one can take home in his pay envelope, and how well he can eat and drink when the day comes, is the most important thing in the life of a human being. I believe that if you want to keep down people, you will have to live down with them.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to deal with matters here when I can rant and tear hon. members to pieces with success elsewhere. (*ASIDES*). If the hon. member wants to keep a meeting in Queen's Park with me he will have to bring the Premier from Trinidad! (*Laughter*). I hope that my remarks to the Hon. Premier will bring forth at least the contract for the Deep Water Harbour if nothing else.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member desire to speak before the Hon. Premier replies?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be long in replying to some of the remarks made by various members who have spoken on this question. I will refer to the question of the Deep Water Harbour. I should like to say from the outset that as far as economics are concerned, I have not been trained in that field; but I believe that I know a little practical economics; and that is, that since one has to work for wages, one has to know how to spend those wages and stretch them to some extent at least. That is, in my opinion, practical economics.

During the course of his speech, the hon. junior member for St. John said that we had produced a monument for four thousand displaced people and he said that there should have been economic planning so as to absorb those people before the Deep Water Harbour came into being. The hon. member was also so confused in his argument, that he said that we were letting off the wealthy people; and on another occasion he was saying how heavily we were taxing these people and that Barbadians were the most heavily taxed people in the West Indies. One can just understand how the hon. member was ranting; and how he was inconsistent.

As far back as 1952 when Professor Beasley made an economic survey for Barbados, he said that the Government

was taking too much or too large a percentage of the national income between Government Tax and Revenue. Among his recommendations was one for a Deep Water Harbour because he felt that having such a Harbour would, to a large extent, increase the national income of the country. Professor Beasley went so far as to say that it was absolutely necessary to have this Deep Water Harbour if we wanted to increase or improve our expenditure and our economic development. Today our national income is approximately \$100 million per year and we are taking 25% of that as Government Revenue.
10.30 p.m.

It is along the same line that that gentleman said we were taking too much. After you take what is regarded as a reasonable amount, then you have got to spend it; and you cannot spend more than what you have. You have education, hospital, roads, housing and all sorts of things, and therefore the money is to be divided into the various sections.

What is the position with the Deep Water Harbour? The Deep Water Harbour, Mr. Speaker, was discussed for many years, and it was finally agreed on by a Committee which was set up in 1953 to have this Deep Water Harbour established. As this stage I would like to thank the hon. senior member for the City for the few remarks he made to the effect that the Deep Water Harbour should be regarded as something national and not Party. No doubt people who are not well mentally developed will attempt to exploit the situation at this stage. They will tell the workers all sorts of fantastic things and make them believe that if they were in power they would have taken greater care of the workers; they would erect a mansion in the sky and allow the workers to work on Mars or something like that.

The Committee which sat, Mr. Speaker, comprised the hon. senior member for St. Peter as Chairman — I referred to him in the Park on Friday night — and the hon. member for St. John as well as the hon. senior member for the City. Some have said that the member for St. Peter was responsible for the Deep Water Harbour; I am not so silly as to say that; but I would say that he played an important part because he was Chairman of that Committee. Also on the Committee were A. S. Bryden, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, the Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, Mr. Hassell, the Hon. K. R. Hunte, the Hon. D. Lucie-Smith, the hon. senior member for the City, the Hon. E. S. Robinson, the Financial Secretary, Mr. Burrowes, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Masterton-Smith and myself. This is what the Committee said on page six of the Report:

"The need for a Deep Water Harbour is justified by factors which characterise present methods — delays in turn around, diverted *entrepot* trade, high cost of discharge, high risk of damage to goods in double handling, interruptions to work in bad weather, congestion in warehouses and in the town area." Possibilities of supplying oil fuel to vessels and facilitating tourist traffic are also cited. Then in dealing with the scheme in sections 3 of paragraph 11 it says "the scheme would reclaim about 130 acres of land in the industrial area. 92 acres of this land would be surplus to harbour requirements and would remain a valuable asset to the Government. Ritchie offered a conservative estimate of 12/6 per square foot, that is, £27,255 per acre or roughly £2 1/2 million for the surplus land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you will remember, when that Resolution was under debate on 1st June, 1954 the hon. junior member for St. John in making his contribution to the debate started off on page 1097 and went on to page 1101; so you can see what a lengthy speech, if I may call it so, the member made. This is what he said:

