THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961—66

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 7th July, 1964*

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker)*; Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Communications and Works)*; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries)*; Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees)* and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, *(Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development)*.

*Prayers were read.*

*Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.*

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to nform the House that the Minutes of last Tuesday's meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Scheduled Officers) (No. 3) Regulations, 1964.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

*Government Notices were given as follows:—*

Hon. A. Da.C. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of $141,401 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part II Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65, No. 12 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of $5,820 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part 1, Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65 No. 13 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

I want to give notice of my intention to ask for leave to deal with this Resolution in all of its stages at today's meeting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are steps being taken to have this Resolution circulated?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir. Copies of the Resolution are being circulated.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I also beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply to deal with the other Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

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

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a question standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph relative to applications for loans from the Agricultural Credit Bank.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I will not worry to proceed to put this question today as I have been able to get the reply since I prepared the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is also another question standing in the name of the same hon. member relative to Pan American Amusements Limited.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Government the owner of the land on Fairchild Street where the Pan American Amusements Limited, are now operating?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, what are the details of Government's transactions with this firm for the use of the land; and if the land has been leased, why was not the approval of the Legislature sought?

3. Can the Minister say if the proceeds accruing from the games of chance, especially Bingo, are in the aid of charity, as provided under the Gaming Act?

4. Is the Minister making a careful check of the number of people entering this amusement park, of the amount of money collected, and of what money should come to the Government by way of Entertainment Tax and Income Tax?

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

12.25 p.m.

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

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will the Minister state how many Firearms were licensed during the past year?

2. Will the Minister also say how many persons were turned down?

3. Will the Minister also state, if any such persons were refused, and the grounds of refusal?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a Statement I made last week, I beg to move the Suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's Sitting.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 6) ORDER, 1964

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the first Order of the Day.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking the leave of the House to take charge of Item No. 2 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted.

Order No. 2 is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1964.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is entitled a Resolution to approve The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1964", and it deals, as you will see, with the provision of additional staff for several departments and the establishment of a Lands and Surveys Department with the specified permanent staff. This is the first time we are going to have to staff a Department of Lands and Surveys, and you will see from the Addendum to the Resolution that the staff required for the Central Surveys Department which it is proposed to set up is being recruited along the lines recommended by the Director of Surveys and Sub-intendent of Crown Lands in Trinidad. The proposed staff consists of one Chief Surveyor at a salary of $9,120, one Senior Surveyor at a salary of $4,728 – $8,040, four Surveyors at specified salaries, one Senior Draughtsman, two Draughtsmen, one Junior Draughtsman and one Apprentice Draughtsman, one Long Grade Clerk, and one Stenographer.

Set out here, Sir, are the responsibilities of the Staff. The new Department will be responsible solely for all land survey work required by the various Departments of Government, although the Works Department will retain responsibility for their own engineering surveys and layout work. The Department will also record all plans, field notes and survey computations in connection with survey work done in the island both for the Government and for private concerns, and it is expected to exercise effective control over surveying practices and provide safeguards in respect of the accuracy of plans and survey work done locally. Then they will carry out surveys to facilitate the working of a system for the registration of titles to land, and take over the duties of the Director of Public Works in respect of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949.

The setting up of this Department has been approved in principle, and, as hon. members are aware, the Ministry of Lands formerly had no staff of its own to cope with these matters, and the extension of activities in this direction has necessitated the establishment of a complete Department in order to cope with this burden of work. We have brought in competent persons from Trinidad with experience in this kind of work to advise us on the setting up of this Department, because not only did we have no staff to do this kind of work, but we also experienced considerable difficulty in getting responsible people to carry out this work when we wanted it done. It has taken as long as six or seven months in order to be able to get a qualified staff to do work of this sort from outside, and the setting up of this Department at the cost enumerated here will immensely facilitate the execution of work along these lines for the various Government Departments.

12.35 p.m.

The Resolution, Sir, also seeks to regrade the post of Chief Agricultural Officer from $10,200 to $9,480 per annum. In other words, it is a reduction in salary. Consequent on the integration of the Department of Science and Agriculture with the Ministry, the responsibility for the administrative and accounting duties has been transferred from the Chief Agricultural Officer to the Permanent Secretary. It is considered, therefore, that the post of Chief Agricultural Officer should no longer be graded above that of Permanent Secretary.

The third item with which the Resolution seeks to deal is for the creation of a number of new posts for the Mental Hospital. These posts include the post of Senior Clerk, Mental Health Worker, one additional post of Sister, Assistant Storekeeper, one additional post of Ambulance Driver, two additional posts of Cook, two additional posts of Maid, and the salaries are as set out for the respective posts. There is also the abolition of the posts of Nurse, qualified, and the post of Driver, and the bracketing of the grade of Charge Nurse and Charge Male Nurse with that of Sister and Senior Charge Male Nurse. These proposals are designed generally to enable the hospital to cope with the increased volume of work and advances in mental health work.

I am sure that the appropriate Minister will supply any specific information which hon. members may desire in so far as either one of these two Departments are concerned.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION re COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND KNOWN AS "WANSTEAD", AND "ROCK PLEASANT"

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. John: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of two parcels of land known as "Wanstead" and "Rock Pleasant".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to take charge of this Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, this is a matter to which the House has now become accustomed. It has become necessary for the Government to resort to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act in order to acquire land which is needed for public purposes.

Hon. members are fully aware of certain measures which were recently discussed in this Chamber because of

the intention of the Government to acquire what is known as the Cave Hill area for the purpose of housing. The Government has already acquired plantations in the area, and the debates on the necessity to acquire areas and parcels of land in this district will still be fresh in the minds of hon. members.

The land with which this Resolution deals is also part and parcel of this Cave Hill area, so to speak, which has been earmarked for public purposes, and you will see from the Addendum to the Resolution that preliminary efforts at negotiation with the owner of the land described in the Schedules have failed to reach what the Government considers to be a reasonable price for these two parcels of land. Having been unsuccessful, the Government is invoking Section 5 of the 1944 Act with the approval of the Legislature for the compulsory acquisition of these two parcels of land in order to acquire an indefeasible title to these two parcels of land.

One of the two areas is "Wanstead" (formerly a plantation of that name) containing by estimation 78 acres, 2 roods or thereabouts, and the other parcel of land is known as "Rock Pleasant" containing by estimation 24 acres, 3 roods or thereabouts. With the acquisition of these two areas, the Government shall have over 103 acres, and I do not think it is necessary for me to again repeat that we are invoking the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act for the same reason as I have said before, since the Government and the owners of these two parcels of land cannot reach agreement to the price; and since the Government regards that these two areas are essential in order to provide the total acreage required to carry out the public scheme, there is no alternative than to invoke the provisions of the Act in order to get the price mutually settled satisfactorily, and to give the Government an indefeasible title to the land.

The total area which the Government has in mind for housing in this area is 600 acres. This is necessary for what we regard as comprehensive development of the area. We have already invoked the machinery for acquiring "The Mount", and now similar machinery is sought in order to allow the Government to acquire this 100 acres which is part of the full complement of 600 acres, as the House is aware, for residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural purposes and public services including a site for the University College of Arts.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Addendum to the Resolution reads as follows:-

"Efforts at negotiation with the owner of the land described in the Schedules hereto for the purchase of the areas in question have failed to produce any agreement on price."
12.45 p.m.

Now, Sir, this is a case which was hanging fire before this present Government came into power. This land was "frozen" many years ago. The owner of this land was quite willing to negotiate for the sale of and to arrange and decide on a price for, this land, but it could not be done until the master plan was ready. That is what the owner of this land was told long, long ago. The owner was finding it difficult and, in my opinion, he is still finding it very difficult, to get ends to meet relative to the financial position of this place because the interest on the money for the land was very high. The owner of this land could not develop or sell it, and one thing he had to do was to find the interest to be paid on this land.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said that the owner of this land could not sell it. May I ask the Hon. member why he could not sell it? The Government is not aware of that.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, unless of course it is a rhetorical question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well, Sir, if the owner of this land could not sell, the Government was in no was responsible for his inability to do so.

Mr. SMITH: Believe me, Sir, when you have a Minister who is in charge of a Resolution of this sort and he has the right of reply, I do not think it is fair to the hon. member who is speaking that the same Minister should be getting up and trying to play tactics or be interrupting the hon. member who is speaking when the Minister has the chance to reply.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, my only reason for rising at this point is this ....

Mr. SPEAKER: It may be a point of elucidation. What I would suggest to the Hon. Minister is that if the hon. member is saying something with which he is not in agreement, the hon. member may be asked to give way, as is so often done in the House of Commons. We have only a point of order or a point of elucidation.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: My only reason for interrupting the hon. member is this: the hon. member appears to be going on to develop an argument on the premise that the owner could not sell that land.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is at liberty to develop an argument on the wrong premise, but the Hon. Minister can deal with that in reply.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I was only trying to save the time of the House.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister is saying that he wants to save the time of the House. Well, Sir, he can go outside if he wants to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that the hon. member will cooperate in saving the time of the House.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member is anticipating what I am going to say. I am not accusing the present Government of anything; I am only referring to the last Government; but the hon. member knows what this is leading up to. The hon. member can keep a muzzle in the red box but he will not be able to use it on me. I am only trying to explain that the Addendum to this Resolution has been wrongly worded. It is wrong because the owner of this land many years ago was told that he could not sell it, that he could not develop it or do anything with it. The owner of the land did not waste any time...

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I must rise again on a point of elucidation, if Your Honour so likes.

Mr. SPEAKER: To elucidate something in the hon. member's speech which required elucidation.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The owner of the land has not been told at any time by any Government that he could not sell this land

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you know better than I do. The hon. member is saying that the owner was not told anything like this, and I am saying that he was told. It is a question of my word against the hon. member's word.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is not my word against the hon. member's word; it is what the Government discloses as against the imagination of the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is referring to the written record.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is the only record which we keep, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I mean of the previous Government.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, as soon as the owner of this land was told what to expect, he went to the last Government and was quite willing to throw in the sponge, but he was told that nothing could be done as yet, until the master plan was ready. That was the excuse for holding up this man and I think that that is so up to to-day. This gentleman was not allowed to lease a small piece of the land so as to offset this interest on the land; he was told that he could not do anything. Imagine that a man has to pay his interest on that place - and I may say that there are a lot of us who have things which are not really ours. There are those who can buy a thousand-dollar article with a penny, notwithstanding the interest. The interest on this land was in the vicinity of $1,000 a month. Imagine that for all of these years this land was "frozen", the owner could not even sell a piece of it. He was offered a handsome piece of money for a small piece of this land and then he would have been able practically to pay off for the land or to reduce the rate of interest on it to a very small amount.

12.55 p.m.

Now that was happening over five or six years ago. Now interest at $1,000 a month for twelve months amounts to $12,000 a year, and imagine what the present Government is coming in now to offer this man. This man was in very grave difficulties. It is not a question that he is a land shark wanting to get the most for his property. He wants to save himself from Glendairy and save the little place in which he is living. At one time it was promised that he would be allowed to sell a small piece, but he was later turned down. If I did not know about this before, I would have to go by what the Minister says; but this is a case where a man is throwing away money on his property. It is a case, as I always say, of the big stick in the corner, and that man, being afraid of that stick, has to abide by the consequences. I wonder if this present Government knows that this man is losing money monthly on account of this land being frozen, because I believe if they knew, they would do everything possible to help him out of his predicament. If they are telling us in this Resolution that efforts at negotiation with the owner of the land described in the Schedules hereto for the purchase of the areas in question have failed to produce any agreement on price, who could believe that? A man losing $12,000 a year would not stick out for a price when he has to be paying out interest. I do not believe he is so foolish; so this Addendum is wrong or misleading. I believe the man is quite willing to sell. It is true that I have not seen him for a long time, because I think it is over this same thing that we might have parted company; but we are told in the Addendum that he failed to agree.

Mr. Speaker, I never heard so much about land acquisition until two or three weeks ago in this House. Every Tuesday now there is a Resolution for land acquisition, which makes me believe that the present Government is not willing to negotiate with the owners, but because the law is there, they are applying it. I am sure that if they had seen this man, this Resolution would not be before us today, because I believe that the man is even up to now willing and ready to negotiate. He is making hard up Hindsbury Road to Glendairy, because with the interest he has to pay, and with the Government coming in with the big stick, he is not going to have anything at all. When a man has interest to pay, he does not sleep. Even if you are in bed too sick to drink water, the interest is still awaiting you, and in this case the same thing is happening with the owner of this land, and it is not fair to him. I can afford to speak on this because I know something about it, and this Addendum is wrong and is misleading this Honourable Chamber. I will appeal to the Hon. Minister.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not hear what the hon. member said. Did he say that somebody was misleading the Chamber? Would he be kind enough to repeat that?

Mr. SMITH: If he is a schoolmaster, I am not one of his pupils.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member say that someone was misleading the Chamber?

Mr. SMITH: I did not say "someone"; but if he did not hear, what is he worrying about?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there are very few things which the hon. member seems to know, but Your Honour will inform him that you cannot accuse anybody in this Chamber of misleading the Chamber, and therefore, Sir, when I heard the word "misleading", I rose to enquire in what context it was used. The hon. member did say something about misleading the Chamber. If he said so, I object strongly to the accusation that a Government document brought here with a full sense of responsibility is misleading the Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I will carry on. I was making the point at the time that interest does not let a man sleep, and the owner of this land is heading fast for Glendairy because he is losing money at this present rate since he cannot develop the land nor can he sell it, but he has to look for interest to pay. The Addendum states that negotiations with the owner have failed, but in his present financial position, he would be only too glad to get out of trouble, and the longer it stays, the worse it will be for him when he receives this money. You are a lawyer, Sir, and not a solicitor, but I believe the people will be able to levy on the same land and get it. If he owes the previous owner $1.00 and he gets 50 cents for the land, that 50 cents will remain and I feel you should be able to levy on the land. If it is so, it is a matter for the owner not to open his eyes and make a good situation of this thing. That is the only way out of it.

Mr. Speaker, when this Addendum says that negotiations had failed, I believe that the man would be only too glad, speaking from past experience, to try to get out of this, because he did everything with the last Government to get out of it. He asked them to allow him to sell a piece of the land so as to reduce the interest, but he was refused. The Hon. Minister, I know, will say that he has a right to appeal to the Supreme Court if he is not satisfied when it goes to arbitration, but this Court does not open for nothing.

1.05 p.m.

I dare suppose he would have to look for as much money to open the Court and pay the expenses as what Government is going to pay him for the land. There he is up against a mill-wall. He has a right to appeal, but what can happen? Will any of the Hon. Ministers on that side feel happy to know that they would be responsible for taking advantage of this man? Do you think it would be fair to him? It could not be fair to him. It is all right to say that he can appeal and that he has the right of appeal, but what is he going to pay the cost of opening the Court and so on? After paying out so much for nothing, then, when the time comes, he gets nothing. He would have to look for money to get nothing. However it ends, he will get nothing. Should it be a losing game for him when he did not offer anybody anything for sale? The Government put the big stick in the corner and said that he cannot sell. He cannot sell, he cannot develop, he cannot do anything. It is not fair and I sincerely hope that the Hon. Minister and his Government would look into the matter and make sure that this man would not lose a penny.

Sir, I am not in favour of your buying land at a greater price than what it is worth, and if it is not worth a dollar, it is not worth a dollar; but if it is worth $10.00, do not say that it is only worth $3.00. I feel that they would be doing this man an injustice, and even their consciences would tell them that they are wrong if they should hold this thing over this man's head and do not make sure that he does not lose. They should take into consideration, if what I have said is true, the interest which this man had to pay on this particular property for the past five or six years, and that should be added on to the value of the land. That should be taken into account because it is no fault of this man that he has had to pay this amount for so long a time because if he was working the place or if he had sold it, he would not be in that financial predicament. For that reason, I am not going to vote for this Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I should like to say that I have listened very carefully to most of what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had to say on this matter. I should like, first of all, to assure him that neither I nor any member of the Government, so far as I know, would be a party to buying land from anybody in this Island except under the most reasonable

considerations. The fact that we had to resort to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act in order to secure this 100 odd acres of land is due basically to the fact that negotiations between the Government and the owner had not reached a successful conclusion. The hon. member can rest assured that the machinery set in motion by the Land Acquisition Act is such that Mr. Morris would have in his power to have all the facts, all the circumstances which are relevant to the case put forward on his behalf; and more important still he would have an arbitrator appointed by himself, an arbitrator of his own choosing, charged with the responsibility of valuing the land at a price which is reasonable to him. The provisions of the Land Acquisition Act are very fair. Both sides of the dispute are allowed to provide their own arbitrator, and then if these two fail to reach agreement, there is still the last resort of the Supreme Court finally to abrogate the issue.

