

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st May, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Barbados Statistical Service Quarterly Digest of Statistics - No. 24 - December, 1962.

And on my own behalf, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (The St. Joseph Hospital) (Amendment) Order, 1963.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$10,483 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 3, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee of 900 square feet of land in the Port Area to Messrs. Booth Steamship Company (Barbados) Ltd.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 104/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas regarding the harvesting of peasant canes in St. Thomas, is now ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 105/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael regarding the granting of pensionable status to the post of Price Control Inspector, is now ready.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolution of which notice was given today.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

"WHEREAS the general health of the people in the parish of St. Thomas is very much endangered due to the refuse and dead animals that are allowed to remain in front of their homes for several weeks before removal;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government set out investigating the said matter with a view to remedying the unpleasant state of affairs before an epidemic breaks out."

QUESTIONS

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that there is much dissatisfaction amongst some of the Island's constables with regard to the pay they receive for making an arrest as well as the amount they get when they have to attend Court?

2. Will the Minister make an investigation in an effort to bring about harmony amongst the said persons complained of?"

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY re DEATH OF MOTHER OF HON. SENIOR MEMBER FOR ST. JOSEPH

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the Business of the Day is proceeded with, we have in re-

cent times grown accustomed to the practice of extending the sympathy of members of this Honourable House to hon. members who have been bereaved by the passing of a close relative.

12.25 p.m.

Speaking for myself, I think it is a very good habit because it symbolizes the unity of hon. members. It serves to show how, despite the fact that we may belong to different political parties, there are occasions when we can part with party feelings and demonstrate some semblance of unity.

On this occasion, I should like on behalf of the House to extend to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph our very deep sympathy on the passing over the week-end of his mother. Even those of us who are fortunate enough still to have our mothers can appreciate what an irreparable loss this is to the hon. member; and while I am not suggesting that any expressions of condolence on our part can assuage the grief and distress which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph must feel at the loss of his mother, yet still I hope that our profound expressions of sympathy will in some way exert a mitigating influence upon his deep loss.

I did not personally know the mother of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, but I am sure she must have been a woman of some strength and ability of character to produce a son who has accomplished what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has accomplished; and I want him to have the assurance that we all in this Chamber share his loss and would like to extend our sincerest condolences to all his relatives.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to say that I second the motion of expressions of sympathy to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on the passing of his mother. Unlike the hon. member who has just spoken, I know very well the mother of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and, as a matter of fact, I was taken to her home by his father who has pre-deceased her.

I share the feelings of the hon. member and it is unfortunate that death is the monster which we will never get accustomed to. The old lady who had a full life was fortunate to see her son through the many stages of life up to the stage where he reached this development. Sir, it is the shock of death of the mother of the hon. member on this occasion; but in the order of passing, all these things take place.

Sir, on behalf of the Party to which I belong, I want to share with him his grief on this occasion. We are all very anxious to share one's joys; but when it comes to death we always like to be alone. Grief is a thing which we want to experience alone, and we who have examined the life of the animal kingdom have noticed that they always find some lonely place in the jungle when they want to be alone.

Sir, in expressing our feelings to the hon. member, the very least we can do is to move this Resolution of Sympathy over his loss and with these few remarks I wish to convey our feelings to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph over the loss of his mother on this occasion.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in joining with the two last speakers in expressing our sympathy to my colleague over the loss of his mother, I do not think any hon. member in this Chamber has been acquainted more with the old lady than myself. She was a woman who had no room in her heart for hatred or spite. She was nice to all. She always had something to offer and she always had that smile to give to you and was very jovial to us — and when I say to us — I mean the other boys and myself who live in Chimborazo. We could always look forward for something from her when we passed by her home. She was very helpful to old and young, and I am sure that if the parents of today were to begin to repay my colleague for all of the things which his mother did for us, he will never want.

Sir, I know her passing is a great loss to my colleague because I know that he was her pet although she has more

children. I think I hear her saying now, "Son - son." as she called him. She loved him, as the old people said, to every fault.

The time has come when she has passed to the Great Beyond and I am sure she has left him and the others with a deep heart. To all of them I tender my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should also like to associate myself with the remarks expressed by the other hon. members on this Resolution of Sympathy. On behalf of members of my Party I tender the hon. senior member for St. Joseph our greatest sympathy over the loss of his mother.

Sir, I had not met her in her lifetime, but the funeral was a significant fact of how she lived in the past; and I do join in tendering my deepest sympathy to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it would be inappropriate for me not to tender my sincere and profound sympathy to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on the passing of his mother. It was a shock to me when I returned to the Island after an extremely short visit to a neighbouring colony to hear of Mrs. Coward's death. An hon. member has said that we never get accustomed to parting, and death is one of these instances in life to which we would never grow accustomed.

Sir, I also share the view of the hon. member who said that the hon. member's mother should be a happy woman to know of her rearing a son who could reach such public stature and that her labours were not in vain and that her contribution to life meant something. I too share my sympathy to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph in this his irreparable loss.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, I must rise to associate myself along with the other hon. members to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who has been bereaved of his mother. I also express my personal sympathy to him because I knew his mother well.
12.35 p.m.

There is something to think of when a person has lost his mother, especially when one has remained with her to the end; they would know everything about each other. I remember when the Master on the Cross said: "Mother, behold thy son. Son, behold thy mother." It is one of the most sorrowful things in life for a human being when his mother is taken away to rest. It is appointed to men once to die. However long we live or however short we live, death will come our way. We extend our sympathy to the hon. member in his bereavement; it may be a broken heart and a grief to the hon. member, but if he walks in the footsteps of his mother he must go where she is. According to the life that she lived I know that it will be well for her in the future. If the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I repeat, walks in the footsteps of his mother, I am sure he will be successful in the world to come. I wish him all the best.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On behalf of His Honour the Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the sentiments which have been expressed by hon. members in this Chamber in their remarks of sympathy to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on the occasion of the death of his mother.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are times when nothing we say can put our feelings into words, and this is one of those occasions for me. I wish to thank all those hon. members who have so well expressed their sympathy with me in my recent bereavement; it is a great comfort to know that whatever differences we may have among ourselves, in moments of personal loss or distress, we stand solidly together. Again, I would like to thank hon. members for their sympathy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Clerk will be instructed to have a letter of sympathy written to the nearest relatives of the hon. member.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the business of the House is begun, I would like, on a point of privilege, to discuss a matter that can be treated and regarded as a matter of great national importance in the history of our growing and developing community. I feel that this Parliament and the people's representatives of this island have been denied the ancient and accepted privilege of this Body, quite contrary to all practice found anywhere in the Commonwealth of Nations. For instance, to begin with, the three important Bills connected with the Budget Proposals made by the Hon. Premier have been passed into law without providing an opportunity for free debate of the people's representatives in this Parliament. I say this with much decision and courage because it involves many awkward things which are likely to follow. We were told last year when the Budget Statement was made — it is clear I commented on it then and I expect to do so again — by the Hon. Premier that it could not be debated unless approval of the House was sought by hon. members. The practice in the United Kingdom is this; and with me at the moment is a debate namely Vol. 621, for the Session 1959-60 of the 4th April in which Mr. Amery handled the Budget Proposals. It was then and still is referred to as a Statement, but no hon. member has since accepted or any local Parliament has accepted that a Statement provides for no debate. As a matter of fact, the Budget or Financial Statement in the United Kingdom and in the Commonwealth of Parliaments is more or less debated by a Ways and Means Committee which is a full Committee of the House, and every hon. member is given an opportunity to speak on a number of occasions on the Financial Statement and Budget Proposals. If this is to be gradually denied us, and I am forced to say that if you were to look quickly, thinking of the Income Tax Bill, the Petroleum Bill and the Pool Betting Duty Bill, all of these Bills have been passed and several hon. members of this House were denied the opportunity of debating them.

The reason for all of this is easily seen. You permit a private member, seconded by another private member, the opportunity to debate a statement which is contrary to any democratic practice anywhere in this world, and I may say that the attitude adopted today is not even adopted in Soviet Russia. Where it is necessary to break with the old for something new, it is not even practised altogether. I am thinking of the Czar of Russia. Now you have an item which is of such national importance as the Financial Statement Budget Proposals, which are more or less taxation proposals for the ensuing year, and it is relegated to Private Members' Business knowing too well the limit of time being from 2.30 until 4.30 p.m. of the clock. I say this with some emotion because I feel grieved about it, if not angry, and I feel that any rational human being with the desire for the essence of democracy is bound to agree with me. The tenets of democracy are at war with dictatorship which we are now seeing and which we are being forced to accept. This is indeed a retrograde step in the sense that it destroys our essential liberty. I am thinking of democracy and the early aspirations of those who fought to destroy dictatorship to enable us to enjoy that form of democracy so that every man can have every single right. You will remember the number of things said by the Hon. Premier. 12.45 p.m.

I am very sad today that the Hon. Premier is not here; it is like beating the air. In a matter like this, you would like to know you are addressing him, but I suppose this is the sort of discourtesy we will grow accustomed to, if you can grow accustomed to things like this. You will forgive me, Sir, ...

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of correction to point out that it is quite inappropriate for the hon. junior member for St. George to accuse the Hon. Premier of discourtesy for not being present at today's sitting. Every five year old child who can read must know that there is a meeting current now at Sherbourne of the Regional Council of Ministers, and naturally, Sir, Barbados must be represented. Every other Minister in the Cabinet, with the exception of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who is indisposed, is present at the meeting of the

House today, and therefore it is obvious, Sir, that at least one of the Government Ministers must be in attendance at the Regional Council of Ministers. The Hon. Premier is representing Barbados, and he could not be here and there simultaneously. For all my life in this Chamber, I have seen occasions where some Government representative has had to represent the Island, and I have never yet heard his absence characterised as discourtesy, and there is no justification at all for the hon. junior member for St. George so to do today.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I need not repeat what I said. The hon. member will understand and appreciate that the very delegates are not all in the Island.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would be glad if the hon. member would revert to the point of privilege. The point about the absence of the Premier has been answered by the Hon. Leader of the House. I do not think the House should entertain any more talk on that, and I will ask the hon. member to continue with his point of privilege.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with unchanging respect to the Chair, I appreciate your anxiety to save any attempt at rancour, but surely right in the procedure for debate in Parliament, if the hon. member is permitted to rise on a point of order — and I am just thinking of the Rules accepted some 700 years in British Parliament — and makes a statement that is not completely accurate, for the sake of the debate and for the sake of the record, I should be permitted to correct it. If you order that I return to the debate on privilege, I will accept it without one word. I am not arguing with you, but the hon. member made a statement which is not exactly correct, because there is no meeting today. There is enough talk about the delegates not being in the Island, but the hon. member is usually in trouble with the truth, and I am not thinking of the "Truth" newspaper on this occasion. However, we do know that hon. members should be given an opportunity to debate this Statement. It is correct to say that after you lay your Statement, the things in it come into effect, but you have got to pass the many Orders. What is left of his Statement is a number of Orders which need not be debated in Parliament. As a matter of fact, all you have to do is to lay them for forty days and automatically they become law. To draw one single incident, if you will give me opportunity to continue, this is where I think it is a denial of an essential privilege of Parliament.

The Premier in making his speech said that the decision was taken and there would be an increase of one cent on the aerated beverages sold in this Island. If we were given an opportunity before this was done to debate it, I could have made it clear to him that it would be impossible to collect revenue by imposing one cent on a bottle.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. I do not want to interfere with Your Honour's position, but I should just like to draw to your attention Standing Order No. 68 which reads as follows:-

"A motion directly concerning the privileges of the House shall take precedence of all other public business."

I do not want to interfere with the hon. member's right to deal with this matter, but I am sure that what the hon. member is dealing with is not now a matter of privilege, because there is a substantive motion on the Order Paper dealing with the points the hon. member is raising; therefore the matter ceases to be a question of privilege if the House is currently debating a matter which the hon. member spoke about. I am not now dealing with the merits or demerits, but already a motion is being debated approving of the Statement, and it can no longer therefore be a matter of privilege if we are at present debating the question which the hon. member is raising.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: May I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that my only reason for not rising before was because I was momentarily expecting that you would have insisted that the hon. member refrain from any excursion and discussion on any other matter beside the strict point of privilege which he says he is raising?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is so obvious that I am in trouble to understand the reasoning of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I was in here during the debate on the Budget last Tuesday, and I remember when you indicated that the time for Private Members' Business ended, that Government Business continued and the Bills were passed in Government Business time. This is denying me and the House of a privilege. Nobody in this Parliament including you, Sir, can guarantee me today that I will have an opportunity to debate the Budget Speech. The hon. senior member for St. Peter can well spend two hours on it, and even if he closes his debate on it, there are several other hon. members who may want to speak on this, and I could probably be forced down to six weeks from today waiting to squeeze in within the narrow limit of two hours of Private Members' time when the Acts and laws are passed safely and regarded as ancient history. It is a denial of a privilege.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like Your Honour to rule. A question of privilege is not a matter where a member did not have an opportunity to speak in a debate in the Assembly. A matter of privilege is when something was done which positively precluded any member from speaking on something that had been done, and you have May's Parliamentary Procedure on Page 52 setting out for you the privileges of Parliament. What I am submitting is that there is no breach of privilege because a matter has been produced in Parliament in the way it has been, because Parliament itself has accepted that. There would be a breach of privilege if something had been done in Parliament on which the hon. member could not comment; so I do not think it is fair to the House to allow the hon. member on a motion of privilege to debate something he is circumventing by using this method. No Bills have been passed on which the hon. member could not speak. All the Bills that have been passed were before the Chamber and the hon. member had a right to speak on them. I cannot agree with him that there is a breach of privilege. A breach of privilege has a specific meaning, and this does not come within the confines of a breach of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to rule now. There is at present before the House a motion to approve the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. I ruled last Tuesday, when the Bills which the hon. member has just referred to were being discussed, that members would be at liberty to refer to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Premier.
12.55 p.m.

Therefore, at this stage, I will entertain nothing more on the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. George. I think enough has been said on it, and at least the point which he has made has already been recorded; I rule that that has been ended now that I have spoken.

THE AFFILIATION PROCEEDINGS BILL, 1963

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be taken as the first Order of the day

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: Second reading of a Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to the maintenance of illegitimate children.

Hon. A. Da. C. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the law making provision for the maintenance of illegitimate children is contained in the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act, 1897, as amended by the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act, 1950. For the past six years representation has been made by the Probation Department and the Social Welfare Department for extensive amendments to the existing legislation which deals with the maintenance of illegitimate children.

The Bill with which I am dealing today is specifically brought for the purpose of bringing the legislation dealing

with the maintenance of illegitimate children up-to-date. The opportunity has been taken to separate the provisions of relating to the maintenance of illegitimate children from the provisions relating to the settlement of the poor and also to consolidate the existing provisions together with the amendments which are set out in the Bill.

Now, Sir, the amendments contained in this Bill are as follows:- Firstly, to increase the age from twelve to sixteen years as the time when a reputed father of an illegitimate child would be held responsible for the support of that child under a Bastardy Order. I think it is unfortunate for an illegitimate child that whereas a father is supposed to look after the maintenance of his child until it reaches the age of sixteen years, the father of an illegitimate child is only by law supposed to look after that child until it reaches the age of twelve.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will agree that an illegitimate child is not responsible for itself being illegitimate, and we feel that if a father has to look after his child until it reaches the age of sixteen years, the same thing should apply to illegitimate children. We are aware of the fact of our system of education where a child leaves a Primary school at 11 plus and goes to a Secondary Modern School or a Secondary Grammar School. It is at that stage when this child needs more money to be spent on it than when it was twelve years old. It is at that stage that the mother has to look for shoes and books, and it is at that stage that the mother who might have sent to school her child in an ordinary dress when it was going to a Primary school, now that she has to send it to a Secondary Modern or a Secondary Grammar School, would have to look for uniform, and it is then that the mother needs money to look after that child. Therefore, Sir, I think it is necessary to increase the age for the support of illegitimate children from twelve to sixteen and that is contained in this Bill.

Another clause in this Bill deals with the right of an unmarried woman just as a putative father, to apply for affiliation of a Bastardy Order thus allowing for an increase or decrease of the maintenance towards that child. As the law now stands, a putative father is permitted to apply for a variation, and inevitably that would be a decrease in the Order; but if the means of the father have improved, as the law now stands, the mother cannot ask for a variation of the Order. This section of the Bill gives the mother of the child the right to ask for a variation of the Order if the means of the father improve.

Another section of the Bill gives the magistrate of the district authority in his discretion to order payment of, or part of, the amount of the arrears due under a Bastardy Order. It has been the practice in Barbados for a mother who has a Bastardy Order at the Court for the maintenance of a child through its putative father to take out affiliation proceedings for a matter of four weeks. I do not say that this is the fault of any Writ Server or anyone, but we all know that it is also the practice in Barbados for a putative father to escape from the Writ Server who has a warrant for him and as a result these Bastardy Orders may mount up to a matter of twelve and even sixteen weeks, and, as the practice is to take out affiliation proceedings for only four weeks, the child loses the maintenance which it should have from its putative father for a matter of twelve or fourteen weeks or as many weeks as they are above four weeks.
1.05 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we feel that the magistrate should be allowed to use his discretion and therefore place an Order on the putative father, after going into the means of the father, for an amount which he, in his discretion, feels that the father is able to pay.

It is to be noticed in this Bill that the maximum amount of an affiliation Order has been increased from ten shillings a week to five dollars a week. Now this maximum amount of ten shillings a week in the Order was made in 1950; since 1950 there has been a great improvement, there have been increases in wages, and what a child could be maintained on in 1950, it could hardly be maintained on, or it could hardly exist on, that amount today. Since there have been

these great increases and improvement in the wages structure in Barbados, and since there has been an increase in the cost of living, we feel that it takes more to maintain and care a child today than it took in 1950. This increase from a maximum of ten shillings to a maximum of five dollars is justifiable. This does not mean—I would like this to be clearly understood—that for every Order which a magistrate makes on a putative father he would be asked to pay \$5. As you know, Sir, a father has an Order made against him commensurate with his means. If he can only pay five shillings a week towards the proper maintenance of his child, then he is ordered to pay that; but, as I have said, when we find that a man's wage is between \$40 a week and \$60 a week and he has one child, I think it is unreasonable to the child to ask the father to pay ten shillings a week when he can afford to pay more towards the maintenance of the child. In these circumstances, I do not think that any hon. member will experience any difficulty in agreeing to this increase from ten shillings to five dollars.

The opportunity has been taken to make the father more responsible for the maintenance and the welfare of his child. For example: a father is asked by this Bill to contribute to the expense or the expenses relating to the birth of the child. He is also asked to give further assistance to the mother in case the death of the child takes place. That increase is from \$10 to \$20 and there again that can hardly be considered as being unreasonable. The opportunity is also taken in this Bill to give a mother the right to file affiliation proceedings against the putative father from the time that she becomes pregnant. If she becomes pregnant and she feels that she needs the protection of the Law Courts, she can file affiliation proceedings against the putative father which proceedings will be heard as soon as possible after the birth of the child. That is another advantage for the child in that, after the application is made to the Court, before it is heard, there may be a long lapse of time during which the father can leave the island and leave the child to suffer, or anything else can happen. In these circumstances, we give the mother the right to file affiliation proceedings and as soon as she can get out of the bed after the birth of the child, she can pursue these proceedings for the maintenance of her child; but the putative father is not the putative father until he has been so proved to be.

The opportunity is also taken to order the putative father of the child to leave his address with the Court. This makes the issuing of summonses easier, because if the father leaves his address, the bailiff can find him; but if there is no address, the bailiff will be looking up and down for him. When the summons has been served on a father, he is expected to turn up before the magistrate at the hearing of the case. The opportunity is also taken to enable the magistrate, in any case where the child is not in the custody of the mother, to order the delivery of the child to the mother, and in cases where the mother is dead or in prison, is of unsound mind or has left the island, the opportunity is taken to leave the legal custody of the child to some other person whether it be the Bridgetown City Council, the Northern District Council or the Southern District Council; and any of those Councils has the right to take affiliation proceedings against the father for the maintenance of the child.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not only the City Council or the other two Councils, but the Social Welfare Officer or any other representative person can take the necessary affiliation proceedings for the maintenance of the child. After all, children are a problem to us in this island of Barbados today. Children must be looked after and they must not be neglected. I do not agree that any one who gets a child, or who is responsible for a child, should allow that child to go neglected. Another point is this: dealing with the last mentioned provision, it has been the practice of some fathers to send and collect children from the mothers when the affiliation proceedings have been taken out.

1.15 p.m.

A father goes to Court and claims that he has the custody of the child, as a means of escaping the maintenance of his child; but what happens then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that as soon as no Order is placed on the man, the child

goes back to the mother. A mother is responsible for an illegitimate child, and it is she who should have the right, as long as she is of sound mind, to say whether or not she needs her child, and in these circumstances I feel that she is quite justified in having her child and it should be looked after. There are several other points which I would mention here, but I should wait for the comments of hon. members, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I will be quite willing to answer any questions asked by hon. members.