"This island in which we live had developed the wonderful reputation for taking progressive steps 80 years after they have become overdue, and I think the Deep Water Harbour is the *locus classicus* in examples of this kind. We are in the air age and we are now making provision for the proper accommodation of sailing vessels and steamships. As I said, when we were dealing with the Five Year Plan, I considered the construction of a Deep Water Harbour as the

main spring of any economic and industrial development which should take place in this colony."

The hon. member went on and in his closing remarks he said "Personally I do not care whether the Deep Water Harbour would be self-supporting or not; it is a matter of indifference to me. I consider a Deep Water Harbour so essential to our survival that it should be constructed as quickly as possible. I only regret that it has not yet been constructed." That was part of the member's speech on the Deep Water Harbour, and anybody who heard him today would not have thought that the member.....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Obviously the member does not begin to understand. If he goes back to 1952 he will see that when we were discussing Professor Beasley's Report and the Estimates for that year, I criticised the Government for not having built the Harbour at the time when Sir Douglas Ritchie suggested it.

What I was talking about today was that with the technological innovations taking place, there was no economic planning for people whose normal routine would be disrupted. I was not talking about the building of the Harbour today; I said the Harbour is there. I said that a condition precedent to the building of a harbour should be proper economic planning.

Hon. M. E. COX: He never argued about anything of the sort.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you were in the Chair and you heard me. How can the hon. member get up there in his fulsomeness and say that I never made a statement of that sort. Have I argued against the construction of the Harbour without consideration of the people who would be disrupted? I only said that because I knew he would make some silly statement.

Hon. M. E. COX: What the hon. member has to realise is that I am not one of the gullible ignoramuses into whose mouths he spits and they swallow.

Mr. BARROW: I would not spit in your mouth, I would spit in your face.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member try to contain himself?

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. When the hon. member is attempting to quote me, let him quote from the debates what I said today. I have never today said that the Deep Water should not be built. The Deep Water Harbour is there already, so how could we be talking about the building of a Deep Water Harbour at this stage?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I read through the member's speech and nowhere in it is there any mention of what he has just said.
10.40 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: The speech which he is reading was made in 1954 about the building of a Deep Water Harbour. Today, what was I discussing?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon Minister is now reading a speech of what you said before.

Mr. BARROW: Let me say this: I made a speech today. It was centred around the question of building the Harbour without consideration of the people who would be dislocated or displaced as they call it from their normal occupation. That is all I was discussing today.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have the 1953 debate which is more recent, and the hon. member made absolutely no point about that in his speech. As a matter of fact, he said that the Deep Water Harbour should proceed any question of economic planning. Now, today he is saying that economic planning should have proceeded the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. Later on he will say something else.

What am I pointing out from his speech? Not one word was mentioned of these people who are likely to be displaced. All he said was to get on with the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. He could not care less of the people.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I must rise on a point of order. I challenge the hon. member to say that I said, "I could not care less for the people." I think that he is distorting what I said. I was dealing with the over-all period - the ten-year period - and what should take place, and the projects that should be implemented. Today, I was discussing the question of displacement when you undertake a project. Must I go into all the details?