Having said that, I would just like to say that there are a certain number of statements alleged by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph which are in dispute. He claims that in fixing the price at which the land should be acquired, proper attention should be paid to the interest paid by the owner on the mortgage of the property which he said was $1,000 per month. This seems to be impossible. The sum of $1,000 a month interest at a rate of 6 per cent would involve an investment of $200,000. We know what the land costs. Of course, it is the owner's private business and I do not care to disclose in this public Chamber what Mr. Morris paid for the estate, but I will say that it is far below $200,000. If Mr. Morris paid interest at the rate of $1,000 per month, it is not in respect of this property, because this property is by no stretch, either of fact or imagination, one which can be valued at a cost of $200,000. However, Sir, when the time comes for Mr. Morris' arbitrator to put forward a price which he feels is reasonable, the actual amount of interest as paid since the period when he came into possession of the land until when the price is agreed to, would no doubt be taken into consideration.

Sir, I want to repeat that the owner did everything when the last Government was in power to get out of it. However, we are not dealing with the last Government. All we know is what we find in the files. I do know that it is actually incorrect to state that because the land was "frozen", it could not be sold. What may have happened was that people who may have bought it, having been told that it was earmarked for certain Government purposes, would be chary about acquiring it; but that is an entirely different matter. To claim that the land was "frozen" with the specification that it could not be sold because of any action of the Government was pure fiction. There is absolutely no legal procedure to prevent somebody from buying; but what may have happened is that if the prospective person knew that if he bought he may not get permission from the Town and Country Planning Officer to develop the land, he may not buy it. In this specific case, there was nothing to prevent people from buying this land, but it might be possible or likely that no purchaser would have been given development approval for this land since the Government had said that it wanted the complete area of 600 acres for a comprehensive development programme in that particular area.
1.15 p.m.

I know myself that this matter has been under consideration for some time. It is highly possible that the owner of this land might feel aggrieved, as the last speaker has implied, as a result of the manner in which he was treated by the last Government. That may be so; I do not know. What I know is that we are not surprised to hear the hon. member say that this owner has done everything to get out of this matter. It seems to me that all the grievanc s and the disputes seem to have stemmed from the attitude of the last Government. I do not think it is fair to imply that in any way at all we have taken any step unreasonably to deprive the owner of his land for development purposes or to make him dispose of it at a price which he or anybody else feels to be inequitable. I have no doubt at all in my mind that the sooner the Land Acquisition Act is utilised to settle the disputes in a manner which is satisfactory both to the owner of this land and the purchaser which, in this case, is the Government, the better it will be for everybody concerned. I hope that the owner of the land will be satisfied at the end of the transaction and that the fears which have been expressed by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will be proved to have been completely groundless. If the owner expects to receive any exorbitant or unreasonably high price for this land, then his hopes will be dashed to the ground. We are prepared to act in the best interests of the community and you will find that the owner of this land has been reasonably treated.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need say anything further except to say, from my recollection of the matter, that from the manner in which this Government treated the owner of this land, it is more than passing strange to hear a member of the last Government attack us on this force. I seem to recollect that Mr. Morris actually built a gasolene station and a self-service store not far from this area, and he was refused permission by the last Government to utilise them. With regard to the actual freezing of land which may be regarded for public purposes, I seem to have the recollection that the last Government brought in a specific Resolution to curb the sale of land in this area in order that the owner could not exploit the position when the Government thought that they might have to use this land. I have not got the facts before me now, but that is my recollection. That has only occurred to me in passing from the allegations which have been made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, but Mr. Morris himself would be the first person to say that this Government would give him permission to use the gasolene station which the last Government refused to allow him to use. When we made that amendment to the legislation under which the Town and Country Planning Department operates, that amendment allowed for appeals against the decisions of the Town and Country Planning Officer. By resorting to this legislation, Mr. Morris was able to appeal against the decision of the Town and Country Planning Officer.

I would say that, far from harming Mr. Morris, we are his friends and we are in complete opposition to the attempts which were made by the last Government to give him an unfair deal. Mr. Speaker, I have been reminded that it is not one, but two service stations which Mr. Morris could not operate and which we allowed him to operate. This Government has not tried to treat the owner of this land unfairly, as the last Government has tried to do, but we are concerned about treating him as equitably as the demands of the public commitments would allow.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". ( A MEMBER: No.) I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, let the division be taken.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, what do I understand in this matter? Is a division now being called for? When the question was put, nobody answered to the "Noes."

Mr. SPEAKER: When the division was called for, there were certain voices which answered "Aye" and one answered "No". That voice was the voice of the hon. junior member for St. George. I declared that the "Ayes" have it and the division was called for.

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir. When the hon. member began shouting in his manner which reduces Parliament to something like a market....

Mr. SPEAKER: There was no shouting after I heard the one voice "No" and I declared that the "Ayes" have it.

*A division was taken as follows:-*

*AYES:* Mr. BATSON, HON'BLES W. A. CRAWFORD, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, Messrs. BOXILL, WEEKES, CORBIN, LOWE, YEARWOOD, WALCOTT, COWARD, GODDARD and MOTTLEY - 14.

*NOES:* Messrs. HOLDER, SMTH and MILLER - 3.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, fourteen honourable members voting "Aye", and three hon. members voting "No". I now declare that the "Ayes" have it.

This Resolution has therefore been duly passed.
1.25 p.m.

THE LIQUOR LICENCES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Liquor Licences Act, 1957.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking its leave to take charge of Order No. 4 standing in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted, and according the Hon. Leader of the House may proceed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Liquor Licences Act 1957, 1957 - 40 in order to provide for the appointed members of Licensing Authorities to be *ex officio* Justices of the Peace. It is a simple matter and merely resorts to this method of increasing the number of Justices of the Peace to be at the service of the public. It is felt, Sir, that by virtue of their office, the members of the Liquor Licensing Committee would be in an excellent position to serve the public in this capacity, and without prejudice to the appointment of additional Justices of the Peace and the legislation of other members of other Committees in this manner, that a beginning might be made in this instance by awarding commissions of Justices of the Peace to members of the Liquor Licencing Authorities.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask a question on this. The hon. member said in introducing the Bill that the members should be *ex officio* Justices of the Peace. Does that mean while they hold office as members of the Liquor Licensing Authority, or even when they resign or are not re-appointed? I just want him to clarify that position.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member desirous of contributing to this debate before the Hon. Leader of the House replies?

It would seem not. The Hon. Leader of the House may now exercise his right.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is fully aware of the manner in which this system operates, because from his experience as a member of Local Government, he knows what happens to the Chairman or Mayor or Deputy Chairman or Deputy Mayor of Local Government Councils when they are in office and when they are out of office. The Act, as this one specifically does, says *ex officio*, which means only during their tenure of office. As a matter of fact, Sir, if you refer to the Bill itself, you will see from Clause 2 section 3 that it is only during the tenure of office.

Mr. SPEAKER: That shows how valuable it is for hon. members to do their homework.

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

*On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.*

*Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.*

*On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On the separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

THE GAMBLING (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1964

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Bill standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking its leave to take charge of Order No. 6 standing in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted. The next Order now is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Gambling Act, 1917.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill, as will be seen from the Objects and Reasons, is to increase from three to five the number of Licensing Committee and to provide that three members of the Committee should form a quorum.
1.35 p.m.

The background of the Bill, Section 3 of the 1960 Act, establishes that a Licensing Committee consisting of the Commissioner of Police and two other public officers be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee which in due course on 14th March, 1961, appointed as members of the Committee, the Assistant Commissioner of Inland Revenue and the Senior Inspector of Primary Schools.

Now, Sir, the Commissioner of Police in 1961, after the Committee had been set up, expressed the view that one of the members should have legal training and he repeatedly pressed for this, and in order to do so the Government has now decided that the size of the Committee should be enlarged and the proposal is to make it a Committee of five members and to appoint as additional members the Director of Public Prosecutions who is a legally trained man and the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Home Affairs. Therefore, you will have the question which the Commissioner of Police was asking as regards the inclusion of a legally trained man carried out, the legally trained man being the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Now, Sir, having increased the number from three to five, we also have to increase the number of members to form a quorum. As hon. members will see, the number to form a quorum now stands at three.

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

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

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

*On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.*

*Clause 1 was called and passed.*

*Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:-*

2. Section 2A of the Gambling Act, 1917 is amended in the following respects –

(a) by the substitution of the word "four" for the word "two" in subsection (1); and

(b) by the substitution of the word "Three" for the word "Two" in subsection (2).

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the amendment to this Act is for the purpose of giving people the right to run games, primarily where a substantial portion of the profits goes to charity, and as it has to do so closely with the Police Department, I am wondering if it would not be wise to have the Commissioner of Police as the Chairman of this Committee. I say so for this reason: if three members now form the quorum and the Commissioner of Police is made the Chairman, it may be completely unknown what are the findings of the Committee. I am wondering if the Hon. Leader of the House would make any suggestions on that. You have said that the Commissioner of Police suggested that you should have a legally trained man on the Committee. As you know, Sir, all these applications go to the Commissioner of Police; therefore, I am wondering if you should not stipulate that he should be the Chairman. My experience is that where a person desires to hold a bazaar, a fair or bingo and the like, you apply to the Commissioner of Police and he informs this Committee; therefore, if three will now form a quorum, it might be possible that he might not be there at all.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, the hon. member has not given any reason why, in his opinion, he feels that the Commissioner of Police should be the Chairman. The point at issue is that the Commissioner of Police felt in the course of his duties when the Committee sits it would be advantageous, obviously to have someone on that Committee with legal knowledge, and after making presentation to the Government, we made provision to satisfy him on this score by making the Act extensive enough and to give him among the new members one who is a legally trained man.

I, personally, do not see any reason why the Commissioner of Police should be specifically named the Chairman of the Committee. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown may quite see the reason why, and he should give us the benefit of his knowledge or his decision why the Commissioner of Police should be Chairman and I would be pleased to hear him on this.

*The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.*

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

*On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

## THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) BILL

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

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

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

1.45 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of this Order which stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John, and if there be no objection, leave will be granted. *(After a pause).* There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member to take charge of this Order.

The next Order of the Day is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple matter. It merely involves the making of a correct reference in the definition of the "Letters Patent" in order to give it a more accurate – or rather to give it an accurate appellation. Hon. members will see from the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill that this Bill seeks to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949, 1949-9, in order to provide for a correct reference in the definition of "Letters Patent" in section 2 thereof to the title of the Order-in-Council by virtue of which the Letters Patent relating to the Government of the Island were recently consolidated. The definition of "Letters Patent" was inserted by the Interpretation (Amendment) Act, 1964, 1964 - 18, and the reference in the definition to "The Barbados Order in Council, 1964" reflects the title of the Order-in-Council when in draft form and before its final approval.

Hon. members will realise that the consolidation of the Letters Patent relating to the Government of this island is still fresh in their minds. What we are doing in this amendment is to amend the reference in the definition of "Letters Patent" by the substitution of a reference to the Barbados (Letters Patent Consolidation) Order, 1964." I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

*Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.*

*The three Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.*

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

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

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

*The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER reported accordingly.*

*On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the request which I made earlier today, the Government is seeking approval to deal with the Resolution for the sum of $5,820. We have suspended the Standing Orders so that we have not got to suspend the sitting at 2 p.m. of the clock. However, Sir, today is supposed to be the day when the Opposition is to reply to the Premier's Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals and arrangements have been made for the broadcast of the hon. members' speeches to be made at 2.45 p.m. of the clock. That means that we have to be here at 2.45 p.m. of the clock. We would like to dispose of this Resolution at this stage rather than have to break in on the debate in relation to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. I therefore beg to move that Committee of Supply be now taken.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction of the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with this Resolution for $5,820 of which notice was given earlier today.

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

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

*Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.*

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1964-65 NO. 13

BARBADOS REGIMENT

ITEM 41 (NEW) CADET EXCHANGE SCHEME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of $5,820 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1964-65, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. Hon. members have had this Resolution before them for about an hour or two and I am sure that they have perused and digested it. In connection with this Cadet Exchange Scheme, when the Hon. Premier was in Canada last year he discussed this question of the Exchange of visits between Barbadian and Canadian Cadets. As a result of the discussions which he held with the Canadian Authorities in Ottawa, provisional arrangements were made for an exchange of visits between Barbadian and Canadian Cadets between July and August of this year.

1.55 p.m.

The exchange will take place over the five week period 19th July to 24th August when we expect a contingent of 20 Canadian Cadets and Officers to visit Barbados, and a contingent of 20 from Barbados will visit Canada from 21st July to 22nd August. Now both the Canadian Cadets and the Barbadian Cadets will be transported free of cost by the Royal Canadian Airforce, but the host country in each case is expected to be responsible for its guests except for pay and allowances; so when we send our boys to Canada, we give them an allowance, and at the same time that they are there, we have to be hosts here to the Canadian contingent. The Barbados Regiment will be in camp simultaneously at Fortesque, St. Philip, and we have also been requested by Jamaica and St. Lucia to entertain a number of their Cadets here at the same time; so that the Resolution, Sir, seeks to make financial provision for pay and allowances for our cadets involved, and in addition to that, Sir, for food, cooking arrangements, laundry and entertainment for the Cadet visitors who will be here in camp with our boys.

I think, Sir, that hon. members will appreciate the advantages to be derived from an interchange of military students at this level, and it must redound in some way to our credit to have 20 of our boys go to Canada to be entertained and instructed at the same time by their Canadian counterparts. The impact of the trip must be of great value to them. At the same time we regard this scheme as a sort of advertisement for the island, and we welcome the suggestion that Barbados will be host to an equal number of Canadian Cadets at the same time as a number of fellow West Indians from Jamaica and St. Lucia. Were it not for the fact that time is pressing, of course there are quite a few things I would like to say; but since on this occasion we have to expedite our activities because we have to spend some time on the Budget Proposals, I think what I have said is enough to justify the support of hon. members to the Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

*On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRWAFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On the separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.*

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 2.40 o'clock p.m.

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

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

2.05 p.m.

*On resumption,*

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member. Let the Bell be rung.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the suspension of the Rules of the House, will the Hon. Leader of the House intimate to me what business he wants to do now?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, in accordance with what took place last week, it is the proposal of the Government

that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should now take the opportunity to reply to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals by the Hon. Premier.

I, therefore, beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

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

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

## RESOLUTION *re* FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Mr. SPEAKER: Under Private Members' Business, the first Order of the Day is in the name of the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown: To move the passing of a Resolution re the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the Fiscal year 1964-65.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is my duty, as Leader of the Opposition, to reply to the Hon. and Learned Minister of Finance, the Hon. Premier, re the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the Fiscal Year 1964-65, and parliamentarily speaking, this is the only method by which the reply can be made because this is the third occasion that the Hon. Premier has changed the custom of our replying to the Budget and has made his Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals by way of a Statement. By so doing, it gives no other method of replying but by moving the passing of this Resolution; hence, I have done so.

The brevity of the Hon. and Learned Premier's speech is an indication that we might not have to indulge in any long-winded speeches. However, if during my discussion I happen to render to Caesar what is Caesar's and it happens to offend some people I would like to say, as I said when I accepted the position of Leader of the Opposition, that it is my duty to say that when something is right, it is right and when it is wrong, it is wrong. Neither would I have to make any apologies, Sir, if I have to offer any criticism to anything which I find in this Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals which my Party would look upon as distasteful and would do otherwise had they occupied the position which the Hon. Premier occupies.

As I have said, Sir, this Statement as made last week by the Hon. Premier was really a prepared Statement and a Statement to which one can readily see was given a tremendous lot of study. I may say here, at the outset, Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, that it is part of the Opposition's duty to have a Shadow Cabinet: and although we are small in number, I shall leave it to the hon. junior member for Christ Church to deal with the economic and financial part of the Hon. Premier's speech and I shall during my discussion deal with the other portion.