I should just like to point out that some time last year we had a very serious child problem, and I remember mentioning it when we dealt with the consent legislation which we introduced last year. Evidence has shown that those children who were involved were illegitimate children and the children of fathers who were not looking after them. I should just like to point out that a father owes a duty to his child, not only on the question of finance, but he owes a moral duty to that child, and I would like to make an appeal to fathers to be conscious of their responsibility and see that their children are well cared for.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very familiar with this, and though there is some enthusiasm in the Minister's presentation on the matter, what I have always worried about is that I spent about two years on this. I remember I paid a lot of attention to the Bill now operating in Jamaica. It was copied lock, stock and barrel from the English legislation which is rather unfortunate, but I did leave it in the Ministry, because I was not at all satisfied with many little things about this Bill, and it was my hope that with the help of a Committee a number of important things would be more or less brought into this Bill. Today for instance if a mother dies leaving a child of nine years, although the father was living under common law marriage with a regular and happy family, the father would have to apply for an Order, and there is no grandmother or any other relative of hers who could apply for an Order or insist that the child enjoy maintenance. I remember we had a good deal of worry about it and I never seemed to be able to answer it. It is true that the word "illegitimate" is now reduced to a vulgarism to brand the child, and I had also hoped there would have been some means of changing that word and the word "bastardy". In modern legislation all attempts are made to remove any likely stigma that would follow a child. We understand the definition, but it follows the child and it is responsible for a number of psychological problems which even psychiatrists all over the world are in trouble to understand and explain.

On the question of the increase to \$5.00, the Minister's argument seemed reasonable, because he is probably thinking of certain traits and the level of the community responsible for illegitimate children; but what did occupy my attention and to some extent worry me was that you will have a father who would probably be a merchant or a plantation owner, and he could be reckless about the support of a child. Here you would think in terms of the maximum and the magistrate would use his discretion, but he would be powerless if the child was at secondary school at an age of twelve or fourteen to impose more than \$5, though the father might be able to afford \$50; but there is nothing he can do because there is a ceiling of \$5. I know it would entail probably a lot of work to get around this, and again it is the exercise of discretion by the Court. You would not want to feel that the Court in exercising its discretion on any man would put it outside his reach to support his child. For a man with a humble taking of \$15 or \$20 a week, it is possible that he could have three of these unfortunate children, but if the limit of the law is extended in favour of the children, one probably would understand that that father would not be able to buy himself a meal. That is where the exercise of discretion is very vital and important. A situation like this could create a very serious drain on his takings.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, all these things make it almost impossible to draft the type of legislation that would cover

the requirements of the country. Now what is sad and unfortunate about all this is that here is a father who is quite happy, baptises the child himself, and everybody in the village and district knows he is the father of the child. The mother dies and the father decides for some reasons to take it to another lady with authoritarian methods to feed the child, and there is no one to prosecute him in court for continuation of payment. In the absence of the mother, that child's support would die although the father was willing to volunteer the evidence in the Court.

I know the Minister is dealing with a very tricky problem and awkward trend when he comes to Parliament with this. I think the House will understand my feelings on this matter. The only reason why this matter was not brought before the House three years ago was because I felt it almost impossible to iron out the several snags. I think a lady serving with one of the Organisations in the United Kingdom came to discuss the Jamaica legislation on this matter, and it is possibly on the file before the Minister. I can sympathise with his effort on this, but does it really answer the question? It is true that sometimes half a loaf is better than no loaf at all, but we may have to wait to see this thing evolve in what is a persistent desire by men and women to come together in family units.

I am hoping, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Minister will be in a position to offer us some hope, if not a promise, as to how we can overcome the several problems. You may have a father who could easily afford \$10 to a child, knowing the circumstances of the mother. You may have a child with natural ability and aptitude and probably a desire for higher education, but the father is restricted in the limitation by statute of \$5 a week, knowing only too well that that would certainly be insufficient to keep the child at school. We want to look on the other side of the fence where a father with a modest income of \$10 or \$15 could not be expected to follow this limit, and sometimes he could probably be the father of two or more children from two different mothers.

1.25 p.m.

This is unfortunate; this is how our society is made up. I need not relate to them the grounds on which this matter was fabricated; it remains a cold fact that we are dealing with circumstances.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention that on Page One of the Objects and Reasons, Item 2, it is stated: "Provision has been made to enable a magistrate, where the mother is not a fit person or is dead, in prison or of unsound mind or has left the Island, to commit the legal custody of the child to some other person. The magistrate may order the delivery of a child to the mother or to some other person into whose legal custody the child has been committed. Failure to comply with the terms of such an order is made an offence (Clause 7)."

I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister, since the father is called upon to support the child, why should this discretion be left to the magistrate? Let us say that an unscrupulous magistrate was married to a barren woman and they produced no children, but two unfortunate people produced a little child. What is to stop that magistrate from ordering that this child should stay with his wife?

If the father is called upon to support this child, I do think that in the case where the mother is not a suitable person to keep it, the father should have the first opportunity of keeping it. You cannot take a man's child and just give it to somebody willy-nilly.

If you turn to page five, clause seven, subsection one, it is stated:-

"Where an affiliation order has been made under section 6, the magistrate may on the application of the mother in any case where the child is not in the custody of the mother, order the child to be delivered to the mother, and any order made un-

der this subsection shall have the effect of revoking any previous orders that may have been made under the following subsections of this section."

As it is here, if a mother wants to change her mind about that, she can go back to the magistrate and make an application to get back her child. These are things which I would like explained because they do not seem normal to me. I think, if I know anything about the Adoption Act, that one has to go through a lot of red tape in order to adopt a child. If one has to go through all of that to adopt a child, it would be ironically hard if a mother can come back and make application to get back her child. She did not want it when it was small, but as soon as it started to grow up and perhaps show some promise she can make restitution to the law asking for the return to her of her child. Sir, I would like that part of the Bill explained a little more to me.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like at this stage to express my agreement with the hon. junior member for St. George when he says that a sum of money not exceeding five dollars a week for and towards the maintenance of a child is too small. Illegitimacy is not confined to any one section of this or any other community. We, Sir, are about to build a nation, and it must not be regarded as a punitive measure that a man should be made to contribute towards the support of the child which he fathered.

There are many cases when the father of a child can afford to pay more than five dollars a week, and it must be borne in mind when he does not contribute anything that you and I have to pay towards this child's upkeep because these children are then brought to one of the Councils which are forced to support them.

Sir, we are not here to support immorality. It is necessary for us not to impose a penalty, but rather to see to it that fathers are made to contribute according to their means towards the support of children which they have fathered.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services has said in his remarks that the putative father must be proved to be the putative father. I am wondering if there is confusion in the honourable member's mind about the meaning of the word "putative". It means: "supposed or thought to be". A man can be thought to be the father of a child. I wish the Minister would clear that statement up.

Sir, I do think that the limitation of five dollars a week is too small to impose. Men with a high earning capacity ought to be made to pay handsomely towards the support of children which they fathered. In another community it is seen that people avoid as far as possible fathering illegitimate children because the penalties are very great. In Puerto Rico, by a fairly recent ordinance there are no illegitimate children by law. They say that there are illegitimate parents because the child ought not to have the stigma of illegitimacy attached to it through the parents not having their union signified by the Church or by the State.

I would like to suggest, Sir, that this sum of five dollars should be raised to a higher figure, let us say, seven dollars, or seven dollars and twenty cents a week. We are not depriving anybody consensual pleasures, but these fathers should give support to their children and ought to be made to do so, and the mothers should not have to rely on the City Council or the Northern or Southern Councils to see after the support of these children.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, I have been hearing quite a lot concerning this Bill, and I would say that putative fathers ought to be made to pay towards the support of children whom they fathered and this amount of five dollars per week should be increased to twenty dollars. Any man who has a child and who knows the child is his — no money is too great for that child as long as he can support it, whether that child is from his common law wife or from his lawful wife. So long as he knows that the child is his, he should support it handsomely.

Sir, there is something which I want to point out to this House. There should be provision made for fathers who go away and do not send anything back for the support of their children. A man has children here and he leaves to go to England or any place without leaving any support for those children, and the position is one which not even a cent the poor mother is getting.
1.35 p.m.

These poor children have to go to the public for assistance; they have to go to the Bridgetown City Council or the Northern District Council or the Southern District Council, but that should not be so. As long as the father of those children can be found in any part of the Commonwealth he should be made to support his children; the Government should not be responsible for the maintenance of these children. It should be provided that, before a man leaves this island, he should be asked to maintain his children. We have an Act called the Bastardy Act. I want to say this; I have seen in my constituency that a woman and her husband left as many as nine children in Barbados and went to England, and the Northern District Council had to maintain them. The youngest of those children was four months old. This is the case of a married couple and what provision is made for these children here? The Government has to maintain them while their parents are outside in another country and are flourishing. The lawful children are suffering just as much as the unlawful ones because the parents refuse to maintain them after they leave this country.

I have heard some hon. members speak about adoption. If the mother of a child is dead, then the fit and proper person to adopt that child is the father if he has the means to take care of it. If the mother is dead and the father is alive.....

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to have this matter clear. The hon. member is asking or stating that a father should adopt his children; but is that possible?

Mr. CORBIN: I thank the hon. member. That would not be a question of the father adopting that child but accepting it. That child would have to be adopted by somebody who is not the father; but if the father is in a position to maintain that child, there is no better person to have the custody of that child than the father. The only way in which the question of adoption could arise would be when there is no father. We do not know what circumstances may arise. A child might develop in a higher bracket or it might develop in a lower bracket, and when it comes to a lower bracket then it takes more money to maintain that child. I hope that there is no magistrate who would have to impose a fine on John Wesley Corbin for the maintenance of a child. I would not allow that. If I get bread, that child must get bread; if I get milk, then it must get milk as well; and if I am wearing clothes, that child must also wear clothes. Whether it is a lawful child or it comes under the Bastardy Act, no magistrate will be able to impose a fine on John Wesley Corbin because I am going to maintain my child whether it is a lawful or an unlawful one.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, hon. members — or some of them — are worried about our not carrying this increase to more than \$5. I would like to point out that in England the maximum amount is 30/- and that is a place where wages are higher than they are in Barbados. The hon. junior member for St. George would like to know what happens to a man who works for 15/- a week and has three children to maintain by an affiliation order. As I said before, and I now repeat, an Order is placed on a man according to his means. The probation service comes into the case, and investigations are made as to the employment of the man, as to his wages and what he can afford to pay towards the maintenance of his child.

The hon. member also said that if it takes this man this amount of money to contribute towards the maintenance of the child, he has nothing with which to keep himself; but that is not so. All of these factors are taken into consideration before an Order is placed on a man for the maintenance of

his child and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are aware of all of this. The hon. member said that we should have given this matter more attention before we brought it here, but I am wondering if he wants us to keep it back for another five years because they had it for ten years.

In reply to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, he will see from this Bill that it is a question of the custody of the child and not a question of the adoption of the child. As the matter stands now, we have appointed a Committee to deal with this matter of adoption, but we are not taking care of adoption in this Bill; this is a question of guardianship. In reply to the hon. junior member for the City who said that he would like me to clarify the position of the putative father of a child, I will say that what I have already said was exactly what I meant. No Court can put an Order on a man unless the Court can prove that that man is the putative father of the child. That is what I meant and that is what I said.

There is just one other point which I did not mention and which I would like to mention now. According to this Bill, the Clerk of the Magistrate's Court has the right to take out affiliation proceedings against any putative father on whom an Order has been put. As it stands now, the mother has got to lose a day's work in order to find out if the money is there and she has to lose another day's work to file what she calls an execution. Under the terms of this Bill, automatically, if the money is not paid, the Clerk of the Court will issue a summons to the father and he has to go to the Court and give reasons why the Order has not been complied with. Hence the mother will not lose these days' work which she used to lose in the past in order to come to the Court. What she has to do is automatically done by the Clerk of the Court.
1.45 p.m.

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

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 22 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.30 p.m.

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

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

1.55 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no quorum, and I ask that the bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

ADDITIONAL EXPENSES OF PEASANTS HARVESTING CANES

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is Question Time. Question No. 104/62 asked by the Hon. senior member for St. Thomas regarding the harvesting of peasant canes.

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:—

Is Government aware of the additional expenses that peasants of canes in the parish of St. Thomas will have to undergo during this coming crop in harvesting their canes, due to lack of proper entrances to their fields?

2. Would Government issue a directive to have tracks cut so as to permit lorries to drive nearer the fields in order to load the said canes?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On behalf of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the reply to Parliamentary Question 104/1962 reads as follows:-

"No Sir. The Government recognises that the cost of harvesting canes will generally be higher in areas where the terrain and the access to fields are difficult. The Government is not aware of any charges additional to those which farmers were required to bear in reaping their crops in previous years.

No general directive will be issued. The circumstances of each particular area will have to be taken into consideration. It is to be hoped that peasants who own land adjoining any such entrances will give the Government their full cooperation."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As regards the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 105/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the hon. member is not in his place now.

RESOLUTION re FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Private Members Business. The first Order under Private Members Business is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution to approve the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance.

On the 14th May last, when Government Business was resumed at 4.30 o'clock the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have made a few remarks on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals by the Hon. Premier together with a paper which he brought in - a General Survey of the economy of Barbados for 1962.

The Hon. Leader of the House in replying to this speech made an attempt to get around some of the statements which I made by replying on the subject of income tax and he took the advantage of being able to make a speech in reply before I had completed. However, that has given me the opportunity before I proceed today to deal with his attempts to criticize some things which I had stated.

It is not for me to correct the copy of the speech on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals by the Hon. Premier; it is for the Hon. Minister himself to do so. When the Hon. Leader of the House stated that I attempted to mislead the House by remarks I made in so far as the duty proposals were concerned, and the specific reference to the increase on toothpaste and the analogy which I drew about vacuum cleaners and other matters, it is not for the hon. gentleman to right those statements as printed in the Budgetary Proposals. One cannot ask you to read a statement made by the Minister of Finance and assume that that statement is wrong. There was a recorded broadcast which contained the same things; so if the Hon. Minister in reply said that the statements contained in the Budgetary Proposals were wrong, he should not accuse me of misleading the House and the public. I think it is most uncharitable and unfair.

I regard his statement about economic heresies as rather a matter of opinion. All of us are entitled to opinions, right or wrong, I do not intend to deal with that, but I will join with the hon. junior member for St. George in his condemnation of the manner in which these things were pro-

posed, although I do not agree that it was a matter of a breach of privilege because this matter was proposed in this Chamber, and what we have to do is to exercise our rights in dealing with matters proposed in here.

Sir, I have given serious thought to what I have seen in the Budgetary Proposals and I would like to say that the time is coming very soon when something must be done with the constitution of the House as it is. However, I do not propose to deal with that today under these Budgetary Proposals.

When the Hon. Leader of the House said that it was uncharitable to accuse the Hon. Premier on this respect or whatever you called it, I want to say why I said so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Parliament is regarded in such high esteem that when you read "May's", you would know why in the United Kingdom Members of Parliament are even exempted from attending Courts. That is to say, if tomorrow I am summoned to attend Court and the House of Assembly is meeting, any High Court Judge will agree that the House takes a precedence to the Courts. There was a famous case where a member of Parliament was summoned to attend Court, but because it was a day when Parliament was meeting, it was regarded that Parliament should take precedence to any court and the member was exempted from attending Court. That is one of the reasons why members of the House are not elected to serve as jurymen. They regard Parliament as the highest Court and attendance at this Court must come first.

I am going to justify my reason for saying that the Budgetary Proposals were not debated as they should have done. Moreover, the Hon. Leader of the House must stand positively guilty on this because any arrangement of business in the House of Commons is based that the Leader of the House of Commons, before the House adjourns for its next meeting, indicate to Parliament what he proposes to deal with on the next occasion.
2.40 p.m.

We find the Hon. Leader of the House using his blandishments about the work which the Hon. Premier has to do, and with all of these blandishments he did not tell us on the Tuesday immediately preceding the one at which the Financial Statement with the Budgetary Proposals was made that it was the intention of the Government or the Hon. Premier to make that Statement on the following Tuesday. The Hon. Leader of the House failed miserably in performing a duty which he owes to Parliament. There is no use in accepting the trappings of the House of Assembly or the tenets of democracy or there is no point in putting something into your Manifesto and when you come to Parliament you find that you have torn up these things. In their Manifesto this is what they have said:-

"The party is irrevocably committed to foster, develop and sustain the principles of parliamentary democracy....."

That being so, you would expect them to tell us before hand that an important Statement like the Budget would be made. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has failed in his duty to undertake the serious task of allowing the public and the Government to know that certain parliamentary usages must, of necessity, be adhered to, then we have to look otherwise. The position of this House is that there are ten members who are outside the Government, and of those ten members the Leader of the Opposition is the leader of a party of four. Within the House, therefore, at least there are six other hon. members who are greater than the membership of the Opposition, and I happen to be one of those. I will not allow any matter which infringes the principles of parliamentary democracy to infringe that parliamentary democracy for one split half of a second. No Leader of the Government could be excused for saying that he did not know that the Budgetary Proposals were going to be brought down. I was not in this island, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and one of the quickest passages of the Estimates was done this year. The House met from day to day in a week, and in less than ten days this sort of accommodation was done in that you passed these Estimates; and when you came to deal with the Bud-

getary Proposals, they took a circuitous route and they were not debated in the form in which they were presented, but they were debated in the disjointed form in which you are doing them now. You have had Bills coming out of ordinary proposals. Parliamentary statements and Ministerial statements are meant to be statements by means of which the Government intends to do something. They are made as statements to correct something which has been done in Parliament and to show what Government propose to do in an abridged manner, what legislation is going to take place. When you have that, you have to treat it as if you are introducing a debate and we cannot accept a Ministerial Statement to be used as a statement on which no debate will take place unless a substantive motion is made to deal with that. When you read the Memorandum on the Estimates at paragraph 24, you will see that this is what the Government said:

The measures which the Government propose to take to meet the deficit on current account and to meet further loan charges will be announced when the budget is presented."

That was presented to this House in March. These Estimates were passed in the House before the 18th March, and in these Estimates there was contained a statement by the Government that the Estimates were framed against a background that they propose coming to the House at some future date with Budgetary Proposals. The Government was well aware of that when they made these Estimates; and if the Hon. Leader of the House made the quip that I do not do my homework sometimes, I may say that when your work is well prepared then your homework is superfluous. I do not need to do homework on an elementary parliamentary procedure to know that when the Estimates were prepared, the Government was aware they were budgeting for a deficit, and that deficit was going to be a deficit that would be made good. In short, the Government has not budgeted for a deficit in truth and in fact; they brought forward the Estimates in 1962, and for the first Estimates produced by the Government they could not be accused; they won the Election in 1961 and all the preparations for the Estimates would have been well on the way. The Hon. Premier brought down the Estimates for 1962-63 and it would have been impossible for them to frame their policy and streamline their own policy in conformity with a budget which had already been prepared by a former Government. You could not expect them in March to bring forward all their Budgetary Proposals, and the Premier came in here in 1962 with Budgetary Proposals against a background of a basic estimate which he had then. That is excusable. I thought that after 1961 it would have been unnecessary for me to make the kind of speech which I am making today, because the attitude of the former Government was so obnoxious to the thinking of the people, or it was so out of step with the aspirations of the community, that the community did what was in their power, that is, to reject them at the polls. We thought that those who had succeeded them would have been most careful not to follow so closely in the footsteps of those who were rejected on that ground; but we find to our dismay that instead of taking a different route, they are following in the same circuitous route of the last Government, and trying to circumvent Parliament in order to get these measures through the House. They are allowing themselves to be intoxicated with the idea that because they are there today they will be there forever, forgetting that this community has demonstrated and manifested in no uncertain terms that anybody who is in power — it may be for fourteen or twenty years — can not be entrenched so strongly that they cannot go against the will of the people and the people will reject them. 2.50 p.m.

I did not think it would have been necessary for me to do this. In the speeches which I have made in the last seven years, I had to be very bitter against the actions of the last Government. Now I find myself faced again with undertaking the unpleasant role of not working in Parliament with parliamentarians who seem to respect the highest tenets of parliamentary democracy, but want these deviations and subversions in Parliament for the sake of accommodation. I am not going to accommodate anybody in Parliament, because in Parliament I do not represent myself. It is a big

responsibility on any of us in Parliament to represent the people who have put their trust in us, and we cannot allow friendship, accommodation, association or any of the other frills in public life to supersede and undermine some of the basic things we stand for. When you read that the Budget Proposals were to come down to deal with this deficit and other proposals, it is against that background that you have to examine the Budget Speech. Now you put these things in the Estimates which you debated, but you did not debate the Budgetary Proposals, because they were not ready then.