Mr. SPEAKER: You will not be allowed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I introduced the Resolution then. I was then Minister of Communications, Works and Housing and this is what I said then. You will find it on page 1095:

"The question of the displacement of labour will no doubt arise and it will be considered very seriously. While it is felt that lightermen, for the most part, will not find business very lucrative after we have constructed the Deep Water Harbour, yet it is expected that Barbados will regain much of its lost transshipment business which it once enjoyed. That being so, these workers can be absorbed into this business; in addition to that, I should like to assure this House that the Government will go into the matter and do whatever is humanly possible to find employment for these people, just as the Government is looking after those who have been displaced as a result of bulk shipment of molasses."

I repeat that the hon. member never mentioned one word about displaced workers. Today he is coming and making himself out as the champion of these poor people and saying that the Government has constructed this thing without making provision for displaced persons. He is saying that it is no more essential and it is not absolutely necessary to the development of the economy of this country, but it is today, from his own words, a monument for 4,000 displaced workers. He is the type of person who would have people to believe that he is interested in their welfare.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member also dealt with the question of emigration; but if I may just go back to the Deep Water Harbour for one moment, I would like to say that we knew that as a result of the Deep Water Harbour there was the likelihood of some workers being displaced. I pointed out since in 1954 in my speech and even before that time, that the Government was prepared to look after these people as well as Government possibly can do. Now, it is not a very easy job and I think that we all would appreciate that.

How has the hon. member offered to solve the problem? He spoke for about three hours and when he was finished, he offered absolutely nothing because he had nothing in him. All the hon. member was prepared to do was to come in here and criticise us, as he is accustomed doing, without offering one useful thought. He is an economist; he claims to be educated in this and that, and when he finished speaking, no one but himself saw anything in his speech other than a harangue. That is the position with which we are faced. What has he offered as an economist? All he has said was that we should have planned economically for these people.

Now, Sir, plan in what? Building a quarry? Let him suggest something. Suggest something constructive. What economics are you going in for to employ people such as those? What are you going to shift them over to other than doing ordinary labour work? What else can you plan for them? It is all well and good to come in here and talk a lot of nonsense and speak to the gullible and uninitiated, but when you get down to the hard facts you will find that people like him have nothing to offer but criticism.

The Government has decided to set up an Establishment Board to administer this fund; and I must say that the suggestion made by the hon. senior member for the City is

quite in order. He has suggested that we assist people with money to go outside and look for work. That is one of the things which the same hon. junior member for St. John could have said. But what has he said? He has said that we are sending out all these people when they should be here working. He continually said that we send out domestics when they should be here working, yet I understand that he has sent out somebody the other day. However, I will tell him about it later.

He says that you send out all these people after they have grown in this country and have reached a certain stage. What are you going to do with them here? The very thing which they said they were responsible for is emigration to the United Kingdom and elsewhere, and that is the very thing which he is criticising. He keeps on saying we are sending people to the United Kingdom. If the hon. member had remained in Barbados he would still be a Long Grade Clerk in the Courts. He went out and as a result of his going out, he was able to further his education and to come back to be a lawyer even though he may be a pettifogger.
10.50 p.m.

If you say that people should not leave the island and you want to keep them here, surely you are stifling initiative and depriving people out of an opportunity to go out to be trained as lawyers, technicians, architects, engineers and all sorts of things. The hon. member is opposed to our sending out domestics. Last year when the Estimates were under consideration and the Premier hinted that there was the possibility of getting some of our women to go to Germany as domestics, the hon. member criticised the Government and asked, "Domestics what? All you are doing is concentrating on domestics; domestics will always be second-class citizens."

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. That is a categorical untruth. I have read the debate for the hon. member. I said that when you send people to Germany they will be second-class citizens. Since then the Minister came from one of the big countries and repeated exactly the words I used; whether you send them as doctors or lawyers, they look upon you as second-class citizens. I corrected the hon. member and he persists in saying that domestics are second-class citizens. In the West Indies, you are second-class citizens as long as you have one set of regulations for one set of people and another set of regulations for another set of people.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member said that second-class people will be second-class citizens.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. If the hon. member gets the debate he will see what I said. I said that whenever you send out people, these people are looked upon in such a way that they are second-class citizens.