There are certain suggestions which I feel the Hon. Premier omitted from his speech, and to which I shall draw to the notice of the House and hon. members; but before I do that, I think we all would agree that the situation in Barbados during the past year was due exactly to what the Hon. Premier said, that is, the fortuitous circumstances relative to our crop which he readily said predominantly was the sugar which we exported. We have been very fortunate, not only last year, but over a period of years.

As to the spending of the surplus or revenue over expenditure, I propose to leave that to the hon. junior member for Christ Church to deal with. I note that the Hon. Premier mentioned the savings deposited in the Government and other Savings Departments or Banks of this Colony. And I think that most of us will agree that this is not merely because of the fortuitous circumstances of our crop, but I believe from my experience it is due to the customs and habits of Barbadians who have emigrated abroad in remitting money to their relatives in this country. If that is so, then I say that it is a very good and healthy sign, and it does show that any money which we invest in this direction in helping people to go abroad is money well spent.

Again, Sir, in passing I must mention that I have noted very carefully the Hon. Premier's expression on the increase of the tourist trade. Those of us, on this side of the Table, in my Party, cannot help but think that had it been that our suggestions of encouraging this industry were accepted many years before this Government came into power, what would have been the position and how much more fortunate we would have been in this our second and next largest industry.

I also notice the comparison which the Hon. Premier made with last year. It is very gratifying to find at least that much is being done by way of encouraging this industry in Barbados without at the same time causing any inflation or of it being to the detriment of the inhabitants of this country.

2.50 p.m.

There was a certain amount of fear that if we had encouraged tourism along the lines adopted by Bermuda and the Bahamas, it would have worked out very much to the detriment of the inhabitants of this country. We have always felt that this matter should be controlled, and we were very happy to find that the Government had been keeping some control on this matter. In this Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals, what we have is the question of local securities, and we must, at this point, offer our congratulations to the Premier and Minister of Finance on the proposals or suggestions as to what has been set out here in this Statement. It has been stated here that steps are being taken to develop the local stock exchanges and money markets in this area and the Government welcomes these steps. Possibly to some people that means very little, but a financial expert and those who at least pay some attention to securities in these days must appreciate that this will mean a tremendous lot to Barbadians.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that in this Financial Statement and the Budgetary Proposals, the Hon. Premier has made mention of the Marketing Corporation. I said at the beginning that if I offend those who feel it is my duty as Leader of the Opposition merely to rant and tear and indulge in personalities and say things were wrong which were right, I make no apology for that; but when I find that something is wrong, I will say it is wrong. In dealing with the Marketing Corporation this is what is stated in this Financial Statement and these Budgetary Proposals:-

"The Marketing Corporation is providing a vital and long absent link in the chain of distribution of foodstuffs."

I have this criticism to make. Later in this document the Hon. Premier mentions the difficulty of the small shopkeeper; he mentions the position with regard to the development of supermarkets. I say, Sir, that you cannot any more turn back these supermarkets than you can turn back the hands of time or the hands of the clock. On this question of the Marketing Corporation, one wonders whether the Government of this country has been studying carefully what is happening with this Corporation. We feel that there is no point in exporting yams to find that in the months of January or February yams cannot be bought in Barbados, but that potatoes which are imported must be bought at a very high price. It has not yet been proved to us that there is any extra vitamin or nutriment in potatoes as against yams and we think it is folly and stupidity to export yams. If the Marketing Corporation must enter into competition not with supermarkets, but with only other retailers in the sale of potatoes, onions and other commodities which are imported, then it must be obvious that somewhere down the line you are bound to find that there are those people in private businesses, and not people who can pay their income tax — you are bound to find a falling off in business with what I consider to be unfair competition and what the general public must expect from unfair competition. On the other hand, Sir, we do not condemn the Marketing Corporation at all. We feel that there is room for it and there has been room for it for sometime.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture must appreciate the fact that, from his experience, if there is one useful job which this Marketing Corporation can do, it is for the fishing industry of this country.

If I may quote from one woman in the fishing industry, she said a few weeks ago in the Press that difficulty was found that after coming in with a large catch of fish in this island, it was found that the Marketing Corporation was closed at 10 o'clock and the fish had to be dumped back into the sea. I have witnessed that myself. We did think that after the Marketing Corporation came into being, especially when the plight of the fishermen was such that they might get in about 11 o'clock or sometimes long after that hour with their fish, we did think that at this Corporation something should be done. We feel that the fishermen should benefit from the running of this Corporation. I have been making comparisons between fish and salmon, and I find that having regard to the price of flying fish, housewives in this country find that it is infinitely cheaper to use a dozen flying fish at the price of $1.20 than to use a small tin of salmon at a price of 80¢ of 90¢ or in some cases at a price of $1.00. I am speaking now in relation to a family.
3.00 p.m.

I feel, Sir, that much is desired and much can be done for improvement at this Department. I sound it as a note, although I saw recently the suggestion that people were exporting yams contrary to law and regulations, but I understand that these regulations only came in from a specific date. We have never in Barbados at any time had any glut of yams. You might have had people who held back yams and refused to sell because they were waiting to get a better price. However, I fell that under the circumstances much can be done.

As to the island's public debt of $40 million, we have no apprehension as such, Mr. Speaker, because no country in the world that thinks of progress or development can do so without borrowing money. Thinking in terms of our industry and our people, the sum of $40 million seems small. We do not think that money should be borrowed and spent recklessly, but we do feel that if we are to have development, the amount of $40 million is one which unborn and future generations must assist in repaying, because they will eventually enjoy the benefit which is derived from such loans as any Government in power might make.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier next dealt with the Hospital and in his own words said that the new Hospital is a building of which all Barbadians can be proud. Looking at it from an architectural point of view, Mr. Speaker, all Barbadians might be proud: but I think, as has been said in here before by others beside myself, you can be proud of something, but you need not be sensibly proud. As far as we are concerned, a new and up-to-date Hospital is a necessity; but considering all things in Barbados, we feel that at that price it is somewhat extravagant. We do not object to having a modern and up-to-date Hospital, but in passing let me say that we might be proud of a Hospital building. Either in yesterday's or today's newspaper it was said that they would be appointing a Hospital Board shortly, but it must be borne in mind that a building never makes a hospital; It is your staff that makes a hospital, and while we might be justifiably proud of a hospital as a building, we do feel that it is extravagant to build one at that cost for Barbados, just as we felt it was extravagant to build a school for $450,000 to hold 450 children. I have read recently where a school was built for $250,000 to hold 450 children. That seems wiser and something to be proud of. We have no doubt in our minds that the running of the Hospital will entail great expenditure, but we do believe that some things must be gone into very carefully.

Let us take the present Hospital as we know it. The brevity of the Premier's Statement has given us little opportunity to make a marathon speech, but I would say that I would have preferred to see the money spent on the 650 bed Hospital for 240,000 people go into two hospitals, however beautiful the outer structure may be. There are modern facilities at this institution, and there are, I understand, some facilities which are so modern that they are not actually used in some hospitals in the big countries, and I believe I have entered some of the most modern hospitals that can be seen. For the benefit of the Minister of Social Services, I would say that all is not well. It is not the building that makes a hospital, but the staff. The people in this country are somewhat worried as to the method of employment of what must be considered the backbone of your hospital, and that is the nursing staff. Something is radically wrong and must be put right. According to the Premier, the new Hospital is something of which we can be proud. At the Hospital you have oxygen pipes in the rooms which you do not have in some hospitals in big countries; but if you do not have a humane and considerate staff, then you only have a building. What is wrong, Mr. Speaker, that so many people are being turned away from the Hospital. Young girls leaving school are being turned away and told that they cannot enter the nursing profession; but their parents can scrape money together or even borrow it from the Government and send them to the United Kingdom, where in three or four years they qualify; and they swear vengeance against Barbados for the way they were treated. The Minister of Social Services knows that exactly what I am saying is an absolute state of fact, and if he has any doubt about it, I will show him someone on the staff now who merely went to St. Leonards School, who was told that she did not reach the standard, but who went to the United Kingdom and returned as an S.R.N. and Midwife.
3.10 p.m.

I shall not dwell on this any longer; I shall only remind the Hon. Minister that it takes more than a building to make a hospital.

The Hon. Premier in his Financial Statement brought in something which we already have agreed to and that is to put a tax on the racing business in Barbados.

Now, Sir, how can we do otherwise than say we agree to that? We were really thinking that a tax at this stage would have been brought in on other methods of gambling, but we know that the Hon. Premier has made mention that it is the intention of Government to bring in taxation on other means of gambling.

Dealing with the Civil Service, the Hon. Premier mentioned that there would be amendments to the Leave Regulations on which Leave Passages are granted. Sir, you will recall, more than anyone else, the part which my Party played when sitting on the other side of the Table in those days when we were taken to task for getting Leave Passages Regulations applied to some of our local Civil Servants, when it was felt then that only Civil Servants from abroad should enjoy them. We shall wait and see how these Regulations will affect the economy of this country. But what we know is this. At the present, we are somewhat worried, not only of the Leave Regulations, but we are worried of the advantage taken of the loans which Civil Servants in the Service can get interest free and how it is being used. I shall not dwell upon that at this stage because it is my intention to go very carefully into it; but we do hope that whenever these amendments are brought about, they will not cost the country anything more.

Now, Sir, as far as we are concerned, the Hon. Premier also mention the idea of drawing taxation and land valuation and of bringing out experts to Barbados. I kept frightfully quiet when the Land Acquisition Resolutions were brought before the Chamber, and for many reasons, I feel that I should not enter such debates: but when it comes to your bringing an expert out here, such as Mr. Copes and so on, we shall wait and see what they will say, I would just throw it out to the Government that this Land Acquisition Act has two sides to it. If the Government sets up valuers in this country to value land and fix the price, I should only like to draw to their attention that there are several thousand peasant owners in this country who use land purely for agricultural purposes and who obtain loans and mortgages and credit on their agricultural property; and although it might be said that it does not matter if it is $4,000 or $3,000 per acre for the price of the land, you must bear in mind that the price fixed is what the Government says is the price and, therefore, your land is devalued, so to speak. I, therefore, throw this out to hon. members. It might not affect those of us who live in these areas as such because there are very few peasant proprietors; but outside of these areas, — and I am thinking of persons living in St. George, St. Thomas and Christ Church — where a person pays in

accordance with the prevailing price of land, and then to be confronted after that with this price, I know of people who borrow on the collateral of land. I speak with a tremendous lot of experience on this matter. I know that land varies from area to area, I know it varies according to production, and I know it also varies according to the soil.

Sir, there are some things in which I agree one hundred per cent with the Government; therefore, when we come to this measure of taxation, we shall wait and see.

Now, Mr. Speaker, dealing with this question of population and what the Hon. Premier has said and his statement which sections of the Press immediately transfigured, we have always made it clear — and we always knew and we always have said — that a small percentage of the people in this country pay all the taxation. I have heard some people argue that there seems to be no distribution of the wealth, but what has happened in the United States happens in other countries. A similar thing happens here. That is why we have always been reminding the Government that income tax, as long as it is levied in the correct way, is about the fairest tax which you have because you only pay if you make money. We do not feel that income tax should be levied in such a way that you take away everything from the people and you do not allow them to have reserves. If they do not have reserves to invest and to employ people, it is better that you should not have it.

I say that it was most courageous in the Hon. Premier to repeat what he said that 95 per cent of the income tax collected was paid by 1200 people and the balance by the others. I think that I have read somewhere that the Hon. Premier's speech was far from a vote-catching speech and I must agree with those sentiments. Believe me, if it were a vote-catching speech, I am a master on that and, therefore, when he said that it was not a vote-catching speech, we, our Party, in consultation, say that a man who has the courage to repeat what is a statement of fact and repeat it on the floor of the House, is a man who should be commended.

3.20 p.m.

Now, Sir, there are one or two other things which I would like to mention. The Hon. Premier has imposed his taxation on these gambling places. I have drawn the attention of the Government over and over again to the insurance companies operating in this island; I refer to the foreign insurance companies. Some of these insurance companies are paying income tax nowhere at all. We, on this side, have been drawing to the Premier's attention that even in the Leeward and Windward Islands, these people have had to pay taxation of some sort, and we were surprised that in this Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals no attempt has been made to put any taxation on these companies. Of course, there are companies of high and great reputation but, on the other hand, there are other companies who are very questionable, who are carrying on business here — especially those companies whose representatives go into the fields and take money from people and make these people all sorts of promises. I have a number of these proposals in my office now; these people promise things if and when anything happens and they tell all sorts of fancy stories. I am saying, Sir, that we want protection in this respect. Just as we passed an Act for the protection of some workers, we should have an Act passed so as to give protection in respect of the people who contribute to these companies. We were very surprised to see that nothing has been done in this respect. We notice in this Financial Statement and these Budgetary Proposals that relief has been given to Civil Servants and they have certainly benefited a great deal.

As far as the removal of the Radio Licence is concerned, that is one of the proposals in this Financial Statement. Other proposals are: The imposition of a Licence Fee of $12,000 on premises where racing services are carried on; the refund of arrears of contributions paid by Civil Servants to Widows' and Orphans' Pension Scheme; the increase of the rates of Travelling Allowance now paid to public officers; the reduction of the period of the implementation of equal pay for female Teachers from five years to four years; the initial allowances to the deductable in respect of expenditure incurred before the day on which trade or business commences; the allowance on industrial buildings to be increased from 2% to 3% and the licence fee payable for television receivers to be $10 per annum. As to these allowances and increases in the rates of Travelling which are paid to public officers, we would consider that within the last few years there has been an increase in the amount of travelling and now there is an increase in the price of gas, and therefore we can have no grouse about this increase in the rates of travelling.

Our public debt is now over $40 million, and I would like to know if there is included in that, this sum of $2 million which we guaranteed to the Transport Board. We have television, we have transport, we have C.B.C. and if we are guarantors for them, I think we should know if included in this $40 million is this $2 million which we have guaranteed to the Transport Board. For a long time we have waited for the Report on the Transport Board. We thought that, as this expense is being borne partly by the Government by way of a subsidy, we would have had something in this Financial Statement and these Budgetary Proposals about the Transport Board, its liabilities etc. On the other hand, Sir, looking through the entire Statement we know what is the project to be carried out at Cave Hill. We thought we would have heard whether this would be under the Government, C.D.C. private banks or the like. This is the question about a mortgage insurance scheme, and these are very high-grounding words; will the Government be taking this on, will the Colonial Development Corporation be taking it on or what? The Banks have decided to carry Trustee Departments and we are wondering if that is an indication that the investments of persons locally or abroad will come under this scheme. We wholeheartedly support this mortgage insurance scheme in the feeling that it will afford housing to the middle-class persons who are able to go in for it. However, Sir, in respect of any financial statement we would like to know how this scheme is to be run and we are entitled to know that.

We have also had an important Report which has apparently been pigeonholed, because we have heard nothing about it. Nothing has been heard about that Report in this Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. If you admit, as the Hon. Premier has admitted and all of us will agree, that sugar is the back-bone and mainstay of this country, and a Commission has been appointed to report on the sugar industry of this colony, then, surely, in this Financial Statement and these Budgetary Proposals we should have been told something about this very important matter. I sincerely hope that this Report will not be long in coming.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of Education, it was not my intention to deal with that question, but my colleague, the hon. junior member for the City is absent and therefore it falls to my lot to say something about this matter. I thought that some mention would have been made in this document as to the steps the Government would be taking to control the Private Secondary Schools and possibly in the matter of closing down some of them. In controlling these schools I am also referring to assisting them. If you were to consider the Secondary and Private Schools in Jamaica, you will find that the great majority started as Private Schools. In assisting these schools, the Hon. Minister of Education has met that by giving a palliative to some thousands of parents. If you were to take the number of children in the Private Secondary Schools as against the number of children in the Government-Aided Schools, you will find that the number in the Private Secondary Schools is some four times as many as those in the Government-aided Schools. The Hon. Minister of Education has offered to refund the fees to those parents of children who have been successful in their examinations to enter these schools.

3.30 p.m.