The Hon. Premier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has chosen to make these Budgetary Proposals which could have been included in the Estimates, and I am going to show bit by bit how they could have been included, because the basic proposals are proposals which deal with the Estimates. Now let us take the item of subsidies and grants, as an example. In dealing with rice, that is part of your Estimates, and the amount of money you have provided for the Controller of Supplies is supplied out of the Estimates; so you give \$400,000 to subsidise rice. In here during the Estimates, I would have had the freedom in Committee of Supply to speak on the subsidies, but I cannot do that on the Statement made by the Premier. I would have to make a substantive motion on the basis that they were contained in the Estimates; so that is an example to show what the Budgetary Proposals are. When those Budgetary Proposals can be contained in the Statement and you try to preclude discussion on a substantive motion and take a circuitous route with it coming after the Bills you have passed, that in my humble opinion does not go square with your statement that you are irrevocably committed to foster, develop and sustain the principles of parliamentary democracy. It is a negation of that broad statement made in your Manifesto. In addition to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we passed a Consumption Tax Act, and what do you find? Matters that deal with the increase of tax coming under a consumption taxation are included in an Order that is made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and have been contained in the Budgetary Proposals and there would be no Bills to deal with then.

I remember my good old friend — God rest him in his grave — the late Mr. A. E. S. Lewis, who was a great defender of even the introduction of some of these amendments that are now Orders, because he foresaw and made it clear that these things will be done as Orders-in-Council, and the House of Assembly would have very little chance of dealing with them, because to deal with these Orders requires a substantive motion that these Orders be rejected, because you cannot amend them. You cannot therefore debate them unless you are debating the Budget Proposals; yet you find that the Government has introduced on one day taxation proposals which the House had absolutely no opportunity of discussing, and they so arranged the meeting of the House that you could not discuss them in their totality like the Estimates in which you can make your speech in a similar manner to how presented. You have this disjointed manner of dealing with the Income Tax Bill, the Petroleum Bill and other Consumption Tax Bills. Happily for me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is nothing in Parliament that anybody can offer me. I have been elected by the people and I have been elected for a long time; that is my happiest moment, and nobody can offer me anything which is higher than that.

What I should like to say to the Hon. Premier is that the people of this Island are the people who elected all of us to this Chamber, and in dealing with matters in this Chamber we are supreme to any other body, because there is no other body that elects anybody here. Some Ministers get drunk with power after they have been elected, forgetting that they came through the same road as other members in this Assembly — by the ballot box. Some Ministers and some people get so drunk with this Party organisation that they think the Parties are greater than the people, forgetting that people make Parties and Parties do not make people, and you have to go back to the people each time in your individual constituency and appeal to them for support; and if they are not willing to support you, no Party can put you here. This is not like Israel where you have a common electoral roll, and where a Party can pick out whom it likes and put in Parliament. I say that because I am not going to sit down in this House and allow the slightest infringement on parlia-

mentary democracy to take place. On this matter that has been introduced, the hon. member made a pallid excuse; he was speaking with his tongue in his cheek. It was the most hypocritical speech and reply I have heard coming from the hon. member's mouth relating to the Hon. Premier's business, when he knows as Leader of the House that they had been discussing the Budget Proposals since 18th March, and even before these were passed, they stated that they were coming down with Budgetary Proposals to deal with this matter. They stated that the measures which the Government proposes to take to meet the deficit on current account and to meet further loan charges will be announced when the Budget is presented. Did they mean they were not coming down with Budget Proposals? No! They were warning the public that they were. The Hon. Premier left here and went to Canada or the United States; but what should come first? He could never have gone to Canada unless he was elected to the House of Assembly. He was elected to the House of Assembly by the people of Barbados, and we regard it that the Budgetary Proposals which became an infliction on the people in Barbados by the Government of which he is head, should come before any other business.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not relegate Parliament to any secondary position so far as anything is concerned. If the hon. member is looking at Parliament as an imported institution in this island, then I have to draw to the attention of the hon. member that Parliament is more than his Party. Parliament will go on and on, but Parties will die. This is the highest institution in this land, and it has to be treated with and accorded the best respect that we expect from the Leader of Government. I do not make any excuses for his action. The Budgetary Proposals are the most important proposals that can come to Parliament all over the world. You listen to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to the President of the United States in the State of the Nation Speech, and all over the world in statements that deal with the finance and economy of a country, it is very important for all to hear.

3.00 p.m.

I make absolutely no apology or excuse for his actions and I feel that the way in which it was done was done to circumvent a proper debate. If it had been circumvented, what would have been the answer? The Government or Parliament would have passed these things.

I draw this reference at the beginning because the Hon. junior member for St. George was speaking on it on a breach of privilege, and I told him I did not agree and Your Honour has ruled on the matter. I would say that had he not been a party to this type of rapacious conduct we would not have had these incursions in this democratic life of ours. He was a party to these things by being a member of a Party which tried to circumvent the conduct of Parliament. I would say that some of the members of his Party when they were in Government were more vociferous and possessed a greater amount of parliamentary acumen than he. Unfortunately, today members of this Government are not faced with the type of Opposition as it was when they were members of the Opposition. I thought this sort of attitude would have been corrected, so far as they are concerned. It is historical that what they propose to do in Parliament continuously is something which they spoke against, and that is why I said that I did not think this kind of speech which I am making had any right to be made after December, 1961 because I looked forward to a different kind of attitude from that which I experienced from the former Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to show you some of the things in these Budgetary Proposals with which we have to deal and for which, unfortunately, a debate on the Budget will soon become purely an academic affair, the reason being that some of the main things have already been passed and made law, and for the others which can be rejected by the House, it will become extremely difficult after part of the substance has been missing, yet I am still prepared to deal with the Budget as a budget and the Financial Proposals as financial proposals to show in my opinion the way how I regard these things.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in order to deal with the Financial Statement, it is necessary for me to deal with the

Estimates because the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals are meaningless by themselves. I think I drew to the attention of this Honourable House and the Hon. Leader of the House, when he pointed out that because the population of this island was increasing that was the reason of revenue for Customs and Excise rising to a point of fifteen million dollars which is fifty per cent of the total revenue — the analogy which I made was that the gap was widening between direct and indirect taxation. The Hon. Minister admitted that the answer to that was that as population and purchasing power increased, it was reflected in higher revenue from Customs duty. That is understandable; but not in the same ratio as it is now. At least you should reflect in a higher purchasing power a better distribution of these taxation proposals; and therefore I say that there must be a closer examination of your direct taxation and, maybe, it is in the collection of income tax. I say that because when you can rise from five million dollars in revenue from Customs and Excise in 1952-53 to fifteen million dollars this year, and in 1952-53 the revenue which was derived from income tax was six million dollars and this year it is estimated at eight million dollars, therefore, Sir, when you look and see the disparity between direct taxation which is derived from what the community is paying as against that which you get from income tax, then you can say that it is against that background that you have to examine the Budgetary Proposals in order to know where you are going.

It is my duty as a man in public affairs to pay attention to every aspect of public life. In the closing statement of the Hon. Premier's Budget Speech he exhorted many people to do many things and I would say that it was a very good exhortation because it requested people of the community who should play a part to play their part.

In the conclusion of the general survey it is stated:-

"The year 1963 presents all sections of the economy with a number of great challenges."

"To the business community the challenge is mainly one of recognition of changes in the structure of commerce and in consumption patterns so that adjustments may be made without major dislocation or financially disastrous adherence to outmoded methods and institutions."

"To the general public the challenge is an invitation to discard idolatry of imported goods where locally produced goods are available."

"To the Trade Union movement the challenge is an appreciation of the principle that greater production and effort is not the hallmark of the unfree but a source of personal benefit and national pride."

"To the Government the challenge is one of marshalling our resources in such a way as not only to provide the maximum social and economic advantage but to secure the willing co-operation of all sectors."

"Such is the background against which the budgetary proposals will be made."

I was very pleased to see that statement. My organization and myself have been asking the past Government and people of all sectors of the community to come together for the prosperity of the country. My organization has to its credit the preparing of an economic paper dealing with Economic Development, and it is accredited an excellent document by international organizations. We realize the things which this country needs. We do not stand up and make speeches only, but we sit down and prepare something from which the Government can see what the trade union is doing.

We have done something which none of the political organizations has thought it part of their duty to do. There are three parties in this House of Assembly. Which party has produced an economic paper to the Government? Neither one, not even the Government in power. The Government's Party has produced a Manifesto, but they have not produced an economic paper. There is a difference between the two. An economic paper deals with the financial position, and none of the parties in this House has thought it necessary to

issue such a document. They have not thought it worthwhile to exercise their minds on these important things. It is easier to get on a platform and say that you are going to do something for which you have nothing worked out and then you find that you cannot do it.

It is my business not only to say what we want in wages, but also to show the way how these things can be achieved, and if they are not achieved, let us have alternatives. I can say for my organization that we have the material which can right the economy of this country. A responsible trade union can right the economy of a country. As is said elsewhere, I do not think a trade union is something sacrosanct; it has to deal with all these issues which arise from time to time. Any responsible institution has to be willing and ready to participate in every effort towards the economic development of its community. Certainly we have to participate in the economic development of the community in the same respect as the Sugar Producers Association.
3.10 p.m.

We feel that we have to participate in the economic activity of this island as people who can do something to strengthen the economy. For that reason, we take a vital interest in every economic proposal which comes before this House. (ASIDES). Mr. Deputy Speaker, you would have noticed that I did nothing to interrupt the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he was speaking. He was accorded the privilege of having his speech broadcast. I do not think that I need that, but I think I should be allowed to speak without interruption on any matter. The art of listening is a very good one to be adopted, and I think that I should be accorded that facility which the hon. member was accorded when he was making his speech.

As I was saying, Sir, the proposal here is against a background of the Government's Manifesto and against a background of re-current expenditure. I will deal with the matter of the School Meals Programme. I want the Government to reconcile their own statements which they have made. When the Hon. Premier came into power, he said that the financial position of the colony was in a terrible state. He introduced the Budget Proposals in his first Budget Speech in which he asked for more consumption taxes. He spoke about the infra-structure of Barbados. That structure is good; nearly every child is going to school and you have a higher *per capita* rate being spent on education than in any other territory in the West Indies; therefore your infra-structure is not bad. You are spending \$8 million on a Hospital, your public health services are good, your transport system is good and your basic infra-structure is better than that of the other territories with which you want to join in a Caribbean Federation. I therefore do not accept the statement that: "It is necessary in a developing country like Barbados where Government's Fiscal Policy is aimed at providing the infra-structure and pre-conditions for take-off from a period of stagnation...."

That is a vague statement; I do not believe that the infra-structure was in any state of stagnation. I may be a political anachronism, not being in any Party, but I resent the statement made by the Premier that — he would resign by September, if he did not bring forward a proposal for school meals. — You are at present giving to the school children milk and biscuits. You started a pilot scheme for school meals which cost you \$200,000 against a background where you said that the Civil Servants are getting this and that, and you have increased the pilot scheme which you started in three parishes. There are eleven parishes in Barbados, and you will see what it will cost you if you have to carry out this situation in all the parishes; you will see what it will cost you if you were to remove the milk and biscuits and substitute the school meals therefor. Why do you institute a social condition if you cannot afford it? There is no point in telling a man that you will give his child a hot meal at school and then in the next breath you tell that man that he would have to pay more money for his rice. On that basis I said that the subsidy on rice cannot be justified in Barbados in peace time. I said that because if the market price for selling rice on a free market basis is a reasonable price, something would be wrong with your basic structure in the community if people cannot buy rice which is a

free market commodity which they have to eat. We can remove the subsidy on rice; but whenever you remove the subsidy, the whole purpose of removing that subsidy is either to relieve taxation or to divert it into other channels in which there is a dire need.

Now this is the analysis; you will remove a subsidy so as to afford easier taxation. You say that you do not want to create a danger where you will be putting rice at too high a price, because people will have to go too deep down in their pockets. If you are removing a subsidy, that is expenditure which you are removing. Some hon. member has spoken about growing yams and sweet potatoes, but I am wondering how many hon. members ever have cooked. I should like to say that Barbados is not a wood-producing country. A person who cooks has either to buy wood, coals, or kerosene oil, and the people who are better off use gas stoves; but we have no forests here. Rotted canes are only memories now and animals are going; you do not have many of them now, so that you can use their manure; but when we talk about the use of yams, they will never be a substitute for rice. A Barbadian will tell you that rice yields, whereas yams and potatoes will contract. There is so much water to be taken out of yams and potatoes that it takes time for the water to come out of them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the women who cook do so by experience. After a time, you will know what is the quickest and cheapest thing to cook, and that is why Barbadians eat more rice every day than any other meal. Rice is an easier meal to cook and at the same time it goes much further than any other meal. I did not deal with the increase in the price of rice; I am looking at the financial and the economic end.
3.20 p.m.

If you are going to do that, do it in itself, but I would not do that against the background of starting an experiment in the schools where you had already been giving school children some kind of nutrition in that you are providing all of them with milk and biscuits, and you were not substituting hot meals for all the milk and biscuits; so your own Party has to examine these things. This is going to be a recurring expenditure, and every Tuesday members of the Government Party are asking the Government to spend more money in the various Resolutions that they bring. What are you going to do against the school meals? Are you going to say that the three places where you have the pilot scheme are the ones to have the children fed? What about the children in St. Peter? Are they entitled to hot meals? St. Peter seems to be one of the parishes that all Governments look over; but the more you look over St. Peter, the more you will have to look at me. That only infuriates the people in St. Peter more and sends me back with more force. Maybe through the Boundaries Commission you will try to carve up St. Peter in such a way; but when you finish carving it, I will still find some way. What are you going to do for the children in St. Philip? You have a scheme in Christ Church, one in St. Michael and one in St. Lucy, but that is the Government's own doings. When you take off a subsidy, you should find something else in which to utilise the money, and not start a school meals programme which you cannot accomplish in three years or for a long time. You have stated in your memorandum that the recurring expenditure is \$27 million and next year there is no chance of reducing this expenditure. The Government has not said this, but I am going to say this to the people of Barbados; these are not going to be the last Budgetary Proposals. There is no finality in taxation, because you cannot come in one session and tax people for a whole life time. You cannot tax people up to 1980.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Federation proposals are not known. There are other living costs, and Government has expenditure from which annual increments make up for certain things. Building a new Post Office, though it is capital works, is going to create recurrent expenditure, because the bigger the building, the more cleaners you want, the more water and light you will use. With that before us, I am not going to make the public believe that because rice and petrol have gone up that that is the end. Oh no! There are go-

to be more taxes, and what we in Parliament have to be watchful about is that taxation is an inevitable consequence of our civilised conventional life and we cannot escape it; therefore if we have to live a conventional life, taxation is an essential ingredient in that part of our living. Let us examine the things we do and say against that background. Let us have wherever we can things that are of top priority. I will say to the Government that school meals is not a top propriety within the context of the economic position of Barbados at this time, because every child at elementary school was eligible for milk and biscuits. At least something was done, but today every child cannot get a hot meal. There are so many desirable things in a community which the individual members of the community do not have in their own homes. All of us have desirable elements in our lives to fulfil, but our economy restricts us in what we can do, and if your income does not afford you to have a refrigerator, you get an ice-box. How many of us started life that way? We found our parents or families without any refrigerator; there were none to have anyhow, and those who got them first were those who were better off. Now they have spread in the community on a better basis.

I heard the Hon. Premier say here on one occasion — and I regard it as a very important statement — that there is no point in having a champagne taste if you only have a mauby pocket. Now unfortunately the Premier himself has acquired a champagne taste, but I cannot say that he has a mauby pocket; may be it is a limewater or ginger beer pocket. Everybody is crying out against taxation; therefore if you cannot feed all the children in school, let that project wait until you can do better.

I commend the Hon. Premier for his courage in dealing with the rice subsidy. It took a lot of courage in a community like this for any Minister of Finance to produce a budget that would increase the cost of rice, but I think it can be justified against the enormous expenditure that you are undertaking in a community to save people on the average about 77 cents maybe a year or some figure like that on their total cost; but when you add it up, it is nearly \$1/2 million you are expending on rice. Now I do not subscribe to the argument that you are subsidising the farmers in British Guiana, because the farmers are going to get that price whether or not you buy it. They can get that price any part of the world. It is just like saying that the people in England are subsidising our cane farmers because they buy our sugar at an economic price. I will say that there is no justification in subsidising an article which is sold at fair market price, and therefore if the community cannot buy it, something is wrong with the wages or living standards and you must do something to raise the standards where they can buy the commodities they require. It would be better, if you are going to have a subsidy on things for people to eat, to attempt to subsidise your own local farmers in producing things that people can purchase here at reasonable prices, so that the money which you use for a subsidy is rotating and percolating in your community, and you give your community more reasonable prices in the commodities they use. For that reason I commend the Premier for his courage in removing the subsidy on rice.

3.30 p.m.

Apart from my general criticisms of this method of presentation, I would like to say this. The Hon. Premier made a statement, and I would like to challenge him on it because it is too easy a statement to make in this community: you hear too many people making such a statement. The Hon. Premier said: "At this junction I do not propose to deal with the statutory undertakings which are owned by us. There is a strong Committee examining the working of the Transport; a world famed expert has examined problems regarding Housing and his report is awaited; I may add that I have received his first interim report this morning. The Natural Gas Corporation is consolidating its position. I would repeat, however, that there is no reason why the general taxpayer — and this includes very poor people — should subsidise a service which would pay for itself and make a profit if it were operated by private persons."

I do not know if he means the bus service. At this stage of our lives we do not talk of a bus service operated by pri-

vate people and making a profit because, if that were so, you would not have taken over the buses. I heard some member in here saying that the private people who are operating part of the transport service are making a profit. Hear what they tell the Committee now. It is a different story. It is all right for somebody who wants something to say: "Oh, we can make this pay; give it to me." But when you give it to them, they say that they did not realize how much it would take to run it.

Sir, I do not subscribe to the view that a good bus service can be measured in profits against the running of the undertaking. A good bus service has to be measured by the general economic position of the people of the community. We have to think of a bus service which is doing a good job for the benefit of the whole Island. Let us take something which has happened years ago. A boy from the country who went to school in town never knew what it was to get back home until every week-end. That is why the incidence of the number of boys going to Harrison College or any school located in the City was negligible, and it was impossible for an agricultural labourer in the rural area, even if he were in a position to do so, to send his son to a school in town. First of all, he would have to get somebody in town to board his son, and then they do not take in any bare-footed children at Harrison College. You could be as brilliant as Euclid, you would not be able to go to Harrison College with your bare feet on the ground. People would say: "Look what Harrison College has come to." Were it not for a good bus service the people who live in the country could not send their children to be taught in secondary schools in the City. As it is now, children from the remotest part of Barbados are able to go to schools in the City; therefore you have to measure your bus service in the terms of its services to the community as a whole and not in the profit of the undertaking. I cannot subscribe to the views of the Hon. Premier willy-nilly.

People pay, as I understand, twenty cents to come from Speightstown to Bridgetown. That cannot be regarded as an unreasonable fare to pay. You cannot accuse the company, and you should not say that it is not getting in all the money. You must feel that you are getting all the money. We of the Union who represent the workers do not represent them when they get dishonest. As a matter of fact, we do not represent anything that is corrupt. In our agreement we have drawn up a code of behaviour. Any man caught stealing, we tell him that he cannot expect to do those things and expect us to represent him. We do not want that kind of member in our organisation; we do not want to create that image in the community. We are at the level where we encourage men and women to understand that they must have a different mentality and approach and that they should work in a public undertaking and not regard it as an undertaking which they should get the most out of.

Were it not for a subsidy which is given to B.O.A.C., the Minister would not be able to travel by aeroplane. As regards the building up of our tourist trade, we have to view that against the background that you will only be able to build a Hilton Hotel here because the U.S.A. is going to subsidise Pan-American Airways heavily. Take away the subsidy given operating airway companies and air travel would be a memory. All over the world transport is a subsidised item.

We have to subsidise our land transport in order to get our girls to work. If our bus service stops for one hour between seven and eight o'clock in the morning it would disrupt the industrial flow in the country. The kind of service today is different from what it was years ago. Twenty-five years ago, who cared whether you had a bus service? Our bus service must also be viewed in the light of people who go to the hospital to visit their families. You must bear in mind that it is the poor man's service. What do you think would happen if our bus service closed tomorrow? People are not living near stores today, and that means you must have a service to take them to and from work. Sir, I do not agree with this statement about transport which the Hon. Premier made because I do not regard it as a correct thing to do to put this matter into private hands. It is not the best way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is one general statement which I would like to make. In one breath the Government is looking forward to a tripartite effort of the community in dealing with these proposals, and in another breath it seems to ignore it. Now, when the Government speaks about higher productivity and asks the Union to regard the principle that greater production and effort is a source of personal benefit and national pride, I want to say that there has been a general criticism about production among one sector of the community.

Usually, the man who is exposed to the glare of the public is the man whom you can see idling, and you do not take into consideration that sometimes this man takes his cue from people who are higher up.

What I find in Barbados is that there is not a strong condemnation for the people higher up who are not producing and who are not giving a good day's work for the money which they are receiving. You find people who are getting large salaries who still want to be idle. There are people in the Government service and in other positions who are just waiting for the next occasion when they can draw their salary, and yet the only victim of criticism, so far as idling on the job is concerned, is the cantonnier and the man who works in the street. I have no axe to grind for a lazy man whether he be the top man or the bottom man. What I would say is that Barbados is a poor community.

3.40 p.m.