Hon. M. E. COX: I heard exactly what the hon. member said. He can twist it or get it changed or any old thing.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I deprecate what the hon. member said. (ASIDES).

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member lives in the garbage can around the dead dogs and cats.

Mr. SPEAKER: That will be the end of it or the end of this meeting.

Hon. M. E. COX: We have been concentrating on trying to get people out of this island. I have said elsewhere that one of the reasons why I went to England last year was to see if we could get employment for people who would be displaced, people like lightermen and such workers. We have been pursuing as actively and as steadily as possible a course of finding employment for the people who may be displaced as a result of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. We do not believe in people going cap in hand asking for anything or living on any dole. We believe that people should work for wages and spend such wages as men and not mice.

When one hears it said that this Government has no plans and the Government is criticised for not having any economic development, and the same individual who criticises has nothing to offer, I say that it is a question of cheap politics. It is just playing to the gallery with the hope that the people would be stupid. I pointed out what has happened. It is a bit late and I did not want to develop that point for too long; however, I just want to make a few passing remarks on the point made by the hon. senior member for the City on the question of the Old Age Pensioners.

I want to say from the beginning that I have as much sympathy for these old pensioners as anybody has for them. To be quite honest, I spend my own money and not the Government's money, and while I hate to say what I am saying now, yet I would like it to be known that when I give, I give from my own pocket. When I help people to put a few shingles on their houses, that comes out of my pocket. I have as much sympathy for these people as anybody else has. If the Minister who is responsible for finance says that he is not in a position at this stage to do anything more for these people, then we have to accept that. The hon. senior member for the City has said that these Old Age Pensioners are people who have worked for many years in the field for nothing, with not even a bed on which to sleep and that sort of thing.

11.00 p.m.

That is an indictment against the people whom he represents; it is an indictment, Mr. Speaker, against the wealthy people of this island. That proves in no uncertain manner that those workers to whom he is referring have given yeoman service and have produced the wealth of the country, but have not shared equally or equitably in its wealth. Whose fault is that?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The hon. member is so right he could not be wrong! I have never failed to indict the people with whom I associate that in the 1914 War they took advantage of the workers of this country. I do not work for anybody, but I equally say that after a Socialist Government came into power.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: After you came into power for fifteen years, you ought to be ashamed, being Socialist, of not pulling them out of the quagmire.

Hon. M. E. COX: The member knows that, as a Socialist Government, we have for years had the toughest fight against the Conservatives and against these hon. members representing them on the other side of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is not speaking the truth. I align myself with a political Party and have always been independent. I have never been afraid of saying in here and on public platforms that my colleagues, the merchants, took advantage of these people then; but now I am saying that you have put \$700,000 for social services, but the people should be given more. I say it is an indictment on Conservatives; but it is equally an indictment on you because the people expected more of you than of them. You have been in power for fourteen years.

Hon. M. E. COX: When I first came into this House in 1944 in the height of the War, cantoniers used to get 10/- a week; and with the Conservative set-up, a Committee appointed to go into the wages of these people recommended 1/- more.

We are the people who are responsible for the increases in wages and improvements in conditions of work today among the majority of workers in this country, along with the Trade Union Movement with which we were working just before Ministerial Government started. We have had, and up to now still have, the devil's own job in pressing the Conservatives to pay a decent wage. What has happened recently with the Shops Act? We have had to pass that Act and we also have a Wages Council Act, and yet a lot of the wealthy employers today are still not paying what the law lays down. (Mr. MOTTLEY: That is your fault; you have a right to prosecute them.) You cannot come here and

accuse Government of not doing this and that when at the same time you are saying that this Government is taxing you beyond the limit.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have not said such a thing at all. I said that in my small way I am willing to make my contribution if I know that the tax which I have to pay would go towards decreasing the age limit and paying more pensions. I am not saying that to get votes; I say that from the depths of my heart. A Government who sits there for fifteen years and refused to do that should not go back 200 or 300 years, but should say what it is doing now.