In the absence of any Statement from the Government, I should like to ask the Minister of Education why children outside of Government-aided schools, through no fault of their own, because there is no room in the schools, should

be denied what other children are given. Mr. Speaker, would it surprise you that in Government-aided schools children are allowed to take examinations and fail and the Government pays for them again and they will fail again? Something must be wrong. The State is as much responsible for the education of the child as it is responsible for its health, and therefore this is one matter which no Government can afford to shelve. If there are schools which you feel you should close down, you should do so, because I would never advocate that the Government should help any school in any way unless the Government had a substantial measure of control over the schools which are private schools, and to which people have got to send their children, because there is no room in other schools.

I have been in politics for a long time, Mr. Speaker, and although much is being done for education, I am one of those people who believe in starting at the bottom. I would prefer to see more people in this country being able to read and write than to have a few with Bachelor of Arts Degrees; and when I recall that a Socialist Party campaigning throughout the island made promises of compulsory education, I am at a loss to understand why it has not been started at least in one area of the island. I am a great respecter of education, but I would prefer to see the majority learn the three Rs than the minority hold B.Sc. and B.A. degrees. I have seen young people walk into a Bank with some cheque or draft or Order and when asked to sign their names, they ask the Teller to sign it. When one cannot read or write, it is a most pathetic thing. I do not believe that compulsory education can be brought about by a stroke of the pen. I feel it would have to be done in a way in which it would cause the least burden to parents. I know that all these things must be taken into consideration, and to reflect upon them is no criticism of the House.

I speak now of the Hilton Hotel. I view the erection of that hotel with some misgiving. I would hate to think that a vote of mine would prevent us from developing a hotel that would enhance the island and bring people to Barbados. However I view it with misgiving, and I expect to hear more from the Hon. Premier on this matter.

Finally, Sir, as I said, there is no room for a marathon speech in this matter, but generally speaking, the Statement of Revenue and the Budgetary Proposals, Mr. Speaker, are matters which we can look upon as coming from one who has studied them very carefully.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Leader of the Opposition speak more closely into the microphone, because I gather that the Official Reporter is having some difficulty in hearing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the Official Reporter has difficulty in hearing me, something must be wrong because I speak very loudly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I too have some difficulty in hearing sometimes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, that must be through the adornment of your wig. As I said, Mr. Speaker, the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals, I agree, are really not vote-catching. There is no ill wind that does not blow good to someone, and if we did not have a little wind and frost and what happened in Cuba, we would not have been in this fortunate position. I think I have made my contribution, but I must say that there are one or two things which we thought we would have heard of, and having not heard of them we shall await another year.

The motion I made, Mr. Speaker, that this House view with concern the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals was merely for giving us the opportunity to discuss them. It could not be expected for anyone to make a Statement, Financial or otherwise in here and not have it criticised or praised. We therefore view this Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals with concern in view of the tremendous development taking place, and I hope that the various Ministers, especially the Minister of Health and Social Services and the Minister of Agriculture, will take what I have said and will in turn make investigation into these matters. I hope the Minister of Health will go very carefully into the working of the Hospital, because he seems a rather ardent worker and is rather zealous about anything which falls under his Ministry, but it is only a matter of timing before he gives us satisfaction.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on the Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance, I would like to begin be saying that 1963 was a very auspicious year for all of us. We had a sugar crop the size of which was only second to one other when we made 200,000 tons. In 1963 we reached the figure of 190,000 tons of sugar and that was one great feature of the year. Another happy event was that the world market price for sugar rose to a record height in that year.

3.40 p.m.

The 30,000 or 40,000 tons of sugar which we had to sell on the World Market gave us very handsome profits. Since 1963, that World Market price has fallen and today, it stands at £46 per ton or just about the same price as that of the negotiated sugar; therefore, even today we are still better off than we were in 1962 when the World price of sugar had dropped to the low price of $120 a ton. In that year, we were selling sugar at a loss: so you can quite understand how the Minister of Finance has been able to come in here in his Budgetary Proposals to tell us of the surplus of $4.6 million over Government expenditure which they have got for the previous year. We are, so to speak, putting it colloquially, batting on a good wicket.

How, the Hon. Premier's proposals for the coming year are always matters for speculation. Rumours were going around that taxation would take the form of increased consumption tax on motor cars and spare parts: but had the Hon. Minister of Finance done anything other than what he had done, he could be well accused of doing something which he criticised the last Government on. I remember when the Hon. Premier was in the Opposition he said that instead of setting aside large surpluses that that money could have been used for capital expenditure and so avoid having to borrow on the money market. I supported him in that case, and for that reason I could never see the Minister of Finance doing otherwise than allocating this $4.6 million to capital expenditure, and instead of having to borrow $7 million for this year's work, he has reduced that to $4 million or $5 million. That is well supported by us and I can congratulate him on that proposal.

My speech is not so much a criticism of the Budgetary Proposals as to bring out the things which the Minister of Finance has left out, such as public transport. He could have said that it is a matter of concern to learn that the public transport of this Island carried an overdraft at one of the banks in Bridgetown of $2 million. That is a large sum to have unfunded. That should either be taken up by the Government or the workings of the Transport Board should be so brought up to date. We are all awaiting the Report of the Committee which was appointed to enquire in it, and which Report, I understand, is before the Government - to see what steps they intend to take, either the return of public transport to private enterprise or taking it over entirely and putting it on a sound footing.

I am not one who would say that the Government should necessarily make a profit out of public transport, and I would even go as far as to say that it should be subsidised to a certain level - but not beyond that. However, if we allow it year after year to go by without something done, we are going to find ourselves one morning with a lot of broken down buses. We are going to have adults trying to get to work standing by the wayside and our children being late for school or not being able to get to school at all. It is on the border line now. We have not had any new buses for a number of years, and unless we can put in the replacements now, within a year's time, we are going to be faced with a tremendous bill in trying to buy twenty or thirty buses within a few years. We need attention being drawn to this and it should be done this year.

1963, as I said earlier, was the year when we got a good yield from agriculture, both in the crop and the price which we got for sugar which we sold overseas. That is why we are now on a happy wicket. I congratulate all those responsible for it, the agriculture and, above all, having a good rainfall.

But we have been depending on sugar for a long time, and although we do not wish to relegate it to second place, we must point out the other industries which would assist us in strengthening our economy. The Tourist Industry is number two. We started from humble beginnings: but we now can boast of having some hotels, and the number of people coming to Barbados is on the increase, and the value of the Tourist Industry to the economy of Barbados is in the vicinity of $20 million. We have been rising steadily and healthily in this industry, and I do hope that everything will be done, not only by the Government, but by the people of this Island to see that the steady growth continues because the Tourist Industry lends itself very readily to Barbados. We have a very healthy climate, a friendly people, good services, such as water, telephone and communications, all of which we take for granted. But if you go to one of the smaller Islands, and miss them for one day, you will see what it is to be without them. Those are things which lend to make a happy Tourist Industry here, and I appeal, not only to the Government, but to the people of this Island at large, to assist by their friendliness and by their stability to keep the healthy growth in that industry.

Another industry which really needs mentioning - and we are already taking it for granted - is the fishing industry. We can expand our fishing industry. I do know that the present Minister of Fisheries has been interested in the development of large types of boats so that we can go farther afield to sea, so that we can get greater catches of fish; but we have it at our doorstep. The fishing industry is a great boost to the economy of Barbados. There are twenty-five boats fishing off the shores of Barbados and they are coming in here regularly and pumping good American dollars into our economy, because their catches of shrimps are littered in the American market. They can sell every shrimp which comes to our shores.
3.50 p.m.

There is a good market for them there. They can sell every shrimp they can bring to these shores, and if we can foster and help and extend that industry, by the end of the year, I am told, we can have a fleet of 50 ships leaving Barbados. We all know what that means or what it will mean to wages which are left in this island.

I look forward to the next Budget Speech which the Hon. Minister of Finance will make and I hope that he will furnish the figures showing us how much will be left in Barbados to the sugar industry. That industry can be developed to great dimensions. There again I commend to the people of this island that they assist in any way they can in furthering the development not only of the sugar industry but the development of any other industry which comes to these shores. If you attract one industry and you are able to make a sound business out of it, people are only looking for opportunities. When people read that these industries are established in Barbados, they will be willing to use the facilities which we have to offer in Barbados.

Another great help to our economy in this Island is the result of the operations of the Deep Water Harbour. We are refuelling ships at that Harbour and it is an expanding business. I am told that there are many establishment agencies which are just awaiting the time when the Government will dredge our Deep Water Harbour to another three or four feet in order to allow bigger tankers to come in here to be refuelled. I know that the Government has that matter under consideration, but I still commend it to them because we have to earn foreign exchange so as to pay for the goods which we use here. We have every acre of land under cultivation in Barbados today, and we have to look into other fields. We have to put the Deep Water Harbour to its maximum efficiency so as to attract anything which can bring us more revenue. What I say in relation to the Deep Water Harbour applies also to the Terminal Buildings at Seawell Airport. We have good Terminal Buildings up there and we also have a good runway; as a matter of fact, we have at the Airport, buildings which are as good or better than any other Airport in the area, and we have to offer a service as good as or better than any other Airport in this region, so that we can attract other Airlines to Barbados. We have the makings for attracting these things and we have business for Barbados. I say, Sir, that nothing should be left standing in the way of our earning foreign exchange by means of which we will strengthen the economy of Barbados. We have a growing population at the rate of about 3,000 per year and that is a very high rate. We cannot depend upon emigration alone, although that is one field to which we always have to pay attention. If we can send our boys and girls overseas to work in jobs which we have not got here for them, we know that the remittances which come back here will run into millions of dollars. Over the last three years the remittances which came back here and which are known, are in the vicinity of $7 million. I would say that a true picture would be something like $10 million or $12 million because a lot of this money comes back here and it is not recorded. Even the $10 bill in the envelope cannot be recorded. Those are things which we must consider unless we can find minerals or oil so as to boost our economy. We do not wish a lowering in our standards; we want to have a better standard of living for all.

Mr. Speaker, another very healthy position in which we find ourselves today is in relation to the amount of money which is deposited by Barbadians in the Banks of Bridgetown. That amount of money now stands at the figure of $66.6 million. A very good feature which we notice is the fall in loans made from these Banks. Three years ago, the Commercials Banks were very worried indeed as to the amount of lending which they were called upon to do in order to carry on business in Bridgetown, as against the deposits which they had in hand. They were on the borderline, and it was therefore not an easy matter to get a loan for carrying on any type of business. They were too extended. Thanks to the profits of the last crop, sums of money seemed to have flowed into the Banks, and the borrowings have not been as high as before, which is a healthy feature for the economy of Barbados. It all shows that the people of Barbados have shown a great sense of responsibility, and realising that last year was a bountiful year they have put aside sums of money; but that is the character of the true Barbadian and that is what is lending to the stability of this Island as against what has arisen all around us. That feature, from a financial point of view, is most heartening indeed. It is heartening to see that the money is remaining in the island, and it all goes to show that we have every confidence in the people of this island. If we have confidence in ourselves, then the people from overseas who have money to invest, will also have confidence in us. The people from outside want to see or to meet persons of responsibility before they will invest their money here. There are many places where people are afraid to invest their money because there are afraid of not getting it back. The position in Barbados is just the opposite; we want to try and find the things which we can do best. But the point I am making is that we should foster and maintain the things we have now and expand them. There are people who are looking around to find a home, and the very best form of industry which we can attract here is to manufacture our goods and send them abroad for foreign exchange.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget Speech has been a short and sensible one with the Financial Proposals which are set out therein, and it is not necessary to take up any long time in going over what has been done. I would, however, mention that the relief which has been given to sport is relief with which we will all agree. It will only cost the taxpayers $3,000 to relieve cricket and tennis matches and athletics of a burden, and this proposal is a very welcome one.
4.00 p.m.

We all love our sports and we would love to further the interest of sport in Barbados. As a past member of the Athletic Association, I do know that when we used to hold meetings at Kensington and had to invite cyclists and athletes from the neighbouring islands to make it interesting and internationally competitive, it cost us money. We could

ill afford to pay the tax from the gate receipts at Kensington Oval; so for this we sport lovers are thankful. There are other small and minor benefits given to the taxpayer, but mention was made of working wives being considered. That is very dear to my heart because there are so many of my own constituents particularly that have to go out in search of work, only to find that their salary is added to their husbands', and this puts them in a higher bracket. No account is taken of the extra maid who has to be employed to care the children at home while the mother is working. No allowance is made for that, and very often they find themselves at a disadvantage. I do know the argument is to let her stay home and let a single girl get the job. It is not so easy as that. The high cost of living bears down on all of us, and many a wife has to go out to earn something to supplement the husband's earnings. The Minister is paying attention to that, and I do trust that at the earliest opportunity, if we should find ourselves in anything like last year, we can do something to relieve working wives from the burden of double taxation. To that extent I welcome it and would vote for it at any time.

There are other minor proposals, but the only thing I would like to add to this is that early in the Budget Speech the Premier mentioned that the private sector was somewhat unwilling to give the Statistical Department advance notice of proposed capital expansion of private businesses. It is not an unwillingness to give the Statistical Department any information on capital expansion, but often the capital expansion takes place almost immediately, and when the Statistical Department asks for that information, it may not even have been in the minds of the Directors. Take my family's business; we have just sold a building which we know will in the near future be a big bank. That is going to be a big capital expansion in Broad Street in the near future. We know that the Canadian Bank of Commerce are on the verge of putting up another three or four-storied building on a site which they have. All that is readily available, but there is no unwillingness on the part of businesses to furnish information to the Government, but it is not always that it ties in, because the person may not know. A sale might be pending, but they might not sell. I am sure that businesses are only too willing to cooperate with Government by giving information to forecast the future.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it now falls to be my pleasure to join the debate on the Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance. I am myself unhappy, and unlike the other two members of the Official Opposition, we are unable to congratulate the Government in the manner in which they were congratulating them through the entire speech. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a wonderful document and I deem it an excellent job. You can see from beginning to end that it was handled by the Treasury boys and the Permanent Secretary to the Minister of Finance. There is no mistake that one had to work in close range for some time with the Premier to get accustomed to his language and verbiage, and what is more, his speech is lacking of the fire, enthusiasm, courage and vitality and the other vital essentials that go to make a speech, particularly a Budget Speech by any Premier. It is most unusual that the Premier should read his speech word for word knowing that members on this side of the Table would be aware that he did not have to do one single sentence in the preparation of this wonderful document. What is more, Mr. Speaker, this speech was made in just over half an hour though it represents thousands and thousands of words committed to eight pages, and you can actually feel the ring of Civil Servants in all this.

Mr. Speaker, it is not happy to have to comment like this on a Budget. A Budget's primary purpose is to move and surge the island forward, and in this connection I do not think only of Barbados, because I must think of a nation. We are bound to come together in a Federation; but listening to the Budget and thinking of it, one must of necessity fear that a number of things have been tramelled for the expediency of an election. Imagine this document coming from a Premier who speaks of dynamism as he so often does in his attempt to make us feel that this country will surge forward. When we read his speech, we know that he had not one sentence to prepare in it. I am not thinking of Abraham Lincoln in his manner of speaking, but I am thinking of his temperament. I am thinking of the irrational and emotional hostility that falls from his lip. Most of us agree that it is really impossible for him to make an *ad lib* speech to befit a Premier and Minister of Finance, but I am thinking of the hostility that is so often found in his emotions. I can remember when on some occasion he referred in a speech to the Civil Service being a lot of lousy so-and-sos, but now we find a page and a half is devoted to the wonderful things he is now doing for this huge, majestic organisation known as the Civil Service which will forever remain the bulwark of any society.

4.10 p.m.

For that reason, I am confirmed myself. We have reached no connection on whatsoever with the country's general growth and development. To talk and speak of no taxation is something phenomenal, and to boast that we have a surplus of $4.6 million is purely and only because we have had a tremendous crop last year, in spite of the fires, and we had a wonderful earner in U.S. dollars.

We are thinking of a sudden surplus of $4.6 million. The Treasury too had its windfall in this tremendous surplus confirmed with the sugar sold in the American market. You should not pat yourself as if something had not happened. There is no guarantee that you will repeat it next year, even if you have a yield of 210,000 tons of sugar because this is so. And to attempt to mobilise and persuade the people to feel that this is enough money and that you need this $4.6 million to carry out the capital expenditure of $10,688,978, I do not know, looking at the Memorandum of your Capital Estimates: and for this reason, I am unable to support or even cheer or even join in the speech made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. They have a number of reasons to support you.