I would like to say this to the Government; the sooner the Government gets into the minds of everybody in Barbados that if you are poor you have to work harder than a man who is rich, the better. That has to be realised if you ever want to increase your standard of living. This is a poor nation, and are we following nations which have larger services? You listen to the radio and you hear that Cooper has gone up into outer space; we can go on sending people into outer space until one person remains up there. In a poor community you cannot afford to advance the standard of living on laziness. Where is the Government getting the money that it wants? Where is it getting it from? The Government is getting money from the people who live in Barbados, people who work. I have to work and I pay taxes; the day that I cannot work I cannot pay taxes. The Government must create incentives for people to work hard, those who are willing to put their hands to the plough and work.

I am glad to hear the Government's programme, in relation to housing. In this community there are many hard-working people who are willing to build their own houses, but they must have the incentive or assistance to do so and you must give it to them. You relieve the higher people from circulating money in the community, but you give other people an opportunity of owning their own houses. I would like to see the day arrive when the Government can give every man an incentive to own his own house. People should be willing to pay for what they have, but you should also give them the opportunity to go to a Bank or somewhere so that they can borrow money in order to build their own houses. I say that because, in relation to money spent in Barbados, there is a sector in this community which pays for everything they have to do. They are not rich people; they pay for the education of their children, and these people make an excellent contribution to the community. One of the important things about the Government's financial and economic policy is that they should create incentives amongst those people in this community who have not had the opportunity of incentives being given to them before, and that is how you will strengthen your economy. You cannot have this School Meals Programme unless you have men and women forcing the economic pump so that you can get more out of it. We must work hard in order to succeed, but many of us see that some of us are working easy and are succeeding whereas the poor must work harder and suck seeds. (Laughter.)

My feeling is that the Government has an excellent opportunity to do good. They came in on a wave of high public enthusiasm; they came in against a background of people who were weary and tired of a Government which did not appreciate the growing aspirations of people. Mr. Deputy

Speaker, I hope that this will be the last occasion on which I would have to tell this Government to abide by the principles which they have set out in their Manifesto, if it is their intention to foster, develop and sustain the principles of parliamentary democracy.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, all I need to do now is to supplement the remarks which I made earlier today on the point of privilege in a previous debate. My main plea today is one for democracy against an element of dictatorship which is now seeking to engulf our country, particularly in the inner sector of our community. If we need to be worried about anything it is that, as I said earlier, contrary to British tradition, to say nothing of the accepted convention, the freedom of debate in this House on the proposals for taxation in the Budget has been relegated to the short time left for the consideration of Private Members' Business. For instance, the hon. member who has just sat down has spent an hour and a quarter out of a two-hour period allowed for Private Members' Business in speaking when we have so many other hon. members who are desirous of speaking on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. If we had adopted the principle obtaining in the British Government, we would have been free today to have a Ways and Means Committee, which would be a Committee of the whole House, and we would speak on this Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for about two or three days. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, two or three Bills have already been passed without our having an opportunity to discuss this matter, and I am saying that that is a dictatorship from which the community suffers. Psychologically, you must expect your adherents to accept your policy as being the correct one, and they accept it without realising that, unwittingly, they are adopting a form of dictatorship which we would not welcome in this country. That is why I have prefaced my remarks with a plea for democracy against this ugly feature of dictatorship which is developing. It is correct to say that our country is slipping into danger. I am sorry that the Hon. Premier is not present during this debate; you would hate to criticise something which has been brought in by the Hon. Premier and you are discussing it in his absence. Parliament must always be left free to debate things. We were told by the Hon. Leader of the House that the Hon. Premier had to hurry to go to Canada with the whole Ministry of Trade, lock, stock and barrel, and a few weeks ago we were told that the Premier was overworked to exhaustion in his particular Ministry. You had in Canada the Permanent Secretary of Trade, the Chairman of the Tourist Board and the Manager of the Development Board in a panel with the Hon. Premier when essentially it was the business of the Minister of Trade. We were told that the Minister had cancelled his ticket at the last moment. That is a form of dictatorship; but I assume that the Minister is familiar with things in Canada. Suddenly you have the papers left here and you are figuring under a nom-de-plume hoping to save the face of the Premier.

3.50 p.m.

That is the sort of cruel, creeping dictatorship that is possessing this country and starting with the very Government members. This is something we need to fear. Three weeks ago the Premier made a brief trip to British Guiana and decided that he should emulate what Jagan is doing by coming to the House just a few days after for an Assistant Premier. That is the sort of thing we want to be worried about. We know the subtleties of the unthinking masses that form our community; we know how they are expected to react and respond to the people they admire when they establish a leader, an idol or otherwise, and dare you to knock it down until something has taken place in the community. We know this is wrong, but you would want me to close my mouth and sit down!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the absence of any specific rule in the Standing Orders, we revert to May's; but May's does not provide for Budget statements or proposals to be discussed in Private Members' Time and for that matter even in the House, but in a Committee known as Ways and Means. All these things have been dashed to the ground because it provides him with the facility to ignore us and bring into law things we have never had a chance to discuss. That is where you are destroying the foundations of democracy. Those of us who are thinking and following these things

must think of the early Pilgrims who watched millions dying because of the uncouth attitude of dictators, and decided to formulate some sort of principle or political policy in which the masses could live with some form of freedom. Socrates is my idol up to today. Today you are destroying all that is beautiful and massive in the thought that has come through British history. Britain did not have the struggle in developing a state like that of Rome, because we were offered a measure of freedom not known by some of the other Governments or powers.

Here I am today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, discussing the Budget Proposals and the laws have already been passed and are now ancient history in so far as this Parliament is concerned. I will give you one single Christian incident. The Premier on his legs said there would be an increase of one cent on beverages taken in this country by the people of the country. Little does he know that if I had been given an opportunity to discuss this before it was passed into law, I could have told him he was making a mistake and he did not know what he was talking about. You have increased the capital outlay, and consequent on all this you have increased the gasoline that must move the drinks right across the whole island. The result is that before he left the Island sweet drinks were sold at two cents in addition to the regular price. The morning after there was a meeting in the Ministry of Trade of the manufacturing units of these same beverages, and he had to let them go on the compromise of a penny on a ten ounce bottle.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the hon. junior member for St. George said something about the morning after — I do not know whether he meant the night before — there was a meeting of the manufacturers of sweet drinks and the Ministry of Trade. That is not correct.

On the floor of the House the Premier said that the consumption tax on sweet drinks would be levied at the rate of sixteen cents a gallon.

Mr. MILLER: Is that a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This was on Tuesday. On the Wednesday sweet drinks were marketed at the same price in Bridgetown, but from the Thursday the price was increased to all sorts of levels. The manufacturers did not find themselves at the Ministry; I called them there the Saturday morning — not the morning after — and along with some of my colleagues told them precisely at what rate aerated drinks should be sold in the context of the taxation increases.

Mr. MILLER: He did not deny there was a meeting in the Ministry, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like you to hold him down to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will do what is expected of me. I just want to make it clear that while I was listening to the Hon. Leader of the House on this point of order, the hon. member asked if it was a point of order; but I want to tell the hon. member that a point of order cannot always be made in two or three words. It very often takes a little time to develop. The Hon. Leader made his point of order and I will continue to hear the hon. member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: With the greatest respect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I have always done, I pay a great deal of attention to parliamentary procedure. A point of order does not contain argument or additional comment. May I pass on, with your very kind permission? I was saying that in the Ministry there was a meeting where the price of sweet drinks was adjusted, not that he had any authority to do it. You should have been in Canada; did you send back the ticket? Did you get a discount on it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am hearing the voices of two hon. members. When one member is on his feet speaking, I am not supposed to hear the remarks of any other hon. member around the Table. I will hear the hon. junior member for St. George if he wishes to continue.

Mr. MILLER: I thank you, Sir. However, I was saying that a decision was taken to increase sweet drinks, and this is what the public was given to understand in the debate. You cannot argue against this. I am dealing with the truth as given in the Statement in here and published by the printers. Think of the food value in a bottle of beverage as compared with 17 cents for 16 ounces of milk and 12 cents for fourteen ounces. The only food value to be found in a beverage are the proteins contained in the sugar, and you have to pay twelve cents for a ten ounce bottle. Imported full cream milk in cans which you abandon is costing less today than the beverage you are talking about which is produced locally. That is the sort of thing we are expected to condone and expect to say nothing on, but sit by and watch you pass this into law. All I ask you is to revert to the democracy from which this country has developed and grown happily ever since. Another question I do not think you will want to separate us from. Think of what has happened in here. The Government through its Information Department in Government time in a broadcast has allocated to the Official Leader of the Opposition time for a public broadcast. 4.00 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Again, I am speaking to the hon. junior member for St. George. I would have to confine you to the debate before the House. Just at this point, I must warn you not to dilate any more on that.

Mr. MILLER: If you are taking part in a debate, and something cropped up during that debate, I do not know if you can deny me the right to say something on that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That matter was raised already and it has been settled. May be, if you get the records of last Tuesday's meeting, you would see that.

Mr. MILLER: As Your Honour has ruled on this matter again, I do not want it to appear that we are debating this matter against your ruling; but no matter how you want to put it, it is a denial of privilege. You may have your personal reason which you are prepared to honour; but say what you like, we know only too well that this latitude was granted to the Opposition.

What role is this playing in parliamentary democracy? We are having this form of grief. All we have seen today is our fears dashed and it is not related to truth or fact. It is not expected that the Official Leader of the Opposition would oppose the Government, and he has repeatedly said that he wishes this Government to stay in power for one hundred years. We have the position of a parliamentary farce in this House when it comes to the Leader of the Opposition. This is the sort of make-believe. This is where you destroy manhood and you look forward to the massive collection which you have built up and which has taken you to build probably a thousand of years, to see it crash to the walls and slip to dust by this type of dictatorship which we have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this has caused the lives of millions. Think of the millions and the thousands who have died for this type of freedom which we have enjoyed. Now we are seeing it dashed away from us. We must call a halt to this, those of us who have faith in the essential freedoms and who have the lofty ideals of democracy. We must not see it withered away in the form of dictatorship. Here it is that we have just appointed a Boundaries Commission to decide what the next generation would do and we have six members, 25% of Parliament, denied the opportunity of sitting on that Commission.

This is what we expected to see and this is what this country was misled to believe in the last elections. The last Government was accused of everything imaginable. We are now being accused and held responsible for the failure of this Government for almost 18 months in office. We are now accused of their failure. We see the attitude and the glorious dreams and aspirations of those who have perished wither away in the form of dictatorship.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, look and see that we are having our Laws passed in this country without one single word

of opposition. You can see where we are heading. You are seeing this power which corrupts absolutely. You are seeing what you have fought for withered away. The very reason that you stood on platforms and fought is because you want to carry on those things which your forefathers fought for.

Members of the last Government have been accused of everything. Up to today what have we witnessed in here?

We are told in the speech of the Hon. Premier not to increase company tax. He was advised that way, but he did not say who advised him to crush the masses. You can see what is taking place as regards unemployment. When a man is out of a job he loses his self-respect and decency. Sir, you know what happens when a man is without a job. He feels less than a man. Then, you must also think about his queen who is looking to him. You see all the character marks expressed in her face for want, and yet you come in here and pressurize the masses because you know that the people in the shipping trade under your regime are consigning their revenues into monopolies. Sir, imagine the Hon. Premier calling certain persons in his office to discuss taxation. You know the hard-baked businessman is bent on nothing else but profit. Do you think that he would take off one half cent? You are in a position to discuss anything with him because his business is a field of endeavour which you will never understand unless you devote years of your life to it.

But this is not the thing which I am worried about. If I am appealing to the House today, it is for the preservation of the things which we hold most dearly to our hearts. We must be vigilant in our fight. The hon. member reminded us that the presentation of these Budgetary Proposals was done last year in the same way as they were presented this year and that it is done like that in the British Parliament. The Hon. Premier knows that this is so untrue. All budgets of the British House of Commons are discussed in the full House Committee when the Chancellor of the Exchequer presents his financial statement to the Parliament. Now you have reduced this to a two and a half hour debate. Honourable members may probably be talking for three weeks from now when the price of sweet drinks would be taking on a new increase.

4.10 p.m.

Do you know the consequential changes which will take place by increasing your gasoline by five cents per gallon? Whom do you expect to pay this increase? — The middle and the upper? It is a question of the lower. This is something which we will have to continue to struggle and fight against. The sooner we come to the realisation that this is Parliament to which members are elected by popular and free ballot, then and only then will we want to realize the importance of the preservation of the democracy for which we have fought. We cannot sit idly by. We criticise all the other Government authorities, but we must take off our hats and shoes to England who gave us the opportunity to run our own affairs. We want to be grateful; if they gave us anything, including our shackles, they gave us the right to enjoy freedom and not slavery; they gave us this freedom so that we should not revert to any form of enslavement. One would die a hundred times rather than go back to any form of slavery.

You have people who ask: "What are you talking so much about? They have only put on five cents on gasoline and a cent on rice." But that is not the point; we have been elected to this Chamber and it is our duty to represent the people who have sent us here; it is our duty at this juncture to regard the freedom of democracy. If we fail in this matter, then we will reduce ourselves to a lower type of animal. This sort of thing should never happen again; it should never be put on record that this thing happened in 1963. You have denied the representatives of the people a privilege, and I repeat that this matter could have been discussed by a Ways and Means Committee which would be a Committee of the whole House. We cannot now discuss the Budget and ask the Minister to reduce anything by a cent. These increases which have been proposed may not mean anything to the Minister of Finance, but I am submitting that a \$20 export tax on sugar, five dollars for a motor car driver's licence, a half penny increase in the price of gasoline and two dol-

lars on a bicycle tax and he would have gone through the tulips; he would have achieved something. But you have this dwindling idea of great things which mean nothing. What do you think of the next generation? We can look over the Greats where people had to use their own money and pay their taxes so as to erect this building and other buildings for us. Do you understand what is happening? In a period where we had no taxes to contribute, it was the efforts of the Greats who gave us this heritage, and the least we should do by way of appreciation is to protect it and defend it. Let us become aware of our responsibility and protect this little country rather than see what is taking place in British Guiana. We must fail in our duty if we see our country fall to a period which we would forever hate to think of.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to make it abundantly clear at the very beginning that I am fully aware of the fact that a Government has problems in finding revenue in order to carry out its programme. No man could argue that there should not be any taxation imposed at all; no one would be so unrealistic as to expect that we can have new and progressive services without any taxation. No one would expect that the Hon. Premier would have put before us his Budgetary Proposals without some rise in taxation; but Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us examine these new proposals. It does seem to me that the rise in the price of gasoline is definitely too high. None of us could expect that an increase of five cents on a gallon of gasoline would be absorbed by the taxi drivers. Let us take these taxi men into consideration. They have to go from bus stand to bus stand in search of work; they also have to travel between the Deep Water Harbour and the Baggage Warehouse in search of work. I know that they go from Bridgetown to Seawall Airport in search of work, and it seems to me that they cannot absorb this five cents increase in the price of gasoline without passing it on to the public.

When you come to the Indians, they have to carry their clothing across the country to be sold, and they also have to go back on Sundays in order to collect their money. Mr. Deputy Speaker, can the Government assure me that these people will not put as little as five cents on every yard of cloth which they sell across the country? Not only that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but there are carpenters, masons and painters today who are using motor vehicles to transport them from the country to town in order for them to perform their daily tasks. I feel that the Government should have raised this tax on gasoline by one cent and they would have done the trick. I repeat that this five cents increase in the cost of a gallon of gasoline will not be absorbed either by the taxi drivers or by the taxi owners or by the Indians who travel across the country in order to sell their cloth. I am quite sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this increase is going to be absorbed by the masses of the people.

4.20 p.m.

I used to say, Sir, that the last Government took care of the rich and soaked the poor. I can say now with this five cent increase on gasoline that they are soaking the poor to help the rich, because no man who has to spend five cents more on a gallon of gasoline is going to take it. I am sure there are about 500 taxis in the island and the owners cannot pay their taxes next month. I can tell you further, Sir, that some of these taxi owners are on the verge of falling out because competition is too keen. This five cents more on gasoline has created a hardship on people, and I do not know how the Government can get out of this. What is the Government going to tell the bus concessionaires? They are not allowed to raise their bus fares; yet they had to raise the rates of pay of their drivers and conductors. Is this not going to create a further burden and hardship on the school children of today?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, an increase in the price of rice had to come at some time. I think the Premier has made out a fair and reasonable case, although he has to bear in mind that rice today is the staple diet of thousands of Barbadians; but I hope the Government will continue to share part of the cost of this item for a long time. With regard to the increase on the price of soft drinks, that will also create a hardship on the people of this Island. Thousands of bottles

of soft drinks are used by school children day after day. I can assure you, Sir, that neither the hon. senior member for Bridgetown nor the hon. junior member for Bridgetown are going to feed their children on soft drinks. They are going to give them Ovaltine and Milo, as I would give mine. At my business place when people come to ask for help, the first thing they do is to buy a coke or Ju-C. I would ask them why they did not buy a tin of milk and give the children a warm drink, but they would say they could not wait because the children were hungry. This is therefore going to affect the poor and underprivileged children of this country. The sale of soft drinks has been reduced by 75%. The sweet drink factories employ about 250 persons, and I am giving this warning, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if any item on which a tax has been imposed suffers a defeat in sales, it is obvious that your tax has achieved nothing. The people are very cruel about the price of the soft drinks, and it is time for the Government to wake up. The men who work on these soft drink trucks do so on a percentage basis and make probably \$200 a month. What are they going to tell their families? It is easy to go in the village shops and see they are nearly empty, because they have to pay four cents more on a snap of rum and either 10 cents or 12 cents for a cold drink. The people are not in the big clubs or under the tamarind tree; where are they? I understand that children have changed from soft drinks to Tiger Malts because they cost 12 cents. They are also using cane juice. The men working in the street are using drinks from a bucket of water, lime and ice when normally they would have bought a coke or a Ju-C, and that only shows you what a defeat soft drinks are suffering.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand that there is no tax imposed on Tiger Malt.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m., and this brings to an end Private Members' Business for today. We will now revert to Government Business.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 1 as the next Order of the Day, which is a Resolution to approve the Agreement between Hilton Hotels International Incorporated and the Barbados Development Board.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take Order No. 1 as the next Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

RESOLUTION re AGREEMENT BETWEEN HILTON HOTELS INTERNATIONAL INCORPORATED AND THE BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the passing of this Resolution between Hilton Hotels International and the Barbados Government and one of its Institutions, I think it should be appropriate to present some background which led up to the Government's decision to invite Hilton Hotels to operate a hotel here. You will recall, Sir, that in its Manifesto, the Government Party stands committed to an expansion in the tourist trade to the maximum extent possible during its term of office.
4.30 p.m.

As a matter of fact, Sir, the income derived annually from the tourist trade today is \$20 million. When we came into office in December, 1961, it was \$16 million. My conception then was, and it is so now, that by 1965 the income derived from tourism should approximate that derived from sugar. Sugar is now worth to the country \$33 million, and by 1965 I am absolutely sure that the tourist trade would have equalled in value the national income derived from sugar. There is no reason why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with an Island like this, blessed as we are by nature with a beautiful climate all the year round, sunshine and excellent beaches and all the amenities which we have, we should not

- employ these amenities to the maximum extent in the economic interest of the Island.

My first action, Sir, on assuming responsibility for tourism was to invite all the Managers of the local Airways Companies to my office for discussion in order to see whether by reducing transport rates we could attract a greater flow of tourists into the Island. I invited all the Managers of the Airways operating here — Pan American, Trans Canada, B.O.A.C., B.W.I.A. — and they were unanimous in their opinion that the only way in which they could reduce their transport rates was by an increase in the flow of traffic. I am not so sure if I am in complete agreement with whether the increase in the flow of traffic should come first or the lowering of the rates. I feel if you lower your rates, a greater flow of traffic would flow; but they say that they must be a greater flow of traffic before they can reduce their rates. Leading off from there was this endeavour to attract an increase in the flow of traffic to the country and to provide accommodation for them when they came.

In discussing this matter with Mr. John Kinch, who was then Manager of B.O.A.C. and who is now in Jamaica, I think, he and I came to the conclusion that international hotels like Hilton and Sheraton would probably be our best bet to provide for an increase in the flow of traffic and, secondly, to provide the increase in accommodation to accommodate this traffic. Therefore, Sir, in December, 1961, the Hon. Premier and I began negotiations in New York with both Hilton and Sheraton and found them both receptive to the idea of putting a hotel here. Later in the discussions it was decided not to proceed with both agencies together, as neither Hilton nor Sheraton was willing to begin operations at the same time. They both felt that one should come in first, and after it was established and operating for a little time, then the other should come in. Since we had begun talks first with Hilton, we felt we should begin with them.

If you were acquainted with the tourist trade in the neighbouring colony of Puerto Rico, you would come to the conclusion that the Hilton Hotel in Puerto Rico more than any other agency was responsible for the tremendous development in the tourist trade there. Ten years ago there was no Hilton Hotel in Puerto Rico. The Hilton Hotel was established there at a cost of \$12 million (American), or around \$20 million (West Indian). To the end of last year it had earned in ten years \$50 million. (West Indian). In other words, the annual profit is in the vicinity of \$3 million a year, and it is accepted in Puerto Rico by everyone concerned, from the Government back down, that the tremendous industrial growth in Puerto Rico is also to a large extent a consequence of the establishment of the Hilton Hotel.