Hon. M. E. COX: What do they say? His colleague said that the income tax in Barbados is the highest in the West Indies; this was also said by the hon. junior member for St. John. He said that we tax them to the limit to put down reserves.....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I would like to get the records straight. What I said was that they do not make any use of the tax; they have surpluses and they are taking money out of circulation. I did not say that it had reached any limit. I have not said that the rich people cannot pay more taxes; I am merely pointing out that all sections of the community are paying taxes which is money taken out of circulation and put back into circulation by the Government.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am going to make a study of the speech on these same taxes which the hon. member has made and bring it to the attention of this House. Every time there is a question of a Budget or a Five Year Plan, the member comes down on the Government and talks about high taxation and over-taxing the people. Up to today in his speech he said how heavily we were taxing the people of this country. (A VOICE: What about the \$700,000 which you have in the memorandum?) That is a matter for the Hon. Premier who is Minister of Finance to deal with if he cares. I was dealing with the Deep Water Harbour because I know that a lot of people who mean absolutely nothing to these people, who have absolutely no use for them, and who are not interested in their own well-being, will get up now and try to make-believe that they are trying their best to help them just to get a few votes. (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: The Reporters must be in difficulty as far as reporting is concerned.

Hon. M. E. COX: However, Mr. Speaker, I must confess I do not want to keep the House much longer. On the question of emigration, we have been doing our best, and we are proud of it despite the objections of the hon. junior member for St. John. We are proud of it because we have seen the results. The point which the hon. junior member for Christ Church made this morning was a very good one. If you are prepared to industrialise your country, surely you must send out your people to these industrial centres where they can learn and be trained, so that they can come back here and be useful citizens and operate these industries. The hon. junior member for St. John says not to send them out, but keep them here and find something for them to do. I know what is the "something" he means.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I wish the hon. member, when he is quoting me, would ask Your Honour's permission to borrow the shorthand typescript from the Clerk or the Reporter or whoever is in charge and ask Your Honour's permission to read it if he cannot be accurate in quoting me.

11.10 p.m.

I well remember in 1954 the hon. senior member for St. Philip and myself read out figures about employment opportunities in England; that has absolutely nothing to do with my argument today. That is to say, I regard it as not a panacea but as a stopcock, and my point was that we could not go on looking to emigration as our salvation. Nobody who heard me speak would say that I do not like emigration.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am replying to what he said today. If he does not mean what he said or wants to withdraw it, that is a different matter. Anybody who heard him

today would feel or conclude that we were doing this country one of the greatest injustices by pressing this emigration policy and programme.

The hon. member was opposed to sending out people. We send people to Canada and under the Canadian Immigration Regulations, if those persons go there and spend a year, they are empowered to send for all their family. They get naturalization papers and become citizens of Canada and are able to send for their families and many of their families have gone and are doing well. I get letters from many of them there to explain the situation. The hon. member is opposed to them going there. He refers to them as second-class citizens.

We have sent a large number of people up to England as well and those persons are making good, as the hon. senior member for the City has said. Large remittances are sent back here to develop the island so that those who remain here would find employment. These are the things which the hon. junior member for St. John is criticising. It only shows that if they were given the opportunity to run the Government that they would do nothing. As a matter of fact, their policy is to abuse us out of office, not with any desire to do as much or more for the people, but only to get in office to get the plums and what they talk about, the opportunity to wine and dine. That is the only reason I see.

I am sure that the people of this island still have a little commonsense despite the fact that the hon. member at every opportunity tries to criticise the Government. They want the people to believe that we are unfit to run this country, as the wealthy people have been saying for many years; and I have every confidence that when the time comes, the people in St. John will do to him as the people in St. George did to him, that is to leave him at the polls.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, 15th March, 1961, at 12 o'clock (noon)

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.