This is a wonderful document. It is what is happening and you cannot change it. It is inherent in the country's own economy. Sugar and its by-products are still responsible for 92 per cent of your revenue. Biscuits and edible oil and all the things which we have been exporting, to say the least of the invisible income which has come about, say, during the time of the last Government, by way of emigration made up the rest; but we still find that 92 per cent of the country's revenue is derived from sugar and its by-products.

Now, this is where the whole thing stops. You want to examine it and you want to know what is taking place. What did the Hon. Minister of Finance say? He said that he is going to suppress taxation. Just a week ago, there was a release of the Report of the Boundaries Commission, as we were promised. All of these things add up to this. It is due to political expediency. As I have said, it is inherent; it is something for which no Government can lay any special claim to. I shall dub this speech as an anti-climax of what a nation would expect. You want to be sure always that your thumb is on the pulse of the men and women of the community, the manpower of the country, and you want to see the surge forward in the economy which would keep your men and women surging madly forward to progress and prosperity. There is nothing whatsoever in this to inspire and stimulate this feeling which is so vital and important to the developing of the economy. At the moment, we want to continue to think of Barbados. We know that in the next 25 years, we are going to double our population and our hopes were in the Federation. You are talking now of fixing boundaries for single member constituencies. We have seen the lackadaisical attitude by the Government to the people's demands. We see what is happening in the middle section, the Police, the School Teacher and the whole Civil Establishment which forms the bulwark of the middle-class society which springs from the peasantry to which we belong, and it is the same peasantry to which we lay boast for the sudden rise in the country's economy.

Looking at the Memorandum of the Estimates, there is the estimated expenditure for $33,303,816. This is something which you want to examine. It is because of the remorseless and steep decline in your Party's fortunes and your facing an election. It is inconsistent with progressive Government. It is as remorseless as it can be. We know

what is taking place; we know what is happening and we know why. We do not want to be told; we know what explains this. In the last three years, we have seen the jump and the change in your expenditure by some $10 million, and almost every item of food of the working class of this community has been increased through customs and excise, and you attempt to justify why you are not making any more increase in taxation from the 1,200 who only pay income tax. What has happened to Government with the excess profit tax? What has changed in our society that we are utterly unaware of? I have heard the same Hon. Premier referring to the Financial Secretary, Mr. Burrowes, - and he said it on more than one occasion that he would not entrust him with a snow-ball cart. I am wondering if the same Financial Secretary is out of office now. This man recently was suffering from high blood pressure and was out of office for a few days by the overstrain of the work of the Department, so helpless was the Cabinet when it came to financial matters.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. The hon. member who has just sat down said that he remembered hearing the Hon. Premier say that he would not entrust the Financial Secretary with a snow-ball cart. That is absolutely and utterly untrue. Those actual remarks were made in the course of the Budget Speech of 1961 in reference to Dr. Cummins.

Mr. MILLER: He said that of Dr. Cummins as well. I regard that as his opinion. It is false as usual and equally as foul. If the Hon. Minister of Education is going to get up on a point of order each time, we are going to have a rough debate. I sat here like a fixed wax monument and said not a word when the other hon. members were speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. George has just used the word "foul", if I understand him correctly, in reference to the Hon. Minister of Education, and I must ask him , without any delay, to withdraw that word "foul", which is spelt "f - o - u - l", I take it, and which is completely unparliamentary, and which, according to Standing Order No.26 (5) , is offensive and insulting.

Mr. MILLER: I will withdraw it 52 times which is once for each week in the year, if it will help me with the undue interruptions of the Hon. Minister. We have had all of this and you know what to expect. I want to avoid these utterances and disturbances and obstructions by the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: I expect this debate to continue on the high tone on which it began.

Mr. MILLER: I am quite willing. The hon. members on the other side can say whatever they like. Thank you.

Now, Sir, as to the new trend that you have been developing in the last, three, four or five years ago. Earlier today, we were satisfied that you had a national debt of $40 million. Let us examine what is taking place in the United States. It is true that owning to the resources of that country, they need not buy one item on the foreign market. However, our national debt is $40 million. I am not thinking of the commercial deposits. This represents something like $66 million. What we have got to fear is what this argument is all about. It is because you want to bring in a childish palliative? It is surely and only because we had a windfall of American dollars for reasons of that country not buying sugar from Cuba, which we would not discuss at this stage, that we have become a dollar earner. The Hon. Premier is to be proclaimed a hero now after all this remorse and reaction which have taken place in this country.
4.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, with all of this Budget Speech what are we telling this country today? Earlier today we were told that the Election will not be held until you have Poor Relief Cards in the hands of the masses of this country. That is the misfortune which you see in a society which you call a democratic society. We are only now catching up with the financial difficulties of this country. We are in trouble, and do not let us fool ourselves because we have had this display by the Conservative Opposition in this Chamber. You will listen to this argument from morning until night because you see that nothing is being put on the rich. The poor will be poorer and the rich will be richer.

There are occasions when there is an attempted deflation by the Premier, because he owns Television or attempted to own it. The hon. member is really suppressing a form of depression which we have not seen. Imagine the Premier arrogating to himself the power to tell the community that we must only take an amount of 25% on television! You know the fallacy in all of these promises. The Premier is saying that he will write off the licence for radios, whereas in truth and in fact, I do not believe that they ever collected one. How can you fail to have an interest in your country? The removal of the entertainment tax on these sports accounts for $3,000 and I must say that God must have been in love with us when he made so many of us.

Mr. Speaker, you read this Speech again and you will see that it lacks the fire of a statesman; there is no statesmanship in this speech. The hon. member is running the Premiership of this country in this way because he knows that he is bound to lose in the next Election. You have to face the reality of what is happening today. For three years you have been in power and you have failed to increase taxation by way of an excess profits' tax. I do not want to embarrass anybody and: therefore I do not want to call any names; but where there is an excess profits tax you could afford to take more. Are we bringing in the television sets to see what the cost of living is going to be because it has not been changed from last year? We will put you on every platform and we will attack you in this Budget Speech, timid as it is. You will see a dim industrial twilight setting in this country and you will note that Germany and Japan and countries like those are back in the field of international trade. Because we can sell our labour at a cheap rate what are you going to tell us? Are you going to give us the full brunt of responsibility of coming back here. Sometime ago the Hon. Premier said that it was his ambition to have 1,000 persons at the industrial level of Arts and Science. You are operating in an age when the children are supplied with these hot meals; the pot is going for two hours and the most important period for the school children is the lunch period. I am suggesting, Sir, that there are two or three buildings which you could buy and take Harrison College up to 1,000 or 1,200 in numbers. Ask the Girls at the Industrial Union to give up that building and convert it and take Queen's College up to 1,000 in numbers. Gone are the days when the schools must have just so many pupils.

We are now spending money on the construction of the Hilton Hotel, but what are we to do with owning any Hilton Hotel? What are we to do with Hilton? I say that we should shut down some of these things and use the money which must come under the Heading of Education. We are going to do that at the next Election, and you can set whatever date you like for the Election. You know it is folly to build what is possible even in an Island like ours unless you are going to make provision for it. You are talking about this gigantic hotel. I say, let the Americans build this hotel and divert that money elsewhere.
4.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, you heard all the old talk in here by the Official Leader of the Opposition about the Hospital and what it cost; but how can you ever measure the service of a hospital in any country in dollars and cents? I said in here that my concern about the Hospital was that it should be properly equipped. It is there now and we should look to something else. Let the Minister of Education persuade his Cabinet to throw away this vote-catching rice. They have now promised some in St. George and St. John, because the Premier of the House has invited the Boundaries Commission to find out where to run, whether north, south, east or west in St. Michael.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no premier of the House. There is a Premier of the Island, Head of the Government, and when he made his Statement and presented it, he did so in his capacity of Minister of Finance. As I am intervening at this moment, may I point out to the hon. member that the Minister of Finance did not read his speech? That would

have contravened Standing Order No. 26 (1). He laid a Statement which he read and which is in accordance with our Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLER: I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was in the House and sitting in the Chamber when the Speech was read by the Premier of the House. Mr. Speaker, there are occasions when we have got to face the realities of the increasing consciousness of our feeling to solve our major social problems, and surely the members who hold responsibility in the Ministries must be aware of this. We know what is taking place and what is bound to come about in a Federation, and if there is this insistence for our traditions and ties in Barbados for 300 odd years, we want to be sure that these things are preserved. Imagine, Sir, the ruthlessness in an expression like this: "On the 26th day of June, 1962, I made my first Budget Speech as Minister of Finance on the floor of this House. At that time the Island was faced with a deficit of $2,350,000." If you go back to 1961, you can have a quick look at the major projects we were handling. There was a Harbour for $30 million, a Hospital of $8 million and an Abattoir, and we had not long got over a half a million dollar Airport building; but here the Premier is talking about a deficit of $2 million as being something crucial in the economic development of this country. The Harbour today has revealed that we are getting some $2¼ million out of that single project after only two years.

Today, Sir, we are reading this palliative with a sickening lack of vitality and courage and faith in the very people that you will ask to support you, probably within another few months. You have removed the entertainment tax on intercolonial cricket where you only got a measly sum of $3,000, but you are going to charge $12,000 on the pools, You have also decided to make a refund of contributions paid by the Civil Servants. The Civil Service has never had so much attention in its whole life, but during the last election and after - we were told that the Civil Servants forced the Government to pay out increases to the tune of $3 million. A lot of men served this Government twelve, sixteen, eighteen and some twenty-four hours a day, and we gave them enough to keep body and soul together and educate their children; but we were criticised, abused and accused of all sorts of corruption. I remember that on that occasion you starved the dogs and one of the police old scouts had to share his biscuits, and you were anxious to throw out the police horses. You have forgotten all these things. Now you have removed the radio licence when I do not think that one single cent has been paid to the Treasury, and since you own the only broadcasting station, you have removed the licence. You also go further and say that the profit margin on television sets will be controlled at not more than 25 per cent of the cost to the dealer. This is a crushing dictatorship. It is the most unusual thing to be done by a socialist Government.

As my friend said today, Mr. Speaker, at nearly every meeting of the House you acquire land. You will remember Lenin, one of the faithful disciples of Karl Marx, and Churchill who attempted to use some of the British soldiers and taxpayers' money to establish the Czar. There is this new slant in the Socialist philosophy based on the idea of public ownership where you never had any training, but you are buying plantations like the two on the hill where deterioration will take place. The hon. member in his wonderful speech here today thought that he would not worry Government by saying the truth about commerce, but every week we are acquiring land and hotels, including the Trafalgar Hotel; now you are increasing the rates to be paid to travelling public officers, have revise the terms for leave passages, and then you apologise by reducing the period from five to four years where you will make the ladies' pay equal to the gents' in the Education Department-something that could have been started this year - and you have failed to take more taxation from those who can give for those who are in need.
4.40 p.m.

Now, we are told after all this that the excess profit tax is to be taken away; for instance, in 1961, we had a consumption tax on automobiles and today we have a clean slate. All of this is an anti-climax. All of this is to perpetuate the oppression of the masses. This is a time where it is possible to, probably, find another $3 million or $5 million so as to curtail the loan of $4 million that is in excess of the $4.6 million. You have failed to take advice; and so persistent are you, that you deny the Ministers the right of exercising their authority on their respective portfolios. You want to strip the Minister of Education of his popularity and shift it to the Premier. I would like to see these two gentlemen contesting a seat in the St. Michael's area. I am sure that we are going to get a lot of fun out of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. junior member for St. George still discussing the Financail Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Hon. Premier?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir, I am sorry for that interruption. Imagine the Hon. Premier has asked us to come here and listen to his Budget Speech and you allowed him to read a speech prepared by Mr. Burrowes!

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not condone that. No speech was read by the Hon. Premier. The hon. senior member for St. John did not read any speech. He laid a Statement which he presented to the House afterwards and which is perfectly in order.

Mr. MILLER: How long since is it in order to read a speech? All I know is that a copy of the Budget Speech was probably distributed.

Mr. SPEAKER: A copy of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals was laid by the Hon. Premier in his capacity as Minister of Finance.

Mr. MILLER: And I presume that is in respect of 1964-65.

Mr. SPEAKER: A.D.

Mr. MILLER: This is no farce; this is no joke because the document itself reduces it to mediocrity. It does not mean that we should relegate it to that. What we want to be aware of is that the people of the country by their vote - and that is man's most earthly possession - put us here, and in an age like this when we need so much, we are getting so little.

I know that you are troubled about the private schools. Something has to be done about this. You are denying the children of the country the chance of obtaining secondary education. Let the Hon. Minister apply to his better self what it means to Barbados if we go into a Federation, because you know what it means to be learned. Let us work hard. Let us, with the understanding which we have, feel the pulse of our nation in finding the facts for bringing about a full education. These are social problems which we are facing without anything being done. Every year you talk of extending an elementary school and that is consistent with the country's need. If you do not do that, woe betide you. You cannot deny one child entry into an elementary school, and with our annual changes, you are bound to extend your schools. Do not take it as a sop and say that you are extending elementary. You are bound to do it. You make it appear that you are extending schools, but you are bound to do it or woe betide you. These are things which you must do, but you want to go a stage further because we have a responsibility to the Federation.

Today, you are making provision in your Capital Estimates for expenses to be paid by the British taxpayers when you talk of Colonial Development and Welfare. That is a sort of English Poor Relief. You cut done to a respectable total your aid by C.D.C., but it is budgetary assistance because it is the gift of the British taxpayer. You talk about the independence of your country when half of your expenditure comes from the working people of Great Britain. This is a wonderful document. During the course of this debate, I pointed out that it was not fair to accuse this Government. Do you mean that you want collective responsibility because somebody gets something at election time? You accuse this Government of being unfair by not taxing the rich when you know that only 1,200 people are now paying income tax. You

see that they are the people who are getting the money and you would not take it when it is available. You say that you know this; you know it is there and it is available to you. These are things which you want to be aware of.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member address the Chair and not the Minister of Education.

Mr. MILLER: But can I not address him via the Chair? 4.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not intentionally, but perhaps indirectly.

Mr. MILLER: To continue my remarks, Sir, I am appealing to the Minister. You have a tremendous responsibility and whatever you say with regard to education, you have to be very careful that you do not go to the grave and have it on your conscience that you had an opportunity to deal with this matter and failed to use it. I will probably see you in the Market Square....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not understand the hon. member's reference to the Market Square.

Mr. MILLER: Our revenue is derived from the Market place. I am only asking you to bear in mind that I share the responsibility of this country with anybody who is in the Opposition. When the economy of this island was $10 million, Harrison College was built. Now that the economy has moved to $33 million, do you not need to do something more for Harrison College? There is the possibility of getting another $3 million this year and you see some people smiling because you have not taken things out of their hands. I have a responsibility to this country and the souls that are therein. When the revenue of this colony was $8 million or $10 million, a Conservative Government built Harrison College and Queen's College; and now the economy is $33 million, you do not make proper provision for the Sixth Form Students at these schools. Do something about Harrison College and Queen's College and put more students there. You are talking about feeding the school children and you know that you will not be able to feed them all.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most important subject in the House and you can extend it. Do you not think that the time has come when we have to take courage in our hands? You should say that you have examined the position and you have come to realise that you are going further. Let us make sure that we can have some of these buildings converted into class rooms. You have the Agricultural Department and other buildings up there and let me pray with you; put up another two-storeyed building and afford more class rooms at Harrison College. I am sure that Mr. Hammond would bow down to you because you gave that man or you would have given that man the opportunity to do something. I have said that with the buildings in Roebuck Street you could carry your numbers at Harrison College to one thousand. Why should we deny children with the natural aptitude for advancement of this opportunity? Having regard to the men and women of this country, you have failed to inspire confidence and courage in them; but all of this is because of an Election and now we are told that we must put universal security in the hands of the age. You are spending all of this money on Poor Relief. I wonder what the Minister of Health is saying about this matter because we have fought to get Mr. Stockman from the United Nations to come here and we made one request of him. You want to see to the central distribution of the poor relief.