I have some figures here to demonstrate the growth of the tourist trade in Puerto Rico since the establishment of the Hilton Hotel there. In 1962, something like 425,000 people visited Puerto Rico; in 1952 the number was only 60,000. Whereas only 335,000 people passed through the airport at San Juan in 1952, since the impetus given to tourism by Hilton, over 1 1/2 million people have passed through that airport in 1962. In addition to that, the occupancy of all the hotels in Puerto Rico has increased considerably since the construction of the Hilton in that country. Similarly, in Trinidad I noticed in the *Advocate* some weeks ago a statement to the effect that the Trinidad Hilton was losing money at the rate of \$12,000 a day. Of course, that is manifest nonsense because \$12,000 a day would mean over \$4 million a year and, naturally, no institution like that could sustain an annual operational loss like that. I wrote to the Manager of the Trinidad Hilton and I received the reply that far from the hotel there being operated as a loss, his opinion was that it is a resounding financial success. (A VOICE: That is Trinidad Hilton?) Yes. I said that I saw in the *Advocate* some weeks ago a letter to the effect that the Trinidad Hilton was losing money at the rate of \$12,000 a day and I said that that was manifestly absurd, because no organisation could have sustained a loss like that; so I wrote to the Manager myself and in his reply he told me that far from losing money they were making money. He said that the first few months were the hardest, but they

averaged 55 per cent occupancy during the last few months of 1962. Up to when he wrote me on the 26th April this year, the average occupancy had been 75 per cent, and for 1963 already they have had reservations for 8,000 people and over 1,000 more were to be confirmed. He also said that Port of Spain would never have been able to have the group business they have unless they had an hotel of the calibre of Hilton with its facilities and baggage room, and that for 1963 the Trinidad Hilton would generate a minimum of \$2 1/2 million in trade for the hotel.

4.40 p.m.

It is estimated that for every dollar which a visitor spends in the hotel he spends two or three outside of the hotel; therefore you can readily see what it would mean to Trinidad or what it has already meant to Trinidad to have Hilton operating there. The value of the hotel in Puerto Rico is in implementing the tourist trade and in implementing the formation of investment capital; as a matter of fact, in 1949 before Hilton started, the gross domestic investment in Puerto Rico was \$63 million; last year it was \$243 million. That was largely due to the fact that people who came into the Hilton hotel saw the investment possibilities of the country and began to pour in their money. We have no doubt at all in our minds that with the establishment of a hotel with international connections the operation of Hilton will mean a lot not only to expanding the colony's tourist trade, but it will also attract a number of potential investors to the country who will be attracted by what we have to offer in terms of a labour market, reasonable rates, concessions to investors and so on, and therefore assist in the all-round expansion of the general economy of the country.

The site selected for the erection of the hotel is at Needham's Point. Hon. members are aware that much as we had another site in mind, the negotiations with regard to this other site broke down. Fortunately, I think it was the hon. junior member for St. Michael, the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing who suddenly had the bright idea that Needham's Point would have been an excellent spot. Hon. members of this House as well as members of the Other Place were invited to visit this spot about a week ago, and I think that all of those who were there left convinced in their minds that no better spot could be easily obtainable in the island. The Hilton people themselves are delighted with this spot, and the representatives of Hilton Hotels and their architects think that when a hotel has been constructed on this site, it will have a view which will be regarded as uncontestedly the best site anywhere in the world. You have the sea on three sides; only on the part at the rear of the hotel will there be a view of the landscape, but on three sides — to the right, the left and the front of the hotel — there is nothing but one magnificent vista of the Caribbean. When you erect the hotel on a reasonably high foundation, I agree with the Hilton people that the view of this hotel will capture the imagination and satisfy the taste of the most exacting.

With regard to the Agreement itself, as is well known, the Government has to build the hotel which Hilton will operate as management on fixed terms. Since we have the responsibility for the erection of the hotel and Hilton only gets a share of the profits, it means that we will get the remainder of the profits. I have no doubt at all in my mind that this Barbados Hilton will be the money-spinner, something like Fix-It-Right. (*Laughter*). To go further, the Government in the fulfilment of its programme has to find a lot of money from time to time, and, therefore, there is no reason why it should not itself participate in some of the investment of the country and also share in the profits. We are going to have to find money to finance sooner or later our Social Security Scheme; and if these funds are not to come from taxation, either direct or indirect, it means that the Government must look around for profitable means of investment. Personally, I should not be over-surprised if an enterprise like this contributes immeasurably to the financing of some of our schemes. I should like to think that as soon as a scheme of Social Security begins to operate, the finance will come, if not *in toto*, at least to a very great extent, from the operation of this hotel.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have dealt with the site of the hotel. We have to construct, furnish and equip it, and hon.

members who will, by now, have had a chance to read the Agreement, will be aware of the basic provisions of the Agreement. I am quite prepared to answer any questions which may be asked with regard to the terms and conditions of the lease or as to the basic Agreement itself.

4.50 p.m.

I think, Sir, that generally speaking, hon. members will accept the proposals in principle without much opposition, not only because of the international reputation of Hilton, but because of the success which is attending all its efforts in various European and Asiatic capitals. It is now also going into Africa. As a matter of fact, it has gone into Africa and the Nile-Hilton is already in operation — and even in staid, conservative London, which was felt already to be well equipped with hotel accommodation, only this year Hilton Hotels opened an operation there. The people who were concerned with the establishment of the Hilton Hotel in London were regarded three years ago as complete lunatics when they paid \$5 million for less than an acre of land on which to erect the Hilton Hotel in London. The Hotel itself costs between \$3,500,000 and \$4 million, and all the indications within the last week or two are that it is bound to be a financial success. If hon. members want more information on the projections for the London Hotel in the next twelve months, I am willing to give them. I have got here the estimates of earnings and revenue for the next twelve months.

I do feel, Sir, that generally speaking there is no point in labouring this issue because the idea has already been sold to hon. members. They have or should have by now acquainted themselves with what an operation like this would mean to the Island.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, not today, but in 1950 our Party stood very firmly for tourist development in Barbados. When we looked around and saw that sugar had taken us up almost to the peak of our development in agriculture, with every acre of land under cultivation and the crops through development had reached almost their peak, we realised that with a rising population, if our standards were even to be maintained, we had to look elsewhere for additional revenue-earning enterprises. We thought of industrialisation; and when we looked around we realised that only light industries could be attracted to Barbados; but before that could be done, we would have to find markets for these industries. The Barbados market is small and infinitesimal, and no one would venture to risk their money in any type of industry in Barbados dependent only on the Barbados market. That is why we were so interested in the Federation, because we felt that from a population of 200,000 as it was then, we had collectively between Jamaica back down to Trinidad a population of three million people, and that is why our interest grew in the Federation. While we were waiting for that development, we had to look for something else more immediate, and tourism was the answer. It was the only alternative because of our beautiful beaches, good climate and friendly people, and the beginning of a tourist industry was developed by local hotels. We had coming to this Island every winter over a period of years the same people, and the very best form of advertisement is a satisfactory customer. When our winter visitors went North, not only did they book the same room in the hotel, before they left, but they told their friends that if they wanted to go to a very peaceful and healthy spot they should come to Barbados. Our hotel industry has been developed along those lines. Now we have not changed one iota. We realise that the development of the tourist industry in Barbados can still go a very long way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not nearly to full development here, but I wish to warn the Government of what I know is operating in hotels up to today. We run a resort type of tourist industry. It is unlike Puerto Rico which has been mentioned recently in the Minister's introductory speech. Puerto Rico at one time might have been like us, but quite a different tourist industry has developed there to what we have in Barbados. The intensive season in Barbados extends not beyond six weeks in a year, and every hotel in Barba-

dos during these six weeks is filled to capacity and makes money. They have to make money because the next seven months of the year every hotel in Barbados loses money; they just cannot help themselves. If they close the hotels, they lose money; but if they keep them open, they may not lose as much. That is one of the features of a resort type of tourist industry, and that is what Hilton will have to face up to when he comes to Barbados, though I do hope they will be able to change it somewhat and develop more of a summer trade. The hotels in Barbados today would be happy if they could break even in the summer months of their trade, because it would mean that what they made during the winter season would be profit, and they would not have to allocate so much of that to the losses in the summer. If Hilton's coming here will mean a change, I welcome it, and I hope they will come tomorrow; but I do not see it happening immediately. We are so far away from Puerto Rico that the figures quoted for Puerto Rico cannot apply to Barbados in any manner whatever. Puerto Rico enjoys the trade because they have a very heavily subsidised air fare between New York and Puerto Rico, because of the number of Puerto Ricans living in New York, and because of the traffic between New York and Puerto Rico. It is like a bus service. You do not have to book a flight to Puerto Rico from New York; you just go and buy your ticket and line up, and I believe there are something like ten to fifteen flights to Puerto Rico every day.

5.00 p.m.

Puerto Rico in its Operation Bootstrap has with American money and help been able to establish big industries and they have as a result of that a flow of high executives between Puerto Rico and New York. Executives go there and spend two, three or four days a week and pay high rates, and all the hotels there benefit as a result. Do not let us compare the operation in Barbados with the operation in Puerto Rico. I would say: let us go to Trinidad, and even there it is difficult for us to compare our position with theirs because Trinidad is more industrialized than we are. With the absence of adequate hotels in Trinidad, the Hilton should make money; but I still have seen written that it is not making any money yet, although the Hon. Minister of Trade has said that the Manager of that hotel has written to say that they are operating at a profit.

I wish them well. I hope the Government will be able to establish this hotel, and to the specifications of the Hilton people who are going to get the very best equipment to put in that hotel. I wish to say that they are not going to get it built at a cost of \$3.4 million as is stated in this Agreement; it is going to cost more. A hundred-room hotel with adequate rooms for holding conventions — and air-conditioned at that — would cost more than \$3.4 million (B.W.I.). I understand that the cost of the Government's land of 13 acres is not being taken into account. If Government had to go up to Dover or near any sea-side to purchase land for this purpose, they would have to look for another million dollars or so because land in Barbados, as we all know, is very expensive today. As soon as we want to get land near the beach, it is very expensive and only my honourable friend on my right is in the position to get near the beach.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this venture is going to cost more money than what is envisaged here, and the terms of the Agreement are such that Hilton will be operating in the form of rent annually if they make money. If the Hilton hotel makes one hundred thousand dollars in any one year, they would have to pay the Government in the form of rent \$66,000 odd and they would make \$33,000. That is according to the terms of the Agreement and that is after everything has been provided for them, such as wages, cost of food, services, depreciation, repairs.

I would like the Hon. Minister when he is replying to let us know what provision is going to be made in the form of taxation. I am concerned about this. This hotel is going to be established in the area of the City Council, and it is going to be built at a cost of \$3.4 million. Will this hotel carry a property tax? If I establish one and build a Marine Hotel, my hotel has to operate and pay a property tax, whether it makes money or loses money. If I make money, I will then have to pay a tax of 40 per cent and then I have a

trade tax of 19.5 per cent to pay. That is what private hotels have to face in Barbados. This Hilton Hotel is going to be run for the corporation. It is Government-owned, but run for the corporation, and I would like to know if this hotel would be subject to the same taxation proposals as other private companies would have to pay. This hotel will enjoy the benefit of free import for all of its equipment, and that is something which the other private hotels do not even enjoy. Free import for equipment does not extend to all hotels in Barbados. The owners of the Marine Hotel have not yet enjoyed one penny for any equipment brought into that hotel because they have not added an extra room to that hotel. Of course, if any extensions were to be added to the Marine Hotel, naturally, that benefit would be extended to it. That is not fair to me.

I want the Hon. Minister to make a note with respect to taxation of that hotel and tell us about it when he gets up to reply because, as he has said, if they have to find money for the social services which they have envisaged in the near future, Government will have to invest in revenue-earning ventures whereby the profit from those ventures will go a long way towards the extension of the social services which they envisage.

When the Hon. Minister made that statement he realized that taxation in this island has got to the limit. I will not say that you should not embark on that now, but I would say if he is going to wait for revenue from the operation of the Hilton Hotel for some of the social services he envisages to come into being, we will have to wait for a long time before they are through. He said he has proposals of the London Hilton hotel for the next few years. I wonder if there are such proposals for the Barbados Hilton. What occupancy is envisaged in the first year? What occupancy is envisaged in the following years? If we have that information, even without giving us any figures of the cost, we can work it out ourselves. We who operate hotels would know whether he can operate at a profit with 55 per cent occupancy the first year or not.

5.10 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am glad that the Government is so interested in the tourist trade as to venture this sum of \$3.4 million in a hotel. Like ourselves, they realise that in relation to our future or to the financial development for which we are looking, the best step is by way of the tourist industry. We are repeating what we said some ten years ago; we are just as firmly convinced about it today as we were ten years ago, and so I am not in any way going to discourage the Government from going into it. If this venture does not pay in the first five years of operation, it will eventually catch up. They have to start somewhere. If Hilton feels ready to come into the island now, I say that we should make the start; but I do not wish the Government to fool either themselves or the public that they will make money in the first five years. I would be glad if they could make money during that period, but I do know that in the operation for the first five years there is likely to be a slump; that rights itself wherever Hilton goes. When Hilton went to Trinidad everybody wanted to see the new Hotel and people were prepared to pay; that is how the pattern goes. It is not everyone who wants to stay at a Hilton Hotel; as a matter of fact, many people who are coming to Barbados will run from the Hilton Hotel because they say that it looks like an institution. It suits the businessman to know that a Hilton Hotel will be established in Barbados. A person may not quite know where he is going but he knows, if there is a Hilton Hotel there, what standards he has to expect.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want the Hon. Minister to state in his reply what proposals they intend to make for taxation purposes after the Hilton Hotel has been established and has been handed over to the Development Corporation. I want to know if they will pay a property tax. I see no reason why they should not pay and why they should not pay a trade tax as well if they make money. That should be taking place before you arrive at the net profit. You cannot expect an ordinary householder to contribute to the lighting, to the poor relief; you cannot expect him to contribute to these things and the hotel is not making any contribution, because some of the very employees at the Hilton Hotel may find

themselves in the Almshouse or in some other institution. For that reason I say that they should be on the same basis as any private industry.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, sometimes it is difficult for me to understand the members of the Opposition. In one breath they say something, and in the same breath they contradict what they say. The hon. junior member for Christ Church made his speech for the promotion of the hotel and in the same breath he said that it should not be dealt with in the same way as other things. You cannot expect to have incentives and then quibble about things not being in the same way. I am not pleading any case for the Government because it is stupid to talk about not having incentive legislation. You do not talk about incentive legislation based on something which was operating about 100 years ago. You did not start with a man who built a house in 1898; you started with the new houses which are being erected in 1963. Incentive legislation does cut across what we have been doing before. You read of the plans in Italy and in France, and wherever you start an incentive programme you will find that it cuts across what you have been doing before. You only use a name and you call it a pioneer industry; you give a man a privilege where he is doing something for the first time.

The hon. member is asking a question and he gave the answer. The Minister says that what we have before us is an Agreement, and if you are opposed to it then you should say so. Article 4 of this Agreement deals with the enactment of tax exemption legislation and this is what it says:—

"Government shall do all such acts and things as may be necessary or proper to give any company operating the hotel exemption from the payment of income tax, trade tax or any other taxes based in whole or in part upon profits for a period of at least ten years from the commencement of the lease of the hotel on income received therefrom in the hands of such company and any distribution thereof by way of dividends or otherwise in the hands of its shareholders or debenture holders and the implementation of the provisions of this article shall be a condition precedent to the execution of the lease of the hotel."

Is the hon. member still asking about the taxation proposals? They say that they will exempt them for a period of at least ten years. The property tax is not based on profit. They may tell the Board: "You will exempt them from income tax"; but when you come to property tax — well, you had better allow them to pay property tax. You can be operating a business, you lose money; but still a property tax has to be paid. The rate in respect of property tax is not based on whether you make a profit or not. We are paying a property tax at the Barbados Workers' Union — the tax is nearly five hundred dollars a year — and you do not ask if we make a profit. We put up a nice building, we pay a tax for keeping the place clean and we make it cleaner. 5.20 p.m.

The Municipality gains by people putting up a better building, not that they do more. From putting up a new building in the Municipality, it gets more income tax, though the Municipality does not have to do more. In some instances they do less because of the type of building. For example, some buildings put up garages so as to have the cars off the street. I am not arguing the hon. member's point, because I doubt very much he will get an affirmative answer based on this project. What I did not hear the Minister say is the cost of construction of the hotel. I have been in a few Hilton Hotels in Europe, and I find that wherever the Hiltons are, they are very nice hotels. There is one in Berlin, one in Rotterdam, others in many of the European countries and all over the United States of America, and there is one in Puerto Rico. These Hilton Hotels have been built after the War when there was a lot of devastation in Europe, and the need for Hilton Hotels or good hotels was a different thing. The hon. member talked about the income, but we will go into that a little later.

I would say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a Hilton Hotel will do Barbados good in the sense that it would bring you techniques in hotel management and hotel operation from

which the country would benefit. I believe that from an organisation like this and the contacts which Hilton International possesses, you will get more trade, just as in bringing in Pan American Airways, a big international airline, your traffic increased; so today you will have to have an examination of the tourist business as such. I believe that the tourist trade should be exploited, seeing that Barbados possesses natural resources for tourism — a good climate, sun and good beaches. I am not, however, going to accept these woolly figures of \$20 million.

What I do not want thrown in my eyes is that the Minister has said that when they came into power the tourist trade was \$16 million and now it is \$20 million. By what method did you arrive at this estimated revenue in Barbados? Now I want to explode this myth in Barbados which the hon. junior member for Christ Church has spoken about concerning the economy of the tourist industry. Do not let anybody make you believe that these figures of \$20 million *vis-a-vis* \$30 million in the sugar industry ever begin to relate to the same thing. The income from sugar is net income coming into the country. That is not any vague figure; it is based on the price you receive for the commodity you export. You do not arrive at the income of the sugar industry by adding up any potential or estimated figures like the number of tourists coming into Barbados and multiply them by \$25 and saying that is the income, because if you had to carry these statistical facts further, you would have to ask yourself how it is that \$33 million in the sugar industry can be reflected in such a positive manner that you can see it and feel it, and how it is that you cannot see and feel the \$20 million. By that I mean that if you withdraw \$33 million from the sugar industry, the impact that is going to have on this community would mean a collapse.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this \$20 million that people say tourists spend when they come here is giving a false impression to the economic position, because it is inflating something. If that were so, your spending power would have to reflect a difference with the \$33 million from sugar, and with almost twice the amount you would see where you would be. What they forget is that the hotel business is a very expensive, exporting business too. Lots of the things the hotels use are paid for by exports. They give you the idea that this is \$20 million net we are earning from the tourist trade, which is not so. They have not got down to the statistics to analyse them. If they were getting \$20 million from the tourist trade, what are the hotels doing with the money? (A VOICE: All does not go to the hotels.) \$20 million must be so reflected in the income tax system of this country that you can feel it. How much income tax do the hotels pay? How much do the taxi people and garages pay? From what I heard today these are people struggling, because the hon. senior member for St. Michael said that five cents on a gallon of gasoline will drive these fellows back to the wall. If five cents will drive them back to the wall, they are not in a business which is comparable to the sugar industry, because \$20 million in the tourist industry should reflect greater prosperity among a smaller sector of people. There are 250 plantations in Barbados and nineteen sugar factories. Now compare \$33 million distributed among 250 plantations, 19 sugar factories and 22,000 people, and yet for the short period of the crop, you can see a difference in the Barbados economy. You feel that more than when the tourist trade is in full swing. If the \$20 million had been reflected here this year or last year, everybody would be knocking down the stores in town. I feel that this estimated amount of money is false, and I say that so that the House would get a clear picture of the estimated income from tourism.

I am not saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you should not have a Hilton Hotel; by all means it is one of the things to be expanded. But, in doing so, do not paint the lily too white and make people believe that the lily has no false colours about it. I am not so sanguine about that statement and would not make it myself. What I am prepared to say is that the Hilton people are very knowledgeable people, and they are going to enter business on strict business terms with you. I agree with the hon. junior member for Christ Church that wherever the Hilton Hotels have been

erected you have had a sudden depression among the other hotels. I was in Trinidad night before last, and I could see that the impact of the Hilton Hotel is still on the other hotels. It is true that Trinidad really needed a good hotel; but though that was so, the impact which Hilton has made on Bretton Hall Hotel which is a new one, the Normandie and Queens Park is still felt. Queens Park has an excellent location for a hotel in the heart of the City, but you still find this taking place.
5.30 p.m.

Now, in Barbados, the hotel situation is not much better than in Trinidad, although Barbados is traditionally a hotel country. What the hotels here lack is getting into the swamp of the 20th century and not making themselves up-to-date. Despite their inertia about their own hotel management, I have seen that our Development Board has already made loans to hotel owners in Barbados of considerable portions of money which have not yet been reflected in repayment. What the Hon. Minister has said about that? If you read the last report of the Development Board, you will see stated that there are outstanding loans to hotel owners which have not been repaid and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am somewhat chary about your making the statement about this being a profitable business and yet as regards the loans made to put this business on its feet, you find that the people to whom they were made have not yet been able to repay them.