All along we were told that it was a question of the Report of the Boundaries Commission without which we could not have an Election. We know that the Boundaries Commission was appointed last year and that the Report of that Commission was laid yesterday.

Mr. SPEAKER: That Report was not laid yesterday. The Report was laid on the same day that the House was reopened, and that was the first day on which it could possibly have been laid. That Report was delivered to the Speaker of this House within the time allotted for it to be delivered to him but it could not be laid on the Table of the House until the House had resumed. The House had nothing to do with the publication in the Press.

Mr. MILLER: I will just say that we received the Report a couple of days ago, which was less than a week. We are told that this Social Security Card must be in the hands of the aged, and even poverty is used against the holding of the Election. What I have said are the things with which we have to concern ourselves; these are the moderate or the modest results of what we have to pay. We must face the facts and what are we doing? I feel that it is not too late to do these things. I am sure that we can attract commercial entities to this island to take the responsibility which falls on them and we can extend Harrison College even if you should call it Tudor College. A rose by another name does not matter.
5.00 p.m.

We do not want to deny the opportunity of a comprehensive school, even if you change the pattern in your secondary modern schools, because it is an experiment which is now working after trial and error in the United Kingdom, and if you come down with it we will support you in it; but do not let us believe that you will add on two classrooms, because you are bound to need more space. When all is said and done, I would say that this Budget lacks the thrust that would move the island forward to progress and prosperity.

When you look around the island, Mr. Speaker, you will see the mammoth banks that are going up. There is one in Roebuck Street, there are about three in Speightstown, two in Hastings, and in Broad Street there will be another in the building which was formerly Goddards Food Fair and another to be built across the road which, I think, is going to be the Canadian Bank of Commerce. Why do you think they are coming here? Why do you think there is all this expansion and floor space? I do not think I need say anything more on this because there is no enthusiasm in this Budget, or nothing in it to inspire an ideal or dream that something is likely to happen later on and this is one of the indications, like the swallow in summer. The Civil Service has had more say in this, and after all the criticism, a page and a half have been devoted to this unchanging section of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough on this and regret that there is nothing more that I can say. I regret that there is no meat on this meatless bone called the Budgetary Proposals. The whole thing smells and reeks of the undying odour of elections. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think you should ask the hon. member to accord himself with the dignity of the Chamber. Maybe you are not paying the attention to it as you should, but a member cannot address the Chair and then when he has finished, thank you and just walk out of the Chamber like that. I think that you should .....

Mr. MILLER: If the hon. member would give way....

Mr. WALCOTT: I will not give way.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did bow to you.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not giving way.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Both hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will not give way to the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Both hon. members must sit.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not giving way to that kind of behaviour.

*Mr. SPEAKER rose and both hon. members took their seats.*

Mr. WALCOTT: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am an extremely serious Parliamentarian and I do not make jokes at these things. This sort of political buffoonery that we have been subjected to and then that sort of peroration and uncouth and coarse behaviour of walking out of the Chamber and coming back in and standing up and getting on as you please is O.K. when you are having a tamarind tree Parliament.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I object to that, and the hon. member is bound to give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. MILLER: You cannot make unpleasant remarks about an hon. member and tell him that you will not give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. junior member for St. George risen?

Mr. MILLER: I have risen on a point of order, a point of explanation, a point of privilege or any other point that you will have in the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a case of what point I would have. On what point has the hon. member risen?

Mr. MILLER: I have risen on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter resume his seat?

Mr. MILLER: On leaving this Chamber I always bow, without exception, to the Chair. I have always been accustomed to discipline in a home, and even when I started to wear long pants, I still referred to my father as "Sir".

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point. He has stated that he bowed to the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: At this stage of my history, is somebody telling me what my conduct should be?

Mr. WALCOTT: I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that any member after making his speech must resume his seat. This is no tamarind tree Parliament that when you are finished you leave your Chair and walk out. When we get this sort of melodramatic, political buffoonery to which we have been subjected for an hour here and this sort of glorified myopia being exhibited, at some time or other some of us must rise and put an end to this sort of thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am hearing senseless utterances from an hon. member who is still in his chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: You will hear more, Mr. Speaker, as I go on to illustrate the sort of weary infliction we had here for an hour emanating from the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. SPEAKER: But we are looking forward to hearing the hon. senior member for St. Peter on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals.

Mr. WALCOTT: Without any prompting, I will speak on them.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. Let the hon. member sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let it be a valid point of order.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member talked about buffoonery and all that.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member made an unkind and unsympathetic criticism of me which you heard. I am not asking him to withdraw, but he cannot come and lay rules in here and decide what I should say and what I should not say. If it is part of my nature, I dare you or anyone to change it. He has been in pain to listen to what I said. Why did he not go outside? Now we have to listen to the childlike folly of the hon. member for an hour and a half.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order has been made by the hon. junior member for St. George.

5.10 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, if we are prepared to entertain this form of amusement, I am not in for it. I do not regard Parliament as a circus. I sat here hearing this painful exercise, but it is my duty to sit and listen. I had to speak on the last occasion to him over the same type of behaviour of his and he left his attache bag in here for two weeks. I hope when I am finished with him today that his bag will be left here for a longer period. On the last occasion, he said that the people were giving you a demonstration when they were reducing the economy of the country to fire, and that is what he regards as a speech. What was democratic vandalism, reducing this Island's economy to ashes, he came in here and tried to qualify it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I observe that the hon. junior member for St. George is on his feet.

Mr. MILLER: I rise on a point of order. Let him sit down.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not going to sit down. I am not going to give way. I am going to let what is going to take place, to take place. I am not giving way to this type of behaviour by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two members on their feet.

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir. I am on a point of order, and I am not giving way. If you are Speaker and you allow the hon. member to say something derogatory of me, I am not giving way. We have Standing Orders. I am not giving way; I am on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regard this as an instance of grave disorder when the authority of the Chair is being flouted and, accordingly, I suspend this Sitting for fifteen minutes.

*The Sitting was suspended accordingly.*

5.15 p.m.

*On resumption,*

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I was drawing to your attention that it is part of our constitutional behaviour that when we rise to address you, we rise from our seats, and when we are finished debating, we take our seats. This Chamber cannot be subjected to such bad behaviour as when you are finished making a speech, you then walk out of the House. That is objectionable to other hon. members and I still maintain that we should abide by our Rules. You sat here and heard a long speech by the hon. junior member for St. George, and I regret that what we have heard reduces what could be an important debate in any country — a debate on the Budget — to a farcical situation. We have heard a speech about the Boundaries Commission. What is the Boundaries Commission to do with this debate? The Report of the Boundaries Commission is a document before us to be debated by all members of the House. How comes it to be introduced in a Budget Speech like this today?

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member criticised the Government on the grounds that the Government's Budget is a political budget. All budgets are political budgets because they are made in Parliament and Parliament is a political institution. To say that the Budget reeks to election time, what more electioneering speech do you want

than that? The hon. junior member for St. George spoke of the Boundaries Commission. That is a subject to be debated by this House in this Chamber and I do not know how that could be brought into a debate by any hon. member other than the hon. junior member for St. George himself. He is attempting to use that in a political electioneering manner at this stage when all of us will have the opportunity in due course to deal with that matter.

I think it is fair to the Government and to all hon. members, if you are going to criticise the Government on its Budgetary Proposals, by all means you have the right to do so. We have the right to be as critical as we can be on that, but I do not think it is necessary in making those criticisms to be over zealous about the elections. We heard today what is going to happen and I simply reminded the hon. member that we had an exhibition of his conduct in a similar manner as we have had today when he was talking about inviting this House to look at the cane fires which were taking place in Barbados. He was inviting the House to take note that that was a demonstration against the Government; therefore, why we do not take note of it. After that demonstration of his, he left his bag in this Chamber for two weeks and I predict that after this debate, he is going to leave his bag in here until the next elections.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I regard the last statement by the hon. member as a threat. The hon. member is threatening me and I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to call the hon. member to order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me say this now, I will not allow any hon. member to use the phrase "on a point of order" as a pretext for interrupting a debate of this House. Let the hon. senior member for St. Peter proceed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure Your Honour is capable in your own profession to determine if I used a threat. If you understand what a threat means, I do not think an hon. member, in making reference to another hon. member in respect of his past conduct in a debate to show how his behaviour was in a debate, that that can be regarded as a threat. I never threatened the hon. member. All I said on that occasion was that he invited this Chamber to watch the fires which were going up all over the country, and which we all regretted very much because they were striking at the root of the economy of this country. But this hon. member regarded them as a classic example of the people militant against the Government and he called on us to take note of them. I said that after that debate in this Chamber the hon. member left his attache bag for two weeks and did not return for it. It was left on the Table of the House week after week. On this occasion, I believe that he will leave his bag until election time. That is all I said.

Sir, all I would say is that it is one of these remote reflections that take place in a human heart after he has indulged in certain exercises and he begins to think or review what he has done, then he realises the error of his ways. Today the hon. junior member for St. George gave us what is a typical exhibition of his. He talked of meatless bones and all of those empty meaningless phrases of his; but when it comes to the meat which we can really chew, what do we find? The hon. member criticised the Government in its Budgetary Proposals of not embarking on building more schools. I am not offended by the hon. member's lack of knowledge in economic affairs nor am I offended by the hon. member not being aware of what takes place in an ordinary territory like ours. Nor am I worried if the hon. member does not understand the full significance of this country going towards full independence, or how this country is getting aid. Some hon. member spoke about Germany and West Germany. Some hon. members forget that it was the Marshall Plan which was put forward by the United States which made it possible for West Germany and other countries in Europe which were devastated by the last War to be able to be the countries which they are today.

There was an organisation in Europe called OECD (Organisation for European Co-operation and Development) and that organisation was responsible for giving aid to independent sovereign countries. As regards these independent countries which are aspiring towards independence, it is the duty of the metropolitan countries to give us the aid with the kind of infrastructure which the hon. member speaks about so that we can proceed to development in the other sectors which call for development.

5.35 p.m.

Just as an example to demonstrate the nonsense which we have heard today about economic planning, I would quote from a pamphlet which deals with economic planning and social planning. This was a speech made by a former member of the British Labour Party, Mr. Hilary Marquand, and now he is in charge of the Institute for Labour Studies at the I.L.O. What did he say in relation to this same matter? This is what he said:- "All of our emphasis today is on the importance of infra-structure. It is being discovered how essential and important it is. We must establish a solid foundation of healthy and educated human beings and of communications which will enable us to develop the economy itself. But these essential pieces of infra-structure can never pay dividends. You cannot start charging for hospitals, running them on a commercial basis;...."

He means that you cannot build a hospital and tell somebody: "I will charge you a fee and therefore when you pay a fee you will begin to get back returns. The hospital is a service and if we make a charge for a hospital for "X" million dollars and say that within the next twenty-five years you will get back the money. You cannot attach a prospectus to a hospital and ask people to come along and subscribe to it. The nation must pay for that. I go on to quote from Mr. Marquand: He says:-

".....the same applies to schools, universities, hospitals, health services and roads. To these I would add free investment surveys and technical assistance. All these should be financed by gifts out of our 1 per cent contribution, which should come in from the form of grants.

There are, in addition elements of infra-structure which make a measurable contribution to direct development...."

Things like schools, roads and railways etc., form a part of the infra-structure. Mr. Marquand said that all of these things should be financed by gifts. This is a man who has given a great study to economic thinking. He was a lecturer in the University of Wales and he has said that all of these things should be financed by gifts out of our one per cent contribution which should come in the form of grants. He was inviting the British Government to form the O.E.C.D., in order to provide grants, in order to provide this infra-structure and economic building up, in order that when you begin to deal with your other investment spending, you are doing it on the revenue and Income-bearing types of things which take place, for example, the hotels. You cannot ask this country for a grant for a hotel or for any economic-bearing prospect. It is just like asking a man to give you money to buy a house when that is a capital investment. You can ask a man to lend you money to build or repair your house, but you can make a gift of food.

I will say this now: the Government would be well advised to make a plan — I am sure that they are capable of doing it - to set out the income-revenue bearing aspects of their Development Plan as against the ones which are not revenue bearing. I quite agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, although I do not agree with all that he has said. The hon. member's speech and that of his colleague were not up to the standard to which I was looking forward in the Budget Speech; but, on the other hand, the hon. member's speech was devoid of that sort of harangue which we heard from the hon. junior member for St. George, without the projection of anything which was really worthwhile and positive. I quite agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he spoke of compulsory education. Seventeen years ago my first exercise was in connection with compulsory education for Barbados. That was before I entered this Chamber. I have repeatedly made this statement about

compulsory education because I believe it is that part of our structure which must be exposed to the element of thinking, so that when we grow older we will not have some of the exhibitions which we have today. People must be saved from themselves and they must be saved from these things.

I agree that we need more schools. (Mr. MILLER: Night schools too.) Well, we need day schools and we need Parliamentary Schools. Parliament is one of the places which you need no qualifications to enter, and some of those who enter in here should be called upon to formulate and do some of the things which they ask other people to do, and it would not be easy for some people to enter this Chamber and make us endure these inflictions which we have to endure. They have the effrontery to tell us, after inflicting us with these things, that we should have left. They do not want us to pay them the courtesy of listening to the speeches with which we have been inflicted. If that is the price which we have to pay for democracy, that is the price which we have to pay for democracy: but we can underwrite democracy by looking to these things in the future. There is nobody in Barbados or in any other part of the world who would ever deny the population education, and the Government has done its part. You may criticise the Government, and any Government can be criticised: but where do you put the emphasis? Could any right-thinking person say that in your plans for education you do not have to have higher education? There is nothing wrong in having the Arts College because that is a primary necessity in any developing country. What are you going to develop cannot develop itself; it is impossible for this country to develop itself unless there is a nucleus in this community, those who are capable of seeing the projections for the future. 5.45 p.m.

The average man who looks for a job looks to those who are capable of creating the atmosphere for employment. He himself is willing to work, but he is bereft of the know-how to create conditions to supply work, he is bereft of the economy to do so, and it means that the thinking which emanates from higher training at a University is an essential ingredient in the whole fabric of our society, and more so in a developing society. There can therefore be no real criticism against a Government that endeavours to balance its educational policy by giving it at the lowest level, at the middle, and at the top, bearing in mind that you are operating an economy where your gross domestic product is about $150 million and your gross national product will be a little higher. There are no figures in this economic survey which set out what is the gross national product; it only deals with the gross domestic product. Be that as it may, if we take the gross domestic product as our example to draw these budget proposals on, it is better to watch it in that light. There is no point in laying a criticism at the Government and saying that the Government is doing this for election purposes, because if the Government in power brought down a proposal at this time imposing taxation, the same hon. junior member for St. George would jump on it; and anybody at election time would jump on any Government and rip it to pieces if it put on taxes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Government brought down taxes two years ago, it was criticised severely. Now I say and I repeat that no Government or no country can function without taxation. I will go further and say that Professor Arthur Lewis, a former Principal of the University made a statement which was quoted by the same Mr. Marquand. He said that one cannot take seriously any Government which claims to be development-minded but which raises only 12 per cent or less of national income in taxes. You cannot have your national income at one point and not get enough out to create these things in the community that you are talking about.

The hon. member criticised the Premier's speech and said that was a Civil Servant's speech. I think it was one of the unkindest things you could say to someone, and I would say the charge attributed to the Hon. Premier of incapability of making a speech like the one he has made in here can only come from a puerile mind. No adult mind in Barbados.....

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, nothing I said, Sir, could insinuate or be interpreted to mean that the Premier was not capable of producing his speech. I simply stated...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That point has been made.

Mr. WALCOTT: What other deduction could one make when he said: "Look at this document! You can tell from the language in it that it is the language of Civil Servants." How could anyone say that the Financial Secretary should have nothing to do with the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals or should not prepare any sort of notes and minutes, and suggest that it is the Premier who is responsible for it, but it is not his doing? I say that because sometimes you can be unkind, but you have to measure the degrees of unkindness to the form in which you put it. What are we going to say to the hon. member who made that Statement? Sometimes the hon. member is taken up with his own speech, and the flow of words becomes so fast and furious that he is not aware of what he has stated. I believe when he hears a recording of his speech, he is going to be very ashamed of it, and I hope it will be replayed for him.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are the statements that I do not think you would want to have him say, and I only ask that you be fair in all this. There is nothing I can say on earth or anywhere that I would be ashamed of. I would know....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point has been made.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, he is in company with millions. There are millions of people who would make the most shameful statements and get up and say they are not ashamed of them. We are not saying that there are not shameless people in our society, but I was attributing to the hon. member a quality that I felt is a quality in all of us, and if we have erred in our ways, we should be willing enough and prepared to say this was an error, and "I am ashamed of myself; I did not realise I had done it." If that is a quality he does not possess, it means that I have attributed to him a quality higher then he can aspire to. I thought that he would want to aspire to the highest qualities.

Mr. MILLER: Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not have these things said, When you talk about behaviour, it comes from culture and starts with the child, and it involves the home.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot hear the hon. member and I would like to hear him.

Mr. MILLER: When you think of being ashamed, you must be conscious of something you want to be ashamed of. There must be a reason. There is usually a psychological effect which is more or less inherent in so far as breeding and training are concerned, and those are things you cultivate in a home. The training you get would determine the things you would do.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order has been made.

Mr. MILLER: If I may elucidate a little further....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have said that that is enough.

Mr. MILLER: With all respect, Mr. Deputy Speaker...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. junior member for St. George to take his seat immediately.

Mr. MILLER: I will, Sir.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you would be surprised to know that all of us sat in this Chamber and heard the hon. member speak for nearly an hour or more, and the solitary interruption that came was made by the Minister of Education, and even in replying to the hon.

member, - and this is the type of training you get at home - he accused the hon. member not only of being false, but foul, and those words had to be withdrawn, and in a melodramatic circus fashion they were withdrawn fifty-two thousand times - if that is one thousand times a week, 5.55 p.m.

I am not going to follow that, but I am going to ridicule that. The hon. junior member for St. George was at pains to criticise the Government on the proposals, but his criticism was a criticism to re-arm the Government in its proposals. The hon. member asked: "Are you going for independence when we have so many bare-footed people here?" Well, Sir, when can any member living in an underdeveloped territory like ours ever breathe the idea or make the suggestion that there is any barrier whatever if our aspirations are for independence that it must fit in with our economic disabilities? Our economic disabilities are things which we are not responsible for. This territory was owned and governed by a metropolitan country: and if we are poor, we are as poor as we were allowed to be, and you cannot say that these are the barriers which can hinder us from becoming independent. If the hon. junior member for St. George had any knowledge about the countries in Africa, he will know that they have become independent, and the population of barefootedness in those countries is greater than it would be in any part of the world because Africa is a tropical country. There is poverty in India which is a place of 400 million. Are you suggesting that those countries should not be independent because they were poor? This objection to people being poor means that you must be dependent on a country based on this stupid idea of the economic position.

I think the leaders, today, are aware that independence and our economic position would be solved by asking the metropolitan countries to redress that unhappy balance which exists. What the hon. member should be doing is this. He should compliment the Government for building up the economic sector of the community so as to provide increased revenue, so as to provide employment and create a society where we would be able eventually to pay and maintain all the social services which we need, such as schools, the hospitals and the roads which we have. Anybody with a nodding acquaintance of the economic conditions of under-developed countries would know that a high labour market such as what we have in this country can only develop on having intensive industries. If a hotel is needed it is not a bad investment in our time because the ratio of employment to the amount of capital which you are going to employ in a hotel is greater than it would be in other heavier industries. You have had the experience when you built the new Hospital of the number of people which you were able to employ, and that number represents a larger number than what you would get in some other countries.

Barbados has a lot of unemployment and with a one-crop economy you must look for other avenues of employment. My own organisation prepared an economic plan of development two years ago and we pointed out that if you wanted a higher employment in a small community like this, you will have to look for the type of things which would build it up. There was a criticism levelled at the Government for not going to Harrison College and doing this and that. And it was surprising to hear that coming from the hon. member.

I am saying this. The pace which this Government has set both in its physical and economic policy in the last three years, has outstripped anything that the hon. junior member for St. George and his Government did in their whole term of office. This Government has completely revolutionised the thinking of this community. They have put more people to work in the three years that they have been in office than what the other Government can lay claims to. The last Government has absolutely no answer to what this Government is doing. The last Government would never think of doing anything with that dirty Constitution swamp. They would never have touched it. The Constitution swamp which was one of the greatest eyesores in this City has now been changed completely, and it had given the area the dignity which the Government of the hon. junior member for St. George would never think of doing. This Government has gone to the East Coast Road and is constructing it. That is something which the people were asking to be done for years, but was never done until this Government came into power. When it is finished, posterity will know what this Government has done because I do not think we might live long enough to know what the building of that road would have on the economy of this country. The fact of our being under the pressure of a colonial system is the reason why these things which the Government is forced to do are done at this stage; but while we are called upon to do these things, the British Government should give us the aid for those kinds of infra-structures which I say we are in need of.

Barbados can make a claim for no less than $20 million over the next five years to give us the infra-structure which we are in need of, and there should be no question of asking us pull our pockets to do that. I do not think that the attention which this Government has paid to the employment situation is a match for anything which the last Government did.

The hon. member's Government was in power when the Deep Water Harbour was completed, but they thought that the winning of the 1961 elections, in so far as the Deep Water Harbour was concerned, was giving an invitation to the people so that they could come and hold beers in one hand and think that the millenium had come. They felt that all the satellites of the country should be there so that they would see that they were ushering in this new light. But while they were doing that, what plans were they making for the section of displaced workers coming from the results of having a Deep Water Harbour? However, when members of that Government were outside and were looking in from the outside, you found that they were aiding and abetting the same displaced people to come and annoy those who were planning for them. I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was among those who agreed with me in a Resolution which I brought to this House in April, calling on the then Government to note that displacement would come as a result of the building of the Deep Water Harbour. When I put forward the Resolution, the hon. member and his Party which were in power then rejected the Resolution and only the members of the then Opposition voted for it. That is on record. Those are the consequences which we have to face.

Mr. MILLER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me inform the hon. member to say whether he rises on a point of order or whether it is a point of elucidation. Has the hon. member risen on a point of order?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir. I rise on a point of order to refute the statement that I did not vote on some Resolution put forward by the hon. senior member for St. Peter with respect to displacement of workers as a result of the Deep Water Harbour. I said that they could be absorbed at the Hospital.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member made a statement as to what happened to that Resolution. I understood him to say that the then Government did not support it. If the hon. junior member for St. George is rising on a point of order, he is saying whether that is false or not. Is the hon. member saying that it is not so?

Mr. MILLER: I am saying that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If it is not so, the hon. member has made his point and he must take his seat.

Mr. MILLER: No. Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must take his seat.

Mr. MILLER: I have a right to speak in this Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to take his seat for the last time.

Mr. MILLER: No, Sir, I have a right to speak in this Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unless the hon. member takes his seat, I will ask him to withdraw from the Chamber.

Mr. MILLER: I will take my seat, but I will come again. That is my right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will make a final ruling. With respect to the point which I have made, I have said that the hon. member has made his point of order and I will entertain nothing more on that point. Let the hon. senior member for St. Peter continue with his speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was developing the point to demonstrate that within the context of the hon. member's speech in which he was criticising the Government for not doing certain things, I drew to the attention of the House that a Resolution was introduced by me and it was supported by all of the members, not members of the Government Party then, in April 1961. That Resolution drew to the attention of the Government the consequences which would stem from the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. The Deep Water Harbour had not yet been opened, and therefore it was not a question of people being absorbed at the Hospital, because those people were still working at the Deep Water Harbour. That Resolution was promptly and vigorously rejected, and speeches were made condemning me and the Union. That was supported and reinforced by the Government. It is the Government's responsibility to take into consideration the things which should have been done. A Committee was set up prior to the construction of the Deep Water Harbour to consider the consequences which would follow. Notwithstanding all of these things, the Government succeeding the last Government, and faced with an unemployment bill which was a very heavy one, embarked on projects for unemployment. They embarked on projects for employment like the canalisation of the Constitution Swamp, the East Coast Road and now one of the Government's economic policies is to assist in the development of trade and industry and in the construction of some other things. They were not preaching Neo-colonialism. Now the Government is going to enter into the sector of the economy and also assist in constructing a hotel, but we do not want the Neo-colonialists to bring in all the capitalists from outside. That is one of the things from which Asia is suffering – this Neo-colonialism. So much of the investment is owned from outside and so little is undertaken from the inside that the Government has to invest in the name of the people in order that it can help in these things.

As to the purchase of land in the Scotland area – I would say that if you do not agree with the Government for buying a sugar factory, in process of time I believe that the sugar factory may have to go; but if the Government bought that factory as part of its overall plan to acquire land in St. Andrew at a price which would stabilise land values over a wide area, the Government is doing something for the preservation of prices in a very important part of the economy which is land. If you can stabilise the price of land, you stabilise investment in industry and you will give your community the sort of economy which it needs for virility and development. Which of us could say that, within the next ten years with the scientific development which is taking place in the world, the parish of St. Andrew could not become a development area when it is electrified? The land would be valued at a reasonable price which could be offered to investors, and not at a market value which would be inflated. The Government has made a wise investment in the name of the nation. If these plantations were resold and held by private hands and then resold, the price of land would increase and it would be worked out as compound interest. The community would be called upon to pay an enormous price for this land.

What is wrong if the Government decides to purchase these properties? What is wrong with the Government owning land at Graeme Hall or owning areas of land for development or for the diversification of agriculture in this island? We are dependent on sugar: but do you think that we can always be in the happy position of having a single-crop economy and we are not diversifying our economy? If we have a nice climate which we did not create, and the sea is ours which we did not have to build, is there anything wrong in exploiting these natural resources which God has given to us? Countries all over the world extract their natural resources. We do not have the resources which other countries have, but we have sunshine which thousands of people are willing to buy by coming here and spending time. What is wrong with our doing things to attract them here?
6.15 p.m.

Rich countries today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are investing in the tourist business. Europe invests heavily in the tourist business. The Minister for Scotland went to the United States earlier this year seeking American investment to develop areas in Scotland. There was an airport when you come from South America going into London when the piston engine planes were used called Prestwick, but the jets have made Prestwick redundant by flying right over it to London, and the people in Prestwick are trying to have it developed into a housing area. Those are the changes you have to make in an economically changing society like ours. The Government must be prepared to keep pace with this thinking, and I do not think that you can criticise the Government for its projections. The hon. member was a member of the last Government, but I would by no means use the language he used to describe what means they would employ to depose this Government. In the political game I am in favour of fighting your enemies or opponents on the level.

There is no point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this Budget Speech saying that the Government has done this to the poor, because there is no infliction in this Budget on any of the poor. We know why the word "poor" is being used in this Budget debate, because it is going to be broadcast, and the poor people are going to be listening. In a community like this, and in all communities, there are more poor people than those who are not poor, with the exception of the United States and some of the Scandinavian countries, because there is such a good distribution of the wealth of the community. A community that has a gross domestic product of $150 million you must expect to be a poor community, no matter how you look at it. We are living in a poor community where the population is 240,000 and the gross domestic product is $150 million; so from that premise you should analyse the Budget and see what it is doing.

With regard to the criticism that was made of the Hon. Premier, I would say that there is one thing that his opponents cannot accuse him of, and it is that he has not got courage, because whether right or wrong he has the courage to do things that are not always popular. It takes a courageous member of Government to talk about the incidence of taxation in the terms he did though he is a Socialist, because you expose yourself to all the cheap jibe you would get from people; but sooner or later any man holding a responsible position must find his responsibility catching up with him. I will read a statement from the Speech which I am very glad he made. He said that "moreover, the middle income groups in this Island are hard pressed to meet demands placed upon their resources for housing and even the normal requirements of comfortable family existence. I have, therefore, examined the feasibility of assessment of the wife's income separately from her husband's where both happen to be in receipt of incomes.

I am of the opinion that such an exercise would lead to substantial reduction in revenue which cannot be entertained at this stage of our development."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am far from a man working for a good salary, but people like myself working for a living with no other income than the one you are getting would know that, compared with what our counterparts or predecessors worked for 20 or 25 years ago and what they owned even at lower salaries, it is difficult to own some of the type homes that our predecessors owned, because relative prices have gone up, and what you have to live on would not permit you to do that. I will give you a classic example. I do not have a working wife, but any income she gets from any source is income. She is on some cinemograph business

and gets an income of $400 a year. To show the incidence of taxation, that $400 was added to my income and made me pay $126 on that $400 which she received. Am I a Rockefeller? That is the incidence of taxation you have on people like myself; so it means that if any person works for $40 more and it is added to his salary, he has to pay a higher income. Any person working for the income I get has to work hard for it, because there is only one General Secretary of the Trade Union and you will know the responsibility attached to this post. I am sure that when you analyse it, it is a lower income than Your Honour or any other member of this Chamber would recommend for that post. I would say, therefore, that there is no criticism that one can make, because you have to be realistic. When your revenue is increasing in a community, you can then have a look at your income structure or your tax structure and see how you are going to balance it.

There was a time in this community when the domestic product and investment was not the same as it is, and you had to look at these things to see from what source you could get income. When you are growing, you have to review these things, and I say that the time has come that the Government should have some expert to look at the income tax structure in the light of its general revenue, in the light of its gross domestic product and national income and see if it is in keeping with modern trends. I have my own recommendations to make to the Government for people with these incomes.

6.25 p.m.

Persons in the lower income group are assisted by the Government in the making of loans for housing. The Government could not carry an idea like that for the whole community at all levels, but I feel that there is nothing unreasonable for an examination to be made of a scheme for persons owning their houses, building or buying their homes in the same form as you make a rebate for industrial buildings. There is a proposal now that you are making a loan for industrial buildings. I feel that that sort of thing can be examined in the same way. You shall examine the idea of giving income tax rebates based, may be, on some form of valuation, so as to encourage people to engage themselves in more building of houses for themselves, and in that way you will help keep the economy buoyant because people will invest in building houses. You will maintain a high purchasing power because the more you get people expending money on things like that, the more you keep the economy vibrant and buoyant.

People in the middle income tax group find that it is extremely difficult for them to own a home. You postpone it when you do not give some rebate and that postponement means that you are postponing some of the vitality of the community. If you encourage them, it means that you are keeping a flow of the economy, and by so doing, you will be maintaining the many artisans and workers of the community.

I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the time has come when we should give encouragement to these persons in the middle income group, and you can choose whatever terms you like to help them in order to supply all the social services. As the Hon. Premier has said in his speech some days ago, that in the classification of the poor, he would not classify himself in that category nor any person like you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or myself, because the things which we can enjoy, the poor of the community cannot enjoy, and therefore, we are making our contribution to the society by the taxes which we pay and we do not want to escape that. These are considerations which I feel can be given because they stem at the economic development of the Island and keeping the economy buoyant.

While I agree to that, I do not subscribe to the view that because I have said so, what I have said must be carried out; but I do believe that these are things which can assist the economy of this Colony.

If I look away from the kind of criticisms which were made by the hon. junior member for St. George with his eye, as he said towards the next elections, let me look at the Budget with a more critical examination, and not in the light at looking at the elections where we can make a thrust. Of the whole, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Budget and the Economic Survey as was presented with it show that we are moving upward and I am very pleased to see that. With a surplus of $4.6 million no hon. member could expect that the Hon. Minister of Finance would have been so crazy as to come to us with Budgetary Proposals to increase taxation. I go further and say that when he has shown a surplus of $4.6 million, it is an excellent opportunity to carry out the survey which I have talked about or the taxation policy, because I do not consider it would be in the best interest of the community — and I am talking about the taxation — that we tax the people year after year to produce a surplus which would represent about eleven per cent more than what you estimate. But as was said, there were some fortuitous circumstances which caused that. There was a rise in the price of sugar which reflected this surplus of $4.6 million, and in the interest of the community as a whole, if we are to benefit from this fortuitous circumstance in the coming year, members of the community should be given some sort of relief. The people are entitled to it.