The Development Board is the Board which is charged with the running of the Hilton Hotel. I would like you to tell me how much money this Development Board has invested in the hotels in Barbados. If you tell me that, I will have some idea and then you will have some idea when you bring in the Hilton as to whether you will have to write off the loans which you have made to other people in business. Let us bear this in mind. The Development Board is going to be a participant in the trade. Let us say that you have two or three million dollars loaned out to people in the trade. The Hilton comes into being with all the things which you get from an operation of the Hilton, with all its newness; you must consider that some of these hotels to which you have loaned the money are going by the board and are going to collapse, and I think the ones which are going to collapse are the ones whose owners owe the Development Board the most money and they would not be able to pay you back your money. They will say that the Hilton has caused them to fold up.

Why have I said that? If the Hon. Minister says in one breath that the tourist business is developing and developing at the rate of nearly 25 per cent, then we should see a better reduction of the loans from the Development Board. If this development was so high, let us ask the reasons why the owners of these hotels cannot repay their loans. So if they cannot repay their loans, what percentage can we see going into the Hilton Hotel to make it pay off its operational expenses and the redemption charge to demortize its debt.

Of course, this was just a statement in passing by the Hon. Minister when he linked this with social security, for what reason I do not know. This is just like linking a jack-ass with an elephant; you are talking about two breeds of animals. You are talking of money and yet talking of work. You are talking of bringing in hotels and also talking of money for your social security needs. Money for your social security needs has to be taken out of your economy. The quicker politicians gear their minds to the fact that social security services are paid for by the people who work, and the people who work do not get the benefits out of social services, it is better for their own thinking. You save money for sickness, but you do not get sick to save money.

Sir, I would like the Hon. Minister to remove from his mind the idea that this hotel will pay for your social security. No \$3 million project like this can run any social security; not even Old Age Pension. Your Old Age Pension Scheme costs you something like one million dollars a year.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I never said that the Hilton Hotel would run a social security scheme. I said that the Government would be wise to participate in investments in the country because

it needs additional money for extending social services; therefore, any profits derived from investments like this would obviate any necessity for seeking any more taxation.

Mr. WALCOTT: I agree with that clarification. I said that it was a serious thing to link the two, and I agree with the Hon. Minister that the Government should participate in the economic activities in the island. That is why I said I did not agree with the Premier in his Budget statement as regards what he says about transport because an efficient transport service is going to call for subsidisation.

Sir, I am going to point out some criticisms about tourism. Barbados hotels are expensive, and they do not give room for tourists with the minimum means. I have been in hotels all over the world and I have found out that the hotels in Barbados, Jamaica and now Antigua can rank nearly with the more expensive hotels in the world. I have been in hotels which provided me with heating, hot and cold water, telephone services, television — and in New York television and radios are commonplace — and with the Hilton people in Los Angeles they give you free television, although of course when I get into my bed I have no use for television or radio because the time I get in is near to morning. However, Sir, they provide all these things at a very low cost, and if you get over paying \$10 a day you will consider that you are paying a lot of money. Sometimes you get breakfast along with that for that money. When you realize the wages paid are higher than what they are here, as well as that the operational costs are higher, then you realize that the *per diem* rates are lower comparatively speaking than what you pay in Barbados. (A VOICE: You are wrong.) I paid \$10 a day at the Sheraton in New York, and New York prices are higher than what you get in Europe. I am talking of \$10 (U.S.).

Sir, far from that, you can get board and lodging at hotels in Europe at a cost cheaper than \$10. The hon. senior member for the City should know that even in London you can go to a hotel right in the heart of London and board at a hotel at a cost of less than £3 a day.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The figures which the hon. member is quoting are figures for a room and 3 meals a day in Barbados. You can rent a room in Barbados for \$7 (B.W.I.).

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not talking of the summer rates because the summer rates here are cheap. We are talking of the figures charged during the tourist season. I am not comparing the out-of-season rates. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am making a statement based on what I have experienced. As a matter of fact, there are some of these tourists who come here on my instigation. I am no agent, but I meet friends who ask me.
5.40 p.m.

What I want to point out is that they complain about our rates. All those persons who are coming in as tourists are not those who are coming for long periods. I have colleagues in the Trade Union Movement who get two weeks' holiday from the United States of America and they come here; but they do not pick out the tourist season to come here. When an American has to pay something like \$250 or \$300 (U.S.) for the passage to come here, as a matter of fact, they can take that three hundred dollars and go to Puerto Rico for two weeks and go back home because they pay \$77 return fare and pay \$10 or \$15 a day. We are getting more of the old tourists, but the bulk of young people who are coming away for two weeks are coming in millions; but we cannot get them because they cannot afford to spend that money.

Looking at the Agreement now, I want to ask the hon. member something. I see a very important Clause here and that is Section 4 which deals with training and pre-opening programmes, advertising and promotion. This is what it says:-

"Hilton agrees to recruit and train the initial staff of the Hotel through such training programmes within and outside the Country, including hotel schools, if any, and other

training techniques as it shall deem advisable. Hilton further agrees to use its best efforts to advertise and promote the business of the Hotel throughout its existing facilities....."

I want to say this to the Hon. Premier: Hilton had some trouble when they went to Trinidad. They had trouble when it came to the question of staff, and they had a big industrial row on staff matters. I hope the Minister will direct these authorities that they are coming to a place where, generally speaking, the industrial climate is good; but some of these Americans come down here with rough-neck methods and believe they can ride roughshod over people and create a bad image in the place to which they come. I hope that the Minister will inform these people that they are coming to an island where the hotel people have an agreement. I hope to get this thing running and I hope what I say will be realised by all elements which are involved in this tourist trade, because unnecessary industrial dislocation is not a good advertisement for tourism. I believe that the island has been benefiting from several things because our climate here is better than in some other places, and Trinidad has been in the unfortunate circumstances of having these repeated dislocations which can be harmful to the tourist trade.

We believe that it would be a good thing to have a big building with a nice convention hall. I agree that we need something like this. I hope that one of these days I will ask the members of the I.C.F.T.U. to come here and hold a convention, ostensibly to advertise our tourist building. If you are venturing in these things, one would think you should be able to see that the Government of Barbados will underwrite some of the things just as if you were to invite a big organization to come here and hold a convention. I would like to see in this convention hall that you have booths for proper simultaneous translation. We want to have interpreters in booths if you are going to have a convention here.

I hope that the Government will pay attention to the question of building a National Assembly so as to emphasise the dignity of our country. This will be our Assembly where we will have big things going on. I just mention this while I am on this point. There is no place for a proper civic reception for the dignity of a country which is growing. We want a hall which would accommodate 2,000 people, and we can appreciate that that is something which is necessary. I am going to ask the Minister this. Presumably this money will be raised by loan funds, but the Hon. Minister has not stated how this hotel project will be financed. We have to pay the full cost. I think that this is a very good venture; but you should not do what the past Government did when it came to the question of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. This Government should think of the consequences which will stem from the erection of a 100-room hotel like Hilton, and ask itself if you think the traffic will increase by that amount so as to make a 100-room Hilton Hotel only an addition to what was there or whether there is any likelihood of there being a recession in the other places.

5.50 p.m.

I personally feel that some of the hotels along the Hastings Route will disappear. Let us analyse this thing and see that the building of this hotel can accommodate what two or three can, and therefore we cannot see them remaining in business. What is going to be the net position because of this disruption? The training of hotel staff is going to mean that some of the best people in the existing hotels are going to Hilton, because we are not going to let them come here and bring in barmen from the United States of America when we have barmen here by telling us that our barmen cannot mix drinks. We have enough of this staff. In this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am thinking in terms of labour.

Now you have in the agreement "subject to the Immigration and Health Requirements, personnel needed to establish and operate the Hotel, to be permitted to enter and work in the Country and in some reasonable way to be remunerated in the currency of the Country of their domicile." I want to be very clear on this. Apart from the few executives you have here, let us be quite clear that we

cannot take up Barbados money and build a hotel to employ American labour; therefore we want to create an atmosphere of training and re-training. Training for this work should be a prerequisite in the establishment of a hotel. These things should start now and not wait until the hotel is ready to open, and then the next week say that the waiters are throwing away all the things. In my view all sorts of workers in Barbados should be exposed to training. I hope the Minister would clear our minds on these things.

Finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not opposed to the idea of the Government entering an incentive like this. What I am worried about is that the Hon. Minister must tell us a lot more. I am not as worried on the financial side about whether the hotel makes money as such, because sometimes you get invisible income coming your way from something. Having a Hilton Hotel may mean everybody coming through Hilton and going to other hotels. I do not think the Hilton itself will be operating on that basis, but from what the Hon. Minister has said about the number of people going to Hilton in London, I would say that London is not a good example to use. It is amazing to see a plane leaving Barbados not quite full, but when you go from New York to London you cannot get a seat. You cannot compare the summer traffic there with ours. They organise these things, and you get people going from the provinces into London and from Europe into London because London is still London, and Barbados is not the sort of place to get that kind of traffic. Barbados is not Barbados in the context of London being London to people travelling. I feel we can raise some money in this since we have had a raise from \$16 million to \$20 million.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have in the Estimates \$700,000 for runway improvement and drainage. Now everybody will be talking about taxation and saying if he was running the Government how he would tax. This is something in which I want to give some other person credit. I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas spoke on the Estimates, but the time is coming when you will have to put a travel tax on people. (A VOICE: That would stop people from coming.) Do you want to tell me that a man would spend \$500 on a ticket to come to Barbados and would not pay \$1.00? You cannot come out of London unless you pay \$2.40. I went to Trinidad day before yesterday, and I had to pay \$1.00. Whom is this going to run? Barbadians would have to pay it too because it is a tax when you are leaving the country. Do you want to tell me that Barbadians must pay to keep up an Airport, must pay to put down a new hotel, and the people who come here to enjoy our beaches would not pay \$1.00? We will have to spend money at Silver Sands and all these places that are covered with bush. If I had the money to spend, I would go to Bathsheba and build a bulwark. If you want to create a tourist climate, you have to do these things. If I were a dictator, I would control those people who are going to desecrate our beaches. Those people who represent fishermen cannot let them believe that they can break sea-egg shells and desecrate the beaches. If you say that this is going to run away tourists, I would say that it has not run them from other parts of the world where they pay. A tourist likes to come in and find a decent airport terminal building into which they can go and have things nice and clean, and that is what they do not mind paying a dollar for. You do not leave London unless you pay a tax for going out of the country. You do not pay it at Idlewild, because maybe they get it out of the people in New York; but if you go to see people off in America, you have to pay ten cents. You do not see anybody off in America for free because you cannot pass through the turnstile. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is not true.) You say it is not true!

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I was just refuting the statement that you pay one dollar to leave London.

Mr. WALCOTT: Not one dollar, but ten shillings. Maybe you never paid it perhaps because Ministers may be exempt from these things. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Other people deny it.) No person can deny it, because when you go to London, you have to pay to come back out. Who else has been to London that would deny it? (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Ask the Clerk.) He would not know. He went to London and

did not know where he was; he did not know what was going on. When you go to London, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and you are leaving even after forty-eight hours, before you go to the Airport, there are two things you have to pay if you are going by taxi. You have to pay ten shillings which include the bus ride and five shillings for the Air Ministry in London. Ask the Minister of Communications to communicate with the people in London and see whether they collect ten shillings. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: He did not pay it.) When the Minister went there, he went as a guest of the British Government and there if they made a charge, he did not know. If you are going to impose taxation on the people of Barbados all the time, and when people come here and enjoy our facilities, and you ask them to share as they are sharing in other communities and it is regarded as something which will run them away, then they will have to be run away. Anybody who has been recently to Trinidad would tell you that you have to pay when you leave Trinidad, because I had to pay a dollar to come out of Piarco. You either pay or you cannot get your ticket.

6.00 p.m.

I want to tell the Hon. Minister that anyone who has been to London knows that you have to pay and the tax is five shillings. I would suggest that one of the things with this tourist business which you can do is this because this is a means of raising revenue. It costs us money and I do not see anything wrong in your raising revenue that way. Estimate the people who go out and then you will have some idea of how much money you can collect.

They are now thinking, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of raising the Trans-Atlantic fare; so I do not understand why when private people raise their fares or do anything there is nothing in question, but when you do something there is always a question. There is a purchase tax on what you pay for your travel ticket in the United States of America. It costs you more there than if you bought it here. You can buy the same stage ticket here at a cheaper cost. Let us say that I am going to Washington. It is cheaper if I buy my air ticket here than if I bought it there. In the United States of America, you pay purchase tax on everything, even on domestic flights. A country gets its money in different ways. When an airline fare goes up, it is going to be more than a dollar. You pay even for excess baggage and you pay for it according to the value of the trip. I have seen people at airports weeping when the airline officials tell them that the excess baggage will cost them \$47. I do not see anything wrong with the Government thinking in terms of your paying a tax on this. This is money which you are getting from us. You are asked to pay \$3.4 million to put up this hotel; therefore let us get back some. They have increased their hotel rates from time to time. An extra dollar cannot prevent a person who is going to London by air travel from going there.

Sir, I hope the Hon. Minister would be able to shed some light on these things. I think it is a good project although I am not as enthusiastic as he is that it is going to make money. I do not expect that large income which he expects from it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not have very much to say on this Resolution because I know nothing of hotels. They are not in my line. One thing is worrying me and that is with respect to sea-bathing at Gravesend when the Hilton Hotel is built there. As I have been made to understand, everybody goes there to bathe and it is a very nice bathing spot. I have also been made to understand that horses, cows and donkeys are taken there and given a bath. I want to know if that would take any effect on the visitors occupying the hotel to be erected there. (A VOICE: Yes.) Well, Sir, if you try to stop that, I want to know if these people would still go there. I would not like to hear the Hon. Minister say that he would have to stop the people who go sea-bathing there. Therefore I ask: would you interfere with our people who at present go sea-bathing there?

There is another point which I want to make. I am wondering what effect the Hilton Hotel is going to take on the local hoteliers. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, large sums of money have been loaned to those

people and it is a sure case that some would have to close their doors as soon as the Hilton goes into operation. What will become of that money which the Development Board loaned to those hoteliers? Those people are going to say: "You lent me money to put my business on a proper footing, then you bring in another business to stop me, and now you are asking me for the money which you loaned me when your business has shut me out." This is money too. The Hon. Minister was very vague in his explanation, and it seems to me that he was holding back something. He was very cautious in his speech. You are going to spend over \$3 million on this project and the Hilton people are only standing by to run the place for you. That is how I take it. I know of one sure case. The Hilton people are not going to lose one cent. If there is any loss, it will be this Government's. This Government would put up the hotel and the Hilton people are going to run it. The Hon. Minister of Trade will be sitting down to partake of the profits from running it. The Hilton people are waiting until this hotel is erected and then they will run it with a handsome profit going to them after all expenses have been taken out.

6.10 p.m.

I am wondering if any of the hoteliers in this island could not take over Hilton after it has been erected and run it; I am wondering if none of them is bright enough or good enough to do that. If it is a question of sustaining a loss, these people will pack up and leave us here with a nice elaborate building and you may have to call upon a hotelier here to try with it, if it is proved to be a failure. It all depends upon the amount of money which is spent in a particular business and it should bring back so much as a profit as to offset the capital. If you have to borrow money in order to erect a building, that money is carrying interest and the loan should be carrying interest as well. The Hon. Minister has not told us anything about the land; he has not told us if it has been valued and if that land will be charged to the business. I am sure that Hilton will have nothing to lose.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not happy about that part of the matter; if they are sharing in the profit they should also be sharing in the capital. They should be investing money because that is the only way you can expect them to take the interest which any one should take. Hilton does not have one penny in this business and they will not care if it is going up or if it is going down. They know that if money is made they will have to get their share of it. In case of failure this Government will have the bag to hold. I do not understand that part of the matter. The hon. junior member for Christ Church knows about the hotel business and he has his doubts about the matter although he is wishing the Government luck. I do not know anything about this business and I have my doubts as to it. The Hon. Minister is counting the chickens before they are hatched because he is saying what he is going to do with the money before he gets it. I hope that he will get it and I hope that he will get more than that; but I am sure that I am not having anything to do with this matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my commonsense tells me that if these people were sure that so much money would be made in Barbados, as the Hon. Minister expects will be made, they would have taken a chance in putting in some of this money. That is how I am taking this matter. Hotels are being run all over the world; and if they were so sure that such a handsome sum of money would be made easily, I do not think they would give us their services and experience without having a share in the capital. I am wondering if the Government is pressing this on them or if they have asked the Government to let them do it. I see that the Hon. Minister is shadow boxing; I have seen from the newspaper that the Hon. Premier has signed an agreement and I knew nothing about it. There it is that an Agreement was signed, and a member of this House I did not know anything about it. We are those who are responsible to the people whose taxes have to go into the erection of this building. I did not know anything about the matter until I saw that the Agreement was signed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hate intensely to be interrupting hon. members, but I must set the hon. member straight. The

Agreement was signed between the Government of Barbados, the Development Board and Hilton Hotels. The Premier signed the Agreement on behalf of the Barbados Government but the Agreement is only valid after it has been given the ratification of the Legislature. That is why the Agreement is here before us now.

Mr. SMITH: I understand the hon. member. I see that the Hon. Premier has committed the Government to this Agreement. The Hon. Premier did so no sooner than he could put his signature there.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. That is what I did not say. Mr. Deputy Speaker, to put it in the simplest language, unless the Legislature ratifies this Agreement, there is no Agreement.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Agreement will be an Agreement because they have the numbers; they have the majority. If they had the minority in here, the Hon. Premier would not have taken that chance before the matter was brought before us. Imagine this Agreement having been circularised, I think it was on Saturday before last, to be discussed last Tuesday. Last Saturday I received an invitation from the Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing asking me to visit this site on Monday and to discuss this matter on Tuesday. I received the invitation at 3.30 o'clock p.m. on that Saturday. This is an Agreement which was signed by the Premier on behalf of the Government; I am a member of this House and you may as well say that one day before this matter was to be discussed, you asked me to visit this site. I believe that if the Hon. Premier were in the Island, I would not have received that invitation; I feel that whoever sent out that invitation sent it to me because the Premier was out of the Island. (Laughter).

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is totally unfair and quite beside the point and it should not be allowed to go on the record unanswered. I have already explained that although this Agreement has been signed by the Hon. Premier on behalf of the Government, it has no force at law until the Legislature has ratified it. It is not only this Chamber which has to ratify the Agreement, but the other Chamber has to ratify it too. As regards the invitation which was sent out by the Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing, I may say that since Thursday before last I gave instructions to have this invitation sent out. The invitation was in respect of Monday before last; I do not know where the invitation for the hon. member went if he only got it on the Saturday.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I received the invitation on the Saturday before. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Not this Saturday.) Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not speaking with the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. This matter was on the Order Paper to be discussed last Tuesday so that it would have to be on the Order Paper last Tuesday. I have always warned this Government to pay the people's representatives in this Chamber a little more courtesy. They are running this Government just as they would run their homes, and it is not fair to the electorate of this country.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member speaks about our being discourteous to him, but we were not supposed to send the hon. member any invitation at all.
6.20 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the site is there and hon. members can go and look at it; it is nothing private. When it comes to the Agreement I will answer him, because I want to know if his Party when in power even signed the Agreement that was tabled.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not have any Government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think we have had enough of that. We have passed the argument as to whether or not invitations were received, and we will now deal with the merits of this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Are you closing down everything, Sir? I cannot hear when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would not behave himself and is shouting across the Table for one "Crawford". Now, Sir, I am a bit unhappy about this Agreement, and I am expecting the Hon. Minister to let us know who made this Agreement relative to the putting up of the funds. Did the Government offer Hilton to put up the money, or did Hilton tell the Government to put up the money and they would give their ideas and lease the building when it was finished? I would like to know how they went about it, because it is not a good business deal. These people know hotel business backward and better than the Hon. Minister of Trade. If they are so sure that so much money is going to be made, why are they keeping out of the sweets? It is not true, in my opinion.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry to think that hon. members can stray so far from the text of the Resolution. I have listened to the debate on this Agreement between the Government and Hilton Hotels, and since the tourist industry is expanding from year to year, we have to find ways and means to accommodate the tourists. I believe that the members of the Government are responsible people and should know what they are doing. What I rose to say, Sir, however, is that I am not against hotels in this country, but I am against the sites that are chosen in the various parts of the Island. There are over 200 odd acres of land lying waste at Heywoods because I understand it is for a hotel site. Now last Thursday, Mr. West called an emergency meeting and asked me as Chairman to release another 90 acres of land, part of Sandy Lane. That amount of land which is under cultivation is what I am against. I do not mind areas that are not under cultivation, but I would ask you, Sir, to get around the Island and see how many sweet potatoes, yams, eddoes and cassava you can obtain; yet your land is lying down for hotel purposes. I am warning this Government not to take up agricultural land and divide it up for residential purposes when it could be planted in foodstuffs. If you build a hundred hotels you cannot feed the poor; you have to depend on the land God has given to us. We should be very glad that our Island is not like Curacao where no rain falls.