Equal pay for equal work is a philosophy which I have always been making in my organisation. There is no logical reason why school teachers, male or female, should not regard themselves as members of a professional class of the same equality because I do not expect from a female teacher the right to spell badly. She should not spell and leave out some of the "i's" nor in her counting should she say two and two are five and say that is how you should count and teach the girls to count that way. I do not think you can have any fundamental difference in respect of girls reading or writing and say that it is different from boys. I do not think there is a certain height of reading and arithmetic for a boy to achieve which is different from girls. Therefore, on that basis, I hope that there should be equal pay for equal work throughout the society, and wherever a woman is doing a job which requires the same skill as that of a man, she should be paid the same pay as that of a man. That is fair.

Now, Sir, I feel that the benefits which are given to the Civil Servants are benefits which they are entitled to. Civil Servants are also taxpayers; they have to pay income tax, and they form a very important sector of your community. For that reason I am of the opinion that aid or assistance given them in a relief like this is nothing which you cannot do and you should do it.

I do not subscribe to the view that because you have said that you are going to make an examination of your taxation that you are going to relieve the rich. The hon. junior member for St. George talked on this matter as if you were going to help the rich at the expense of the poor. It does not mean that if you are examining the tax structure, you are removing it. You are dealing now with it in the light of equity. A man who is prudent enough to save some of his money and re-invest it in the community, is not a drag on the community; he is a builder of society. You want to encourage them and if you can pursue avenues of investment that will help them, that is a very notable thing to do.

6.35 p.m.

Therefore, it would be grossly unfair to criticise the Budget and say that it is a Budget to reduce taxation and that it is the antithesis of anybody talking about development. The mere fact that banks are going up in your community reflects the economic growth of your country. You cannot have prosperity — and let us be quite frank about it — without any kind of economic prosperity and higher revenues of Government, your economic growth remains stagnant. Let us take the commercial banks. In the first place, these banks bring overseas investments into your community and they aid by means of the loans which they make. The hon. junior member for St. George is a businessman, and if there were no banks available, the hon. member could not expand his business in the way he has expanded it. His business has not been expanded on cash, but on loans which have been offered. If there is no economic viability in a country — one of the things from which we are suffering is that we do not have sufficient investment capital and that is why we have to seek aid and to give encouragement.

We are living in a world of competitive capital investment needs. Whenever a country gets independence, it marches to Washington D.C. When you see investment aid and pioneer industries coming in, it means that we are getting more capital. We have to be watchful to see that all of this will not be invested in such a manner that these investors will become squattors in the island. If the Government participates in anything, we are not going to have that neo-colonialistic system which took place in countries like Africa and Asia after the turn of the Second World War.

Mr. Speaker, on page two of this document the Hon. Premier made a wise statement about the Geneva Conference. This is what he said:-

"World trade has been increasing and any measures to expand trade must be welcomed by this Government, We, therefore, watch with interest the deliberations at the World Trade Conference in Geneva. It is important however, that we should know where we stand on the various issues and should not ally ourselves too closely with any of the large groups. While we favour the expansion of markets for the tropical products of under-developed countries, we oppose any reduction in the preferences which we enjoy in the United Kingdom and Canada and any modification of the commodity agreement for the sale of any sugar in Britain."

I am very glad to see that statement. The Hon. Premier spoke about the Conference in Geneva and I hope that hon. members would pay some attention to that statement. I hold a document from this Conference in Geneva, and in this document there is set out in detail some of the disabilities which face undeveloped countries. I am sure that Your Honour has read and heard from Geneva that one of the things which was facing that Conference was the wide gap between the richer nations and the poorer ones. The gap was widening and the representatives of the undeveloped countries at the Conference endeavoured to bring out a formula which would create for these undeveloped countries the narrowing and closing of this gap. Here in Barbados and in the West Indies we gave consideration to the European Common Market last year, and then the Canadian Elections took place and President DeGaulle's attitude towards the six countries prevented England from entering the European Common Market. That matter is still held in abeyance, but there is an organization which is working out some sort of economic co-operation.

I do not see how any member of this House could seriously criticise the Government for embarking on some of these proposals which aim at assisting and developing the economy as against just looking at some of the social aids which are so viable. I would like to say, also — and I drew Your Honour's attention to it earlier — that the statement which the Hon. Premier made in his Budget Speech relative to co-operatives and the assistance which he wants to give to them, I regard as another forthright and interesting statement to make at this time. I say that, and I would like to say publicly and quite frankly that we cannot go forward with the economic drive in a country which has basically a poor economy, where the savings are low, unless we harness the potential of small people and consolidate that into the co-operative movement which is going to play a very important part in the growth of this society. My own Organization is one which is endowed with the philosophy of helping the co-operative movement and I am glad indeed to say that. We are one of the few people who own properties in the City of Bridgetown, and it is my policy to dedicate our profits so as to give the sort of economic assistance which this community requires. No small co-operative could buy a building in the City of Bridgetown, but the Barbados Workers' Union owns two.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, an organization whose assets are only a quarter of a million dollars can give assistance to the co-operative movement, and with the interest which the Government is showing in the co-operative movement, it has led some of these voluntary organizations to build up these things and give the island the projection which is required.
6.45 p.m.

I welcome this and I hope that the Government will give the aid and injection to all of the co-operative movements which exist in this island for the benefit of the economy generally.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not subscribe to the view that you have reached finality in taxation; but if there is one thing I would like the Government to do it is to examine the statement which the Premier made inviting the private sector to participate in these things. He said: "I hope that by this time next year private firms and businesses will be persuaded that it is in the national interest and their own to volunteer information on their plans for expansion, replacement and investment so that the economic picture will be fully displayed."

I am very pleased to see that, because I have been writing and speaking in this country for years to past Governments and to this Government, drawing to their attention that they cannot make and accelerate progress in a small community like this unless you are prepared to integrate all of the economic sections of the community into the thinking and planning of what you have to do. You cannot isolate people and keep them away from the centre. You cannot have the businessmen on the periphery, with the Government working in the centre, and expect you are going to get the magnetism as great as if you drew them inside. My organisation prepared a memorandum on this and sent a copy to the Government. I will read what was stated in our memorandum by one of the young and brilliant, upcoming economists, Dr. George Eaton. This is what he said:-

"It is in regard to this last name objective that we shall have much to say. It is very easy to under-estimate the non-economic obstacles (social and political) which impede the achievement of high rates of economic growth. This is why authoritarian direction of the economy often appears so attractive a solution. But the method of direct controls and coercian present a threat to personal freedom and liberties. It also implies arbitrary decision-making by anonymous officials, whose competence can never be taken for granted.

As far as the trade union movement is concerned, direction presupposes the allocation and placement of labour as a factor of production among various employment alternatives.

Another limitation is that central direction involves a system of direct quantitative controls, which may provide ample scope for corruption and nepotism.

Central direction of the economy, as opposed to persuasion and inducements, also involves the use of valuable manpower and other resources merely to police the system.

If therefore direction by the coercive apparatus of the state is to be avoided, the public must then be induced to participate and contribute to the realisation of higher living standards. Unfortunately a people living in large measure at or a little above subsistence levels cannot be other than consumption-oriented. They can be asked to forego already limited consumption only if they remain convinced of better things to come, either for themselves or their immediate posterity. Sacrifices will be made only when they are led to feel responsible for their government rather than to their government. Dependence on the bounty of government is however one of the enduring vestiges of the colonial mentality. What is necessary therefore is to ensure that the public or substantial segments of it are convinced that policies proposed are designed to promote their well being — physical and spiritual. Acceptance with enthusiasm for change depends on the ability of citizens to express their views and grievances through institutions of their choosing. Sentiments of social justice must also be satisfied. A more equitable distribution of income, enhancement of the dignity of the working classes, and the guarantee of

wage earning opportunities are the important considerations of our time."

We welcome this, Mr. Speaker, and we invite the Government to ask the private sector to participate not by giving information, but we invited the Government to do some of the things that we recommended. The Barbados Workers' Union recommended to the Government in a memorandum the setting up of a National Advisory Economic Council bringing in all the other employers, investors and people in the community having an interest in these things as an advisory body, not to supersede what the Government Ministers have the ultimate responsibility for doing, but to examine, and to assist in creating a climate in Barbados where the public sector, the private sector and all sectors in the community will be co-operating together. That is the sort of assistance and co-operation which is so necessary. I feel that in approaching this matter, the Government should ignore the attitude of the last Government which would not take the community into its confidence. The Government should take the community into its confidence — men who have a vested interest in prosperity and those who have the know how — and encourage them to come into the sector with the Government so that you can have their co-operation and assistance, and not isolate them into corners or areas of responsibility. You should encourage them to come in and co-operate with the Government for the purposes of stimulating and intensifying the capital formation and investment facilities for this community. If that is done, the pace at which our economic growth will take place will beat all the prognostications of all the economists. I agree with the Government that it is a very necessary step that should be taken at this time. You should encourage the young businessmen. We have old businessmen in our midst. You will be able to get some of them, but do not rely on the old businessmen for this sort of new dispensation and exercise. Encourage the young businessmen to come forward so that we can get the vitality from this community on both sides. Do not allow the old concepts to worry you. There are a lot of businessmen in this community who are convinced and are willing to exercise their talents in the interest of this community.....
6.55 p.m.

I am very surprised to hear the coarse behaviour which is coming even from the Government Benches and, Sir, you would not believe that one of the members involved is the member who should reply to our criticisms.

Mr. SPEAKER: It may be that there may be applause.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not accept that. It may be an insult, moreso, when you are speaking in support of a Government measure and the Leader of the Government has shown that positive disregard in not extending that courtesy of listening to you. It is no wonder that we get that kind of behaviour from members on the other side, because if your friends can treat you in that kind of a way, you can expect your enemies to treat you worse. It seems that this sort of behaviour is now endemic. It is like typhoid fever.

Now, Sir, this is a vital aspect of the Hon. Premier's Budget statement. He made a statement and he also made some comments on his statement. And, I think, as this deals with an important part, I should pay some attention to it. He said:

"I hope that by this time next year private firms and businesses will be persuaded that it is in the national interest and their own to volunteer information on their plans for expansion replacement and investment so that the economic picture will be fully displayed."

If I might emphasize on that statement made by the Hon. Premier, then I would like him to know that other hon. members join with him and not only to invite them to do this, but also to give them encouragement you should invite them from an association, as I was saying, a National Advisory Council, so that you give them the sort of dignified position with an air of formality so that when they meet, they would be giving advice through a channel which they feel would be respected. This is a challenge which would bring the private sector closer to the Government's sector.

I notice in Nigeria that they have an organisation called D.C. which brings in people from outside with the State forming a part. The Government cannot find the capital to do all the things that are needed, and if you have an advisory body which would assist the Government with the things they have to do, it would be of great help. It does not take away the powers from a Minister to initiate development plans.

Now, Sir, I come to the last point. The Hon. Premier made a statement about the Airport, but he did not say what those proposals were intended to be. He said:

"Improvements to Seawell International Airport are being carried out at an average annual cost of $700,000 over and above the cost of extensive land acquisition for necessary expansion. Proposals are being worked on for certain additional charges to defray this capital expenditure over a period. The net revenue from these proposals is estimated to be in the region of $135,000 but the details have yet to be settled."

Mr. Speaker, I said I was making the last point, but I have another point to make on sport.

I feel that the time has come — and the Hon. Premier has not said what the thing is going to be — when we can impose a travel tax and it would not in any way increase the cost of living. Every passenger leaving the Seawell Airport should be called upon to pay $1.00, and the Government would make about $100,000 from that source. I believe that the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works would be able to tell me the figure. I know that they have some figures about 50,000 tourists coming here. The sum of $100,000 is not anything which we can sneeze at nor can this suggestion be regarded as something to increase the cost of living. It can be collected either as a charge on your ticket or a charge at the Emigration Department. It would mean nothing to a passenger if you took a dollar from him. If a dollar is added to the cost of his ticket, it would make no difference to a person travelling to anywhere. I know that there is something of the sort in London. If you stay in London for more than 24 hours you have to deposit at the London Airport something like five shillings. I talked of that some time ago and some hon. members wanted to say that that was not so. Well, I do not suppose that if people have extradition orders taken out against them, they will impose any such tax because Her Majesty would be sending them out. There would be somebody to take charge of you and you will be sent off in safe keeping. I say that that is something which I feel could be done.

I have no objection in giving the Government some ideas of mine. They can take them for what they are worth and they do not have to pay me any fee. As I have said, I think that there can be a travel tax imposed on people going out of the Island, and it would not increase the cost of living, but it would be an aid to the economy of the country.

With this Budget, we are not going to suffer a deficit because the price of sugar to be sold on the World Market is nearly the Commonwealth price: and if we can sell all at the price of the Commonwealth Agreement, then, our planters have nothing to complain of because they would be getting the fixed price.

Now, Sir, I feel there is another thing from which the Government can get resources. This Government has given us plenty of good roads. Motor cars are increasing and they are carrying more people. There are more accidents, it is true, and more people are getting killed, but that is the price which we pay for civilization. More people were killed last Saturday in the United States from accidents than all the people who may die from accidents in the next 25 years. The number was 2,300 odd. That is the price

which people in the largest country must pay. Death is inevitable in a society like that on the road. With good roads motor cars are lasting longer now. Our road rates are very reasonable. When you examine what the English people charge you, you realise what it is in this country for the safety of the motor car user. When you compare the rates with the rates which a person who is insuring a motor car pays, especially the high rates which he has to pay for comprehensive insurance, you will see the difference. I have a motor car which has done 48,000 miles and the car is still in good shape. It has never had any broken springs nor a broken axle; all that I have had to do with it was to change the tyres. If I were living in other countries, I would have to change the tyres about forty-eight times.

7.05 p.m.

If you get three thousand miles in roads in Dominica or in Grenada you have done quite a lot. I hope that that will not be taken as a criticism of those colonies, but we have some of the best roads in the world. The Government has the capacity to examine these things so that when it comes to a re-valuation of our taxation proposals, we can see what can be done.

Finally, I should like to say this: I do not understand the Government's logic with regard to the Entertainment Tax. When the Bill was brought in here, we were not treated with the courtesy of a reply to some of the points which were made, but, Sir, for the life of me, all I have tried to understand the Government's approach to this matter, I cannot understand it, I cannot understand how the Government is giving relief to Intercolonial and International Cricket, Test Cricket including Tennis and Athletic and Cycle Sports – the Government is giving relief to these things and it is saying that there is a difference when it comes to Football. If you are taking the Entertainment Tax off these things, then you should take it off them; but do not tell us that you are taking these things off Cricket and Tennis Athletic and Cycle Sports, but you are leaving this tax on Football.

The hon. junior member for the City spoke about boxing. If you say that you are only losing that certain amount of money in relation to boxing, then that is infinitesimal. As far as I am concerned, I would keep the tax on boxing so as to ban boxing. The Government's attitude in relation to football is one of the things in this Budget with which I am left dumbfunded; but, on the whole, the Budget gives the country an opportunity to balance and redress itself although I would not do the same thing as the Hon. Premier has done with the $4.6 million. In my opinion, I would have kept some of this $4.6 million for my future projections. The incidence of higher expenditure will come to the Government next year and anybody who can read and write will know that we have a Budget of $30 million odd and of that $30 million odd, $27 million odd is recurrent expenditure. You can send home the Police and get riots, you can send home the Nurses and let people die on the streets. You would be closing down all of these places which represent the bulk of your expenditure. You must beware of your promises. Do not promise the country that you will reduce the expenditure when you are asking for higher standards of living and more schools. You have the idea that you will reduce taxation. It has been said that if we were to create more schools and have a higher infra-structure, we would reduce taxation.

In conclusion, I would like to say this: a member of the Barbados Labour Party has criticised the introduction of television from day to day, and I have heard another member of the same Party praise the introduction of television. Mr. Speaker, what an amorphous Organisation to which they belong, that amorphous organisation which they call a Party! I am submitting, Sir, that that Organisation should not only be a memory, but a happy one. *(Cheers).*

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think we have had a full day of this debate and, at this stage, I believe that hon. members would like to have an adjournment of the House until next Tuesday. In any case, it will take some time for today's meeting to be broadcast and I am sure that by this day week the broadcast of hon. members' speeches on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Hon. Premier will not be finished. This broadcast will not be finished before the House meets again. In the circumstances, Sir, I beg to move that the further consideration of this debate be postponed.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 14th July, 1964, at 12 o'clock (Noon).

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

*The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday 14th July, 1964 at 12 o'clock (Noon), was put and resolved in the affimative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*

7.15