There are thousands of people who come to this Island to build, but they can build on the hills or anywhere else; but for Heaven's sake, you should preserve the agricultural land we have here. We will come to a very sad state if we allow foreigners to come here with their cheque books and purchase all our land for hotel purposes, because when people get hungry they cannot eat hotels, stones or the trees they are planting. I also want this Government to provide spots around the East Coast so that the inhabitants of the Island can go and have a decent bathe. We may die and go, but soon this Island is going to be hemmed in by nothing but foreigners, and we will hardly get any place to put our feet. There is no place that has facilities better than Barbados. We can open our mouths and receive the iodine off the sea; we can lie down anywhere and sleep until morning; we can eat the smallest meal and survive, all because of our good climate, and we should not allow people to come from outside and occupy the best parts of the country. I am sure Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the plan I spoke about will be coming before me this week, but I am going to turn it down regardless of who brings it, and I will preach against the Government until Christ comes if they do such things.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had an invitation to go and look at the Hilton Hotel site, but I have to come from far down. I am the least among the apostles and I have to come by bus or walk; but a friend of mine took me there on Saturday. I understand that the Lighthouse will be removed and put on top of the Hilton Hotel. I do not know if that is true. Perhaps you could remove it and set it up on some higher point, rather than put it on the Hilton Hotel. If the Hilton Hotel comes into operation, I wish it every success because I know the help it would be to the economy of the Island when tourists come to the Island, since I know they will be bringing money.
6.30 p.m.

I warn the Government to stick to it and finish it; but do not take the agricultural land and divide it for residential

purposes to strangers. Leave the agricultural land alone. You have other places suitable for residential purposes. I hope this Government would take such warning.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know very much about the pros and the cons of hotel management or whether this venture would be a success or not; but I do know, speaking under correction, that Mr. Conrad Hilton came into this business some time in 1946 and I do not think that he has ever built a hotel of his own. I think all of the hotels which Mr. Conrad Hilton has ever run, the buildings were erected by someone else and then he contracted them. The great feature of this hotel is that you are going to spend \$3.4 million on the erection of it although I believe it will come to more than that.

Now, we have to subsidise the Tourist Board with \$1/2 million yearly, and that amount of money which we are granting to the tourist industry would reach the amount which we anticipate spending on the erection of the Hilton Hotel in a matter of five days. The main point is this. "Time Magazine," "Life," and the "Reader's Digest" have a circulation of over one million magazines a month and these magazines go all over the world. I think it is something like five hundred thousand "Time" magazines which are printed weekly. Hilton advertises in both the "Time" and the "Reader's Digest"; therefore, you will see the amount of savings which we will make in getting Barbados on the map when we put a Hilton here.

It is very well, Sir, for some hon. members to get in here and say that they do not know if we would get any benefits from the Hilton. If they had to travel, they would know the difficulty people from Barbados have in explaining about Barbados to foreigners. When you go to New York you find people who know something about Barbados; but when you go South and you say that you come from Barbados, the people there ask you, "Where is that?" I have had many times the greatest difficulty in explaining about Barbados to people. When I explain something about Trinidad to them, more or less everybody seems to know Trinidad, and in order to give them an inkling of Barbados, I have to explain to them that Barbados is 250 miles north-east of Trinidad.

If Hilton comes to Barbados, a benefit would be the advertisement which we would get from it. As I have said, advertisements in "Time," "Life," and "Reader's Digest" are read by people all over the world. The five hundred thousand dollars which we give to the Tourist Board is to pay for advertisements. It cannot pay for everything. It certainly cannot do as much as what we expect to accrue from a Hilton advertisement.

In answer to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who wanted to know about the bathing beach at Gravesend and whether the Government proposes stopping people from going on that beach to bathe, I just want to say that I have asked that question too; but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should be the last person to ask that question because I remember distinctly when the Barbados Light and Power Company made representation to the Barbados Labour Party which was running the Government then, to erect that thing there on the sea to obstruct people from bathing, and which is used for a cooling system, the hon. member never said one word in objection. People from all over the Island go to the Gravesend beach to bathe, and the Barbados Light and Power Company went down there and put up some sort of cooling system to block the thousands of people who go there from obtaining the facilities.

The Hilton Hotel would be built over the other side where the Government Rifle Range is, and I do not see how people bathing on the above end can really affect the hotel occupants one way or the other.

I hear the hon. junior member for St. Andrew saying something about removing the lighthouse there. As far as I see from the Agreement, the lighthouse would not be removed, but the beacon would be placed on the top of the hotel building. (A VOICE: Are you the Minister?) I know what I am talking about.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me say that I will not have any of that. Address your remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that was not meant for your ears. I am not going to say whether the erection of the hotel would be a good business. What I would say is that as this is a young Government venturing out into industries and looking for capital, we have to take the pros along with the cons; therefore, I think each and everyone of us should give this Resolution to approve this venture our blessing and hope it will be the success which the Government is hoping it will be.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are some 2,000 hotel beds available in Barbados at the moment which provide 730,000 — what I would call — bed nights. During the past year, it was 350,000 bed nights which were occupied, leaving 380,000 bed nights free for the year.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are the statistics which are available for the past year. Is it a wise proposition, therefore, to spend what the Government believes will be \$3.4 million but which will actually be no less than \$5 million, bearing the experience of the Trinidad Hilton in mind? Is it a wise proposition to spend about \$5 million in order just to ensure that for a peak season of about three or four weeks there will be beds available? During the past year and the year before that, there was no question of guests not being able to find accommodation. There were times when certain of the more efficient hotels were filled, but at no time was there a definite shortage of accommodation. What perhaps might well have preceded the introduction of the Hilton Hotel might have been a technical training school of some proportions on the site because we are being asked for workers by various countries and we cannot provide them because they have no skills. As some one has said: "Think of the importance of the human hand; shall it be trained or not?" The training of the human hand is a great deal more important than the provision of accommodation which at the moment is not really needed.

The Hon. Leader of the House has quoted figures to prove that the industrialisation of Puerto Rico was influenced in a large measure by the fact that they had a Hilton Hotel. He seems to have reversed the argument or he has got it rather twisted because it was the industrialisation of Puerto Rico which brought about the hotel; it was not the opposite process. The industrialists in big countries do not say: "There is a lovely hotel in Barbados and therefore let us go down there and establish an industry." If there is industrialisation in the island, then the demand for a hotel would become apparent. The operations of the industrialists in Puerto Rico were not because of or influenced by the fact that there was a Hilton Hotel in Puerto Rico, but the opposite; the experience of Trinidad was also mentioned; but let us face it. Trinidad never had any worthwhile hotels anyhow, and there is nothing wrong with Queen's Park which a good fire could not remedy. When you talk about hotels, therefore, do not let us bring in Trinidad; the point is if it suits Hilton just at this moment to lose some money in a particular area for income tax purposes or whether it will continue to suit Hilton to cut it down every year just as they did in Tobago; or to leave when it no longer suits their purpose to have a losing proposition on their hands.

Hilton Hotels have always been hotels for the commercial traveller; we will find quite a few travelling salesmen going there. The Hilton people will be delighted with a free site and no capital expenditure to be involved. I would join issue now with the Hon. Minister of Trade when he talks about Needham's Point being the most attractive site in the world. I am always suspicious about the use of these superlatives. Why does the Hon. Minister say that it is the most attractive site on the face of the earth? Some people hear about Barbados and the question which they ask is: "What is that?" not "Where is it?" I will concede that bringing a Hilton Hotel to Barbados will improve the standards of some of the hotels which cater to the public. Complaints are made regularly that the towels used in these hotels are too small. I have seen lipstick on some of the

towels at the hotels. The service offered by some of the untrained hotel staff needs to be improved; some rough demands can be improved upon and I have heard rumours to the effect that in certain of the smaller hotels the sheets are changed regularly from bed to bed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are things which can be and should be improved; we must also bear in mind that when a Hilton is established, Hilton always brings staff from all over the world. You may find that they have brought a man from Istanbul to Barbados; his father remains in the United States of America and he contributes nothing to the local Income Tax Department. He will remain here knowing that he will be removed from this hotel to the one in Egypt. These are things which have to be borne in mind. There are those people who believe in Hilton as a hotel resort when some of the other hotels may be more popular with the monstrosities. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you have stayed at one of these Hilton Hotels you have stayed at all the hotels. I have had the pleasure of staying at various hotels; at the Conrad Hotel in Chicago; the Statler Hotel in New York, and in Detroit; the Caribe Hotel in Puerto Rico; the Trinidad Hotel and the Crown Point Hotel at Tobago; I have stayed at these hotels and the prices charged at some of these hotels are fantastic. I remember paying 45 cents for a soda and a dollar for a bowl of ice cubes; and, of course, the only thing to do out of the two dollars was to give the waiter the remainder for a tip. Hilton Hotels are not cheap hotels; as I have already said, they are established for commercial travellers; travel agents profit nothing from the Hilton group because you go to one Hilton and you say: "I would like to get to the Hilton in some other country." They make the bookings for you and no agent is involved. There are many hotels like the Conrad Hotel in Chicago, and people at conventions behave in a conventional manner.
6.50 p.m.

That is the thing we have to watch. We do not have the social — I nearly said sexual — amenities here for conventions. As the immortal bard said, "Men are merriest when they are from home", and the behaviour which a man will employ in somebody's else town he never will attempt in his own; so conventions are sometimes suspect also.

The average hotel occupancy in Barbados over the past year was 42% with a margin in the average hotel of 3% profit. That narrow margin of profit will immediately be destroyed when the Hilton Hotel is set up, because let there be no doubt that Hilton is efficient; they know about the running of hotels. They attract away staff from other existing hotels because they offer them training which is not otherwise available to them, and you will find that hotels which have been established and owe the Development Board and so the taxpayers large sums of money, if they will not pay now, they cannot pay later after the establishment of the Hilton, and that money will be a dead loss to the taxpayers. The other advantage might be that 30% of the tourist dollar is spent on food. Those who have done research in the matter say that 25% goes for lodging, 30% for food, 6% for beverages and 3.6% in ground transportation, that is, taxi and the like. There are benefits to be gained, but it must be carefully considered whether the benefits outweigh the disadvantages, such as the disruption of the chances of existing hotels of ever repaying the loans which they have made, and their consequent obliteration from the landscape of Barbados.

That the Trinidad Hilton is losing money is an open secret. The Manager may have penned a message to the Minister denying this, but what man likes to confess, especially on paper, that a business with which he is connected is losing money? It is an open secret that the Trinidad Hilton is losing money, and everybody in Trinidad tells you that. The Manager has confided that to his friends. To compare the London Hilton with a hotel which going to be built in the back of the Drill Hall is also very ludicrous. London is one of the biggest cities in the world.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member in his omniscient discourse on hotels, nor do I want to interfere with the free

flow of his brief for existing hotels in Barbados, but I merely want at this stage categorically to deny his statement that the Trinidad Hilton is losing money. The Trinidad Hilton is run by the Trinidad Industrial Development Corporation, and the Trinidad Industrial Development Corporation in a letter published in the *Barbados Advocate* says that the Trinidad Hilton has realised a profit from its operation month by month. This was signed by the Manager of the Industrial Development Corporation in Trinidad on 3rd May.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the writer of the letter may have meant was that they were making a trading profit. Figures can be made to prove almost anything. There are three kinds of liars, Mr. Deputy Speaker: liars, darned liars and statisticians. Perhaps the writer of the letter was a statistician. However, as I was saying.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not think I would allow that to pass, because the Trinidad Industrial Development Corporation is a Government Statutory Board and its accounts are properly audited; it has to make a monthly return and an annual return to the Audit Department of Trinidad, and any statements made in public which were not correct would be easily disproven. Therefore these are inaccuracies on the part of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, and his attempt at cheap jibe against the statement by the Industrial Corporation cannot be allowed to have any effect at all. You may as well say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Reports of every Statutory Board in this Island are lies, that the Reports of the Chase-Manhattan Bank are lies; but I prefer to err with the knowledgeable statement published in this local newspaper by the Trinidad Industrial Corporation than to accept the off-the-cuff observations by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. LYNCH: A Balance Sheet has yet to be published by the Organisation on the discussion as to whether or not depreciation has been written off, because nobody knows. They are yet to publish a Balance Sheet, and the figures released may well have been coloured by optimism. When the Balance Sheet comes out, we will have to accept whatever figures are submitted.

As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the executive personnel of the proposed Hilton will not contribute locally to our income tax, because it is unusual for people of that ilk to have their families live in the United States of America, whither they will send them their support, because they do not know when they will be moved from this point of Barbados to Egypt, Istanbul or Mexico. I am not trying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to throw cold water on the project. I am just trying to introduce a few lines of thought which might not have occurred to the Minister. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is very kind of you.) That is what I am here for, and you can have it for what it is worth; but I will not sit down here complacently and accept everything that is said without replying to it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is fruitless to compare expectations of business in a London Hotel with expectations of business in a hotel built in the back of the Drill Hall, and the ludicrousness of any such comparison must be apparent to every one. It is also fruitless to compare the progress of hotel development in a place like Puerto Rico which has doubled, trebled, quadrupled, quintupled and multiplied hundreds of times its industrial expectations within the past ten years.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 7 o'clock p.m., and this sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 o'clock p.m. 7.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will continue on the point of rates charged at hotels. Last year I had the opportunity of visiting the City of Miami where the tourist trade

is very well developed, and I was a guest at large hotels — hotels large enough that the garage was as large as some hotels in the Hastings area. The summer rates were \$5.00 a day for a room at the Columbus Hotel and \$6.00 a day at the Everglades Hotel. That is a double room equipped with television and radio, and the service was most courteous and affable.

Rates such as that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, might well attract to Barbados during the summer or off season an influx of tourists who would like to have a cheap holiday. The same rates are obtainable in other States during the off season; but the mistake made locally is in keeping the rates too high during the summer time. I am making no policy; I am just trying to point out where we err in our hotel administration purely because of the lack of a hotel school, and those are things which might well be remedied. It is not my intention to cast cold water on the project, but only to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister conflicting points of view which otherwise might not be expressed.

The Hilton Hotel may possibly not make money during the first few years of its existence. All this talk of advertising boils down to the Barbados Hilton being put in the list of hotels in letters one-eighth of an inch high in the advertising mediums on "Time" and the "National Geographical" magazines employed by Hilton. There will be no \$2,000 full page advertisement. It will be mentioned in a few lines at the end as the "Barbados Hilton." That is how the Hilton people do their advertising all over the world.

Sir, that there should be an influx of tourists is my dearest wish and the dearest wish of every Barbadian who is sensible to the economy of the Island. It is to be hoped Mr. Deputy Speaker, that one positive contribution which the establishment of this proposed Hilton Hotel can do for Barbados would be to encourage the summer trade so that Mr. Conrad Hilton would be able to say to tourists in the middle income bracket when they come to stay: "Be my Guest" which appears in his booklet in every hotel room.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, both my colleague and the hon. junior member for Christ Church have spoken on this matter and they have outlined the difficulties which might arise; but at no point in their discussion did they attempt to offer any opposition to this lease which has been signed by the Government with the approval of the Legislature of this House relative to the building of this Hilton Hotel. It would be very difficult for me, above all people and for any member of this House to offer any opposition to this project which is expected to be a revenue-earning project.

I recall the days when I sat on the other side of this Table, in the Opposition with the now Hon. Leader of the House, though not of the same political philosophy. We all were agreed on the question of establishing hotels here or developing the tourist industry because it was something which we had to look to in case the weather turned against us, and if we had a dry season during a year we might be faced with what we were faced during the latter part of the last century. We, more especially those members of my Party, in season and out of season pressed for the establishment of the industry, and at last we succeeded in the first place in getting the Government to give five hundred thousand dollars annually to the Tourist Board to advertise the industry.

I recall when we were receiving all the opposition which we then could that the then Governor administering the Colony made a Speech from the Throne in the Other Place and pointed out that it was rather unwise to stick to this one-crop economy and not to prepare for the days we know not which might come.

My colleagues have offered criticisms which must come from this side of the Table; but you cannot say that we are opposed to the project. If the Hon. Premier and the other persons agreed to this, it is obvious if this is a democratic Government that the person in charge or the head of the Party would have to sign the Agreement subject to the approval of the Governor. There is nothing wrong with

that. Only on matters of health would I agree to any project which is not revenue-earning in place of a revenue-earning project. This is a project which I believe the Government is going into with the best of intentions. As the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has pointed out: "Who is Hilton; who is he; where he started; where first did he operate?" That does not matter.

The next question is: can we find people in the West Indies who can put up two or three million dollars to erect this hotel? Members of the Government were alone with us when people immediately after the last war joined together and bought the Blue Waters for the purpose of putting up a hotel there. We had the support of the Hon. Leader of this House in trying to get local capital to put this hotel up. The question arises now: is there sufficient money here or can you induce people here to put money in a hotel of the cost of around \$3 million or \$4 million. With my knowledge of the local set-up, it would be a difficult job to get people to put that money up unless you had money lying down, but nobody with working money would put it up and we do not have the people here who would have that money to put up.

As regards this hotel which the Government is going to build to be operated by Hilton, I have no doubt in my mind that in the not distant future it would bring some benefits to Barbados. I had the pleasure of visiting the U.S.A., and when I was there I discussed with the Directors of airways companies, including the Director of Pan American Airways, the question of bringing people here at a reduced rate. While I do not agree with the Hon. Leader of the House that you should make comparison with Puerto Rico, I too feel that if the fares are reduced we would need more than just resort hotels. Why I say that I do not agree with him comparing Puerto Rico with Barbados is because when it comes to travelling from New York to Puerto Rico it is just like catching a bus, packing your travelling bag and getting a ticket. It is not even your having to get a seat on the plane; you can just lie on the floor overnight.
7.55 p.m.

There are those of us who are fully conscious of what is happening. I make bold to say this; there is absolutely no sense in pinning this country down to spending the sum of \$3 1/4 million or \$4 million in a hotel to develop and help the industry of this country. We are forced to pay \$60 for travelling 200 miles from New York to Puerto Rico and then \$180 for 600 nautical miles to Barbados. If you have any negotiations with Dr. Eric Williams for any such thing, then you are traitors to the people of this country. I believe that Seawell Airport should be an open Airport and I am quite sure that the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works knows exactly what I am speaking about. How are you going to get your hotel to pay or how are you going to get people to come here, having regard to the figures which I have just mentioned? I have had the pleasure of having a talk with the Directors of Pan American Airways just before they instituted the "Pay Later Plan." I think that most of us here have heard about the man who started Pan American, and he must have been a very good man to take Pan American to the point or the stage which it is today. I think of workers today, the people who get about two or three weeks' holiday, who will wait off for about two or three years and save money to go on holiday to some country, and they will come to the West Indies. Barbados has its courteous people, its good climate and its seabathing. A girl who has about \$400 or \$500 American dollars will come down here and after paying her passage she has only about \$150 to spend and she has to get back to her work. I am reminded that the people in America want to have a home, telephone, a motor car, television and a refrigerator; they just pay an insurance premium because they know they have to die and that is all; if you have a passport to Heaven you might be denied something somewhere else.

From the figures which have been offered by my colleague, he has pointed out the number of Canadians whom we are getting here, and they are more than the Americans or the English people. The question of air passages from England to Barbados makes it too expensive for the English people, other than those who are in a very affluent position, to come down to this island on holiday. When the climate in

their country is bad, people like to come down here during the winter season. I feel that, while we do not offer any opposition to this Resolution approving the Agreement between Hilton Hotels International Incorporated and the Barbados Development Board, we must draw this matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister. I will read this Article which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has drawn to the attention of the hon. junior member for Christ Church. It is obvious that we would have had our legal men to look through this Agreement, but this is what it states in Article 4:

"Government shall do all such acts and things as may be necessary or proper to give any company operating the hotel exemption from the payment of income tax, trade tax, or any other taxes based in whole or in part upon profits for a period of at least ten years from the commencement of the lease of the hotel on income received therefrom in the hands of such company and any distribution thereof by way of dividends or otherwise in the hands of its shareholders or debenture holders and the implementation of the provisions of this article shall be a condition precedent to the execution of the lease of the hotel."

It seems to me that if this is just a question of the Government alone, that paragraph could go through; but there are other over-riding statutes in the island beside the Government which are signing this agreement on behalf of the Development Board. But there is a proviso and what the proviso says is this:

"Provided that if any income so exempted from tax becomes liable to and is charged with foreign tax or Commonwealth income tax such income may be assessed to income tax at the rate or rates at which such foreign tax or Commonwealth income tax is charged, but not exceeding the rate of payment under any Act relating to income tax for the time being in force in the Country. This proviso shall not apply to any income in respect of which relief from double taxation cannot be claimed under the provisions of any such Act as aforesaid."

In other words, if we are building the hotel, sixty per cent of the profits will come to us and the remainder will go to Hilton. If income tax is to be charged to Hilton whose Headquarters are in the United States of America — if they did make money and if they are exempted from taxation, this is a very wise thing which you have here. You may ask: "Why are you paying this income tax in the United States of America?" You should pay them here. I commend the Hon. Minister on that provision.
8.05 p.m.

I do not believe they will make money in the first five years, but the site is a very good one. The hon. senior member for St. Peter raised a point which struck me very forcibly, and the hon. member who introduced the Resolution should be able to explain it. You have about ten hotels here not including guesthouses that operate not presently under the system which exempts them from taxation, and with the establishment of Hilton, like with all new things, people will run there. Hilton has a reputation of knowing how to run hotels. A difficulty I see here is that it is going to draw away people, because Hilton is going to train people in hotel work. As a matter of fact, I do not know if you have seen it, but I have read where a chef at some of the Hiltons get a better salary than the United States' Attorney General. The Hilton men are trained all over the world, and men may be moved from one part of Europe to the United States, to Trinidad or to wherever Hilton has hotels operating. Not only for the first ten years will you not make money, but you will drag from the other hotels the profits they have been making.

What I am interested in, Mr. Deputy speaker, is whether Hilton together with our Development Board and with the airlines could develop a summer trade, because it is my considered opinion that if we provide a hotel with so many rooms we would want to develop a summer trade. We are not suffering for trade in the season. As a matter of fact, during the summer season in the United States —

and the Minister of Education who has recently been there knows this — thousands and thousands of people go to Florida because they want to get out of New York. It is frightfully hot in New York during the summer with a temperature of 115 degrees; we get it here at 75 degrees or 85 degrees. I have discussed with several school teachers in the United States what a wonderful thing it would be to come down to the West Indies. They have heard a lot about the West Indies, and many of their grandfathers were born in the West Indies. They cannot come out, however, unless you have some agreement or arrangement, and the Government should stand up firmly on this question of getting people to these parts.

I recall that just as this Government came into office, there were negotiations going on between the Caribbean people who run planes between Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, St. Thomas and St. Croix as to whether they could make trips from there to Barbados. I wonder what has become of that and if anything has been done. I admire Jamaica for one thing and it is this: by virtue of some agreement which existed between Great Britain and the United States and of which Jamaica was a part, something went wrong and the Jet Planes could no longer land people in Jamaica. Courageous as Jamaicans are, they waited a week and then told Britain it did not matter what agreement they had, the situation was starving the people in Jamaica and they should do something about it immediately. In a week's time the Jet planes were flying directly out of New York into Jamaica and to the Bahamas, and Jamaica got its tourist trade back. This must be linked up with the Government's attitude towards letting aeroplanes come into Barbados. It is true you are going to say that you are being serviced by British West Indian Airways, but I want to say here and now that no man who can lead a nation should try to damn other people and say he has no intention of helping them carry their burden. I speak now of Trinidad. Air traffic today is becoming safer, and I do not see how anyone can agree with British West Indian Airways. I hope that somebody will do something with Trans Canada Airlines and let it be known that they cannot only hire fair-skinned people in their offices, when they are selling tickets to people here. I object to any airlines which wants to hire only white people in their service. What I say can be published because I owe them nothing and they cannot do me anything.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want it to be made clear that as far as we are concerned, we are not opposed to the running of this hotel; but when you have put down the hotel with its air-conditioned rooms, its lovely beds and installed television, the only way you can get people here is if it suits their pocket. When a girl in the United States or Canada gets two weeks' holiday, she wants to be down here in four and a half hours and be able to spend her time here and go back after ten or twelve days; but she cannot do it if it is going to cost all this money. I do not agree with the hon. member in what he said about Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico is about 1,600 miles from New York, but it does not cost too much to get there. You might say that Pan American Airways are subsidised by the American Government, but how are you going to reconcile this with B.W.I.A. whom you are no longer subsidising? Go and buy a ticket from Puerto Rico to New York and see what it cost. With all the hotels you put up, unless you have some arrangement and unless you stand up firmly on a matter of this sort, though you have the most beautiful airport and all these things, you will not get the people to fill the hotels.

There is one thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which I would like to say and it is that this hotel, I understand, is going to cost around \$3 1/4 million. I know that it is going to be built on 13 acres of land. Now I must agree with the hon. member who has selected the site in choosing this area instead of buying a site which would take money to build up, because this is going to be very good when you look at the three sides.
8.15 p.m.

When you took into consideration your estimates of \$3.4 million, did you take into consideration the \$1 million which you would have to pay for the 13 acres of land on

which this hotel will be built if you had to buy the land? When you come to show me figures, you have to show me a Balance Sheet of \$3.4 million and you have to show me the cost of the land set down, because if you had to buy the land it would have cost something. As a matter of fact, it did cost something.

Sir, what I would like to know and the Hon. Minister should be able to answer this, is what have you put down for the cost of this thirteen acres of land which is set out in this scheme? Sir, I do not think there is much more I can say on this matter. My colleagues have explained their views on it. I have some other things which I could say, but it would be said that I am defending the Government. This Resolution is subject to our approval and it was signed by those who had authority to sign it. My colleagues have expressed the view, taking into consideration the circumstances surrounding the building of this hotel, that it calls for more than just building a lovely hotel. My contention — and it would be the contention of any reasonable person — is that unless the Government stands up firmly and does what it can for the bringing of passengers here by air travel, our hopes would not be as lovely as they seem. We must bear in mind that it is a question of cost between the U. S. A. and here. It is more than twice the mileage between the U. S. A. and Barbados as between U. S. A. and Puerto Rico and that is the snag which has always worried us. However if we can enjoy the privileges of an air fare between U. S. A. and Barbados which is nearly as good as that between the U. S. A. and Puerto Rico, I am absolutely certain that Puerto Rico, Antigua or no other place in the Caribbean would be like Barbados, especially during the summer season when a tremendous lot of people get their vacation.

I agree with my colleagues; while we approve of the Agreement we must draw to your attention all the various ramifications and the possible set-backs. But we have this compliment to pay you, it is built by us, and it will be built on our land.

There is one other thing which I would like to mention. The Minister, I believe, must have gone very carefully into this matter of erection of this hotel which is to be about two or three storeys high. What I want to ask the Hon. Minister is this: What is going to be the effect of the fumes from the fuel or oil which is burnt by the Electric Company on the hotel? What is being done about that? Can you say whether the fumes are going to be diverted?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: After spending eighteen years' trading, Mr. Deputy Speaker, shuttling between Barbados and Trinidad and two of the Western Hemisphere's most recognised tourist resorts — the Bermudas and the Bahamas Islands — and this Government having decided to build a Hilton Hotel, the first thing which came into my mind was the Development Board loaning money to owners of other hotels. My first expression to the Hon. Premier was: "Are we going to compete against persons to whom the Development Board loaned money." After threshing this out thoroughly with the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Trade, I was one hundred per cent sure that a Hilton in Barbados would not only pay its own way, but would also develop to a great extent the tourist industry which would be very beneficial to the other hotels in the area.

People in Barbados seem to have a fancy that a single hotel with 100 rooms would in some measure affect the tourists and occupants in the other hotels. I am perfectly sure that it would not. From 1945 when I was in the Bahamas, I have watched the hotel industry there improve to such a great extent that more and more hotels and larger hotels are being built, and the only thing that has happened is that it has brought better tourists and a better trade for the smaller hotels.

I am quite in agreement with the hon. member for St. George about our developing a summer tourist industry. Six years ago the Bahamas had no summer tourist industry — none whatsoever. Today there is not such a thing in the Bahamas as a tourist season; it is all the year round. The figures of my cargoes of rum from Trinidad and Barbados six years previous to now would show that the majority of

cargoes were lying between the months of November and April. Today it is quite different. It is an all-the-year-round trade.

Sir, I have no fear but that Hilton Hotel would be beneficial to Barbados and the entire tourist industry. One of the great things in tourism which Barbadians must realize is that tourists on the whole are very restless people, and I am sure that in our developing more marine sports, more sailing and travelling by water from one hotel to another and seeing the different coastlines — that is more soothing to the nerves and more relaxing to those people who travel than what they find on the shores. I am sure that with the Hilton established here and with more cabin cruisers and more marine sports being developed in the island, it would be a great benefit to the Barbadian.

The advertisement by the Hilton people will no doubt increase to a great extent the number of tourists coming to this island. In the Bahamas, in the early stages of the development of the summer season, there was a great difference in the time of the year for tourists going there. In the winter months, you will find that there were older people making their regular winter cruises. After the rates were reduced more than 60 per cent, we found that there was a complete different type of tourist coming in. The working class people who have saved their money just for a holiday, and not the old people who had accumulated their life's savings were coming in; and I am sure if hotel owners in Barbados started to use that system, and as the hon. senior member for St. Peter said, make a reduction in their fares, and with this Government doing everything possible to induce people to come here, I am sure that we would get people coming here in abundance. We have got not only what the Bahamas and Bermuda have got, but we have cooler summers in Barbados than what you get in the Bahamas. 8.25 p.m.

In the Bahamas it is comparatively hot in the summer months as compared with the summer in Barbados. One of the great reasons which must place Bermuda and the Bahamas as holiday resorts is their close proximity to the United States of America. Geographically, they are in a much better position than Barbados, but we are in a good position as far as our climate is concerned. With the choice of Needham's Point for the erection of the Hilton Hotel I would like to state this: I visited the site at Dover on several occasions with other hon. members and the Town and Country Planning Officer. I discovered that not only were we going to be asked to pay for this site for the erection of the hotel, but we were going to pay for sentiment as well. This site at Dover had a lot of sentimental value attached to it, and we would be asked to pay for sentiment equally as well as paying for the site. Knowing Barbados as well as I do, and having my knowledge of hotels and the situation of hotels, I suggested that we should have a look at Needham's Point. The Hon. Premier and the Hon. Leader of the House contacted the Hilton people and I felt very glad to know that they wanted to know where we were hiding that site all along.

I have no doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Hilton Hotel will pay its way. I am perfectly sure that it will do so in a much shorter time than any hon. member of this House will figure on. If cheaper air fares are allowed and more publicity is given to the island of Barbados, I am sure that that will induce more people to come to Barbados, after we have had it placed on the map. As it is today, the amount of money which is spent by the Tourist Board on advertising Barbados is only a very small pittance having regard to what countries like the Bahamas and other places spend in advertising tourism in their territories. With the publicity given to the Hilton group, that would put Barbados on the map, which is an essential thing for the building of tourism.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this has been a very long drawn out debate and many of the things which have been said deserve a reply; but there is so much which has been said which is sheer malicious slime and vicious propaganda against having Hilton here. So much is that so, that to reply to that would be unparliamentary and the speakers should be ashamed of themselves. The best answer which to the apprehensions have been expressed by some

hon. members as to the effect which Hilton will have on existing hotels is to be found in this fact: about a week ago one of the biggest organizations in the United States outside Hilton expressed its willingness to erect a hotel here. No other big organization would dream of coming here with Hilton if there were any fears at all that Hilton would be able to support all the available trade. More than that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the fact that one of the biggest hotels on the West Coast has changed hands about two weeks ago. A big American firm has taken Miramar and two adjacent places for expansion; this firm has taken over Miramar, the first addition of 22 double rooms is to be finished by the end of this year, and the Town and Country Planning Officer is looking into the extension. Do you expect that people who were so closely attached to the hotel industry before, would come in here to make a big hotel investment and expand it if they thought that the addition to the hotels here would mean that many of the existing hotels would not get any business?

At this stage, it now being 8.30 p.m., of the clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 8.30 p.m. of the clock, the time at which business which is opposed comes to an end. I take it that the consideration of this Resolution is business which is unopposed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Well, Sir, no hon. member has expressed any opposition to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Minister continue his remarks.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, those two points which I have mentioned lead to the inescapable conclusion that people who understand what they are doing expect that their position is secure. I am sorry that the hon. junior member for Christ Church is not here because he said that people will flock to the other hotels on the West coast even if the fares were twice as much. As I say, I am sorry that the hon. member is not now in his place. He knows quite well that the fares charged by the Hilton Hotels are far less than what others will charge. I am saying without fear of contradiction that, personally, I hope that the advent of the Hilton Hotel here will have an effect on the rates which are now charged by the existing hotels. 8.35 p.m.

They deserve to be closed down because the rates they were charging for inferior service were higher than the rates charged by the Hilton. You can get a room in the Hilton Hotel in Trinidad for as low as \$11 U.S. a day — and the Hilton Hotel is a new hotel with first-class service and excellent accommodation — when some of the old fire traps in Port-of-Spain were charging \$20 to \$23 U.S. a day. The Government knows there is a fear existing on the part of a number of hoteliers in Barbados that when the Hilton comes with its proper accommodation and first-class service and what not, they will not be able to get away with the murder they are getting away with now. It is an open secret especially in certain parts of the island that the rates charged by hoteliers in many cases do not bear any relation to the service they give. The Hilton will not charge the same rates. I know one hotel on the West Coast which charged a couple \$2,200 U.S. for thirty days; that is over \$3,700 W.I. for a couple for a month. That is what the bill was last year; but the people came back this year and went to a cottage on the St. James coast for \$500 a month. A lot of hoteliers in this country are apprehensive about Hilton, because they know that with Hilton service they cannot go on with these exorbitant rates. It is necessary in this island for the simple reason that unless you bring in an organisation like Hilton, you would not be able to control the rates by charged by some of these hotels, and they will eventually do like the Jamaican hotels and the prices will go completely out of existence and ruin the tourist trade in the island.

Now I do not know where the hon. junior member for Bridgetown got his information, but I have never heard such a mass of inaccuracies let loose on the floor of this House in all my time. I would suggest to him that in future

when he gets this type of information, regardless of how reliable he thinks are the sources, he should check it before he uses it in public. Half of what he said was perfectly untrue. To say, for instance, that in Puerto Rico his experience was that hotel development followed industrial development is so far wrong that I do not know where he could have got that. Industrial development followed on the hotel development. It was only after they got Hilton that people came down, stayed at Hilton, saw the country and what it had to offer and began thinking in terms of industrial development; but he got up here tonight in the most pontifical manner without the slightest shame or bashfulness at all and like Pope Pius said that industrial development came first and then hotel development. I have never heard such tommy-rot in all my life.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order, I think it is generally well known that the garment industry from New York moved into Puerto Rico.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard the gross fixed domestic investment in Puerto Rico from 1947 to 1962. In 1947 it was only \$62. The Hilton in Puerto Rico was erected in 1949 when it was \$116 million. It has increased every year since then; some figures are \$125 million, \$151 million, \$159 million and now it is \$443 million in 1962. In other words, Sir, as everybody in Puerto Rico admits, the Government decided first to invest money in the hotel. As a matter of fact I have a publication here of the Puerto Rico Industrial Development Corporation. In it is stated that "The original Government investment in the Caribe Hilton Hotel, which operated ten years ago, had been dictated by the complete lack of first class hotel facilities. It was regarded as essential for industrial development and as a risky but promising investment in tourism. It was also hoped that its distinctive architectural qualities would stimulate other builders to employ the talented and well trained local architects of which there were a number. The Company undertook responsibility for design, construction, and also provided the furniture and fixtures. The operating contract with Hilton Hotels provided that the Company would receive a small flat rental and two-thirds of the operating profit." It goes on to say that "The project has fulfilled all expectations and even the hopes with which it was launched. It has paid out its original cost and has since been expanded. It continues to be the most consistently high earner among the Company's larger investments and by itself it about meets the company's total operating expenses. Moreover its success stimulated the modernization and expansion of some of the existing hotels and the construction of two smaller hotels of good quality."

Every year since then in Puerto Rico, Sir, they have had to provide at least more hotel accommodation. Last year they provided 2,000 new hotel rooms, all coming from this original investment in the Puerto Rico Hilton. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown was also at his most incorrect best when he was talking, Sir, about the situation with regard to what may be expected in connection with other hotels if we establish Hilton here. What he does not seem to understand is this: we know now that the rate of occupancy throughout the year in hotels is comparatively low; we know there are all these thousands of beds not filled; but we expect that the Hilton will not only give us the trade for the entire island, but fill those beds that are vacant at night now. That has been the experience in Trinidad and Puerto Rico. In Puerto Rico hotels are operating at an occupancy rate of 75%; the occupancy rate of the Trinidad Hilton for the period it has been opened is around 70%, and Trinidad has no beaches or anything. There is not a single hotel in Barbados with an occupancy rate of 30% or 40% for the whole year.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order, I think the Leader of the House has forgotten that I mentioned it was unfair to take that simply because there is Carnival in Trinidad which we do not have in Barbados. To take a sample from the first part of the year when people go there for Carnival is palpably unfair. If, as you say, industrial development followed the establishment of hotels, why is it not the pattern in the Bahamas and Bermuda for hotels to bring industry?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: To begin with, Sir, the hon. member knows that one of the first essential prerequisites to any sort of industrial development is a reasonable, indigenous population or the possibility of a good exporting market. Bermuda has neither one of these things. There is a local population of 40,000 which finds employment in the hotels, a very small home market and very little possibility for export trade, and a high cost of living.
8.45 p.m.

Now I was saying, Sir, that the rate of occupancy from around June last year amounted to 70 per cent. The first six months, that is from July to December, the rate of occupancy was 75%. For January, February and March the average was 65 per cent; therefore the average for the nine months was 70 per cent. Carnival is only in February and Trinidad has no business at all. Before I went to Puerto Rico, the average rate of occupancy was less than 70 per cent, but they have developed a summer trade and people are going over on a part-time basis because they are not going like the old time tourists who have accumulated their life's savings.

As I have said, it has increased from 49,000 to 335,000 tourists last year. As a matter of fact, only about two weeks ago I was talking to a B.W.I.A. official asking him whether or not B.W.I.A. was going to put on a special air fare rate from Puerto Rico to Barbados. Aruba is actually doing it now. They are paying a fare of only \$25 for getting tourists from Puerto Rico to Aruba, and they are sleeping in private houses, eating in restaurants, and going on the beaches. If you go on the beaches of Aruba you will find more tourists than natives. Some go wherever they can get a lodging because the hotels cannot accommodate them.

I am reminded that one of the biggest hotel owners has said that it will be surprising what some of the hoteliers would reflect in profit when the Hilton comes to Barbados. This is what was written in talking of the London Hilton.

In London alone they would spend an anticipated £7 million outside of the hotel. Thousands of these guests would not even be coming alone. You get this preference from the London Hotel International, and from this generation and promotion of increased trade existing hotels in Barbados would benefit. If the hon. senior member for the City can tell us of another way of how we can fill our hotels here in the summer we will gladly listen to him.

The point about fares has already been raised by me. If the hon. member would recall, I said in my opening remarks that the air companies said they could not bring down their fares unless there is this tremendous increase in traffic, and to get increased traffic you must provide the accommodation. I also said that I did not know which should come first, whether the reduced rates of the increased traffic. My opinion was and still is, that if you reduce the rates the traffic would increase. However, every single air company said that before they could reduce their fare structure they would have to see an increased flow of traffic and expansion in the trade. As the hon. member has said, the fare is \$90 return from San Juan to New York, and — there is no question about it — that is the real incentive, in my opinion, of stimulating the increase of traffic between New York and Puerto Rico. Last year we had been given a lower air rate from Toronto to Barbados, the same as that given by Pan American from New York to Barbados with the result that there has been increase in the flow of Canadian traffic. Though it was extended to America, many Americans have found it cheaper to go through Toronto and then come from Toronto to Barbados.

(Mr. MOTTLEY: Put the question. That is all right.)

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am quite prepared to wind up my remarks, but I certainly must reply to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who was so outspoken in his criticism against the Agreement. He said he saw a picture of the Hon. Premier signing the Agreement in the newspaper, when he knew nothing of the Agreement, and it is now being brought in here to be agreed to. Somebody had to sign it. The Hon. Premier himself signed it on behalf of

the Governor-in-Executive Committee but it is of valid unless it is ratified by the Legislature. Now, Sir, in the case of the hon. member's party, when they were in power, they signed Agreements and we have never seen them in here at all. We have never seen the Costain Agreement and we knew not what it was. It has never even been laid on the Table of this House. Nobody knows anything about it or what Agreement they signed.

Immediately after the Hon. Premier signed this Agreement on behalf of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, its text was laid on the floor of this House, and honourable members are told that the Agreement has no validity until such time as both Houses of the Legislature ratify it. That is a complete departure from what obtained in this House of Assembly before.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Question.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not like the antics of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I think it is obnoxious behaviour by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to be continually asking that the question be put when the Hon. Minister of Trade is giving information to the Chamber. I must come to the conclusion that the hon. member knows the information which the Minister is giving. If he knows what the Hon. Minister is giving out, he can leave the Chamber; but do not tell you to put the question. What kind of monkey business is this at all? The Hon. Minister of Trade is explaining to the Chair and the hon. senior member for the City is telling him "Question." The hon. senior member for the City is talking as if he is a member of the Government. The Hon. Minister is giving information and you want him to shut up.
8.55 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think I have much longer to go.

At this stage, it now being 9.00 p.m. of the clock.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot possibly finish my reply in one minute and I am afraid that we will have to take the adjournment at this point.

THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In fixing the Order Paper, Sir, the money Resolution of which I gave notice earlier today will come first and the other matters will take place on the Order Paper *seriatim*.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now after 9 p.m. of the clock and this House now stands adjourned until this day week at 12 o'clock noon.

This House now stands adjourned.
9.00 p.m.