

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 31st August, 1948.

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

Present :

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER (*Deputy Speaker*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. R. G. WAPP, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, A. E. S. LEWIS, C. E. TALMA, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., J. A. HAYNES, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., and E. L. WARD.

Prayers are read.

Messrs. BLACKMAN, GARNER, and SMITH enter the House and take their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 24th August, 1948, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

PAPER LAID

Mr. ADAMS : Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to lay on the table of the House the following Paper:—

Statement showing sums advanced to the Colonial Postmaster for the payment of Money Orders up to the 31st July, 1948.

Messrs. CRAWFORD and HUSBANDS enter the House and take their seats.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS : Resolution for £128,500 to supplement Resolution No. 16 of the 13th April, 1948, to provide for the subsidisation of flour, salt fish, salt pork and balanced animal feed to the 31st March, 1949, in order that the price of these commodities may be stabilised at such prices as may be fixed by the Competent Authority.

Mr. BLACKMAN : Resolution to place the sum of £350 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to engage the services of a Manager for Seawell Airport to the 31st March, 1949.

Dr. CUMMINS : Resolution for £5,000 to supplement resolution No. 8 of the 25th February, 1948, for the following purposes:—

- (a) to make provision for the establishment in civil life of discharged service personnel;
- (b) to operate or participate in schemes for the training and for the care and maintenance of discharged service personnel; and
- (c) to provide a rehabilitation fund from which payments may be made.

Dr. CUMMINS : Resolution to place the sum of £248 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the salary at the rate of £325 per annum of a District Social Welfare Officer from the 1st September, 1948, to the 31st March, 1949.

Mr. TALMA : Resolution to place the sum of £3,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the rehabilitation and extension of the fishing industry of the Island.

Mr. TALMA : Bill to make provision for the definition and interpretation of certain terms and expressions, for shortening the language used in Acts and Subsidiary Legislation, and for other matters incidental thereto.

Dr. CUMMINS : Of my intention to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with to-day the Resolution for £248, of which notice has just been given.

Dr. CUMMINS : Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions, with the exception of the Resolution for £248, of which notice has been given to-day.

Mr. CRAWFORD gives notice of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly beg to acknowledge receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 14/1948 relating to the salaries to be paid the Official Reporters.

The House beg to inform Your Excellency that the Debates Committee held two meetings concerning the above salaries. The first meeting was held on the 22nd March 1948, when Hon. Dr. C. H. St. John, M.L.C., attended the meeting and agreed to the decision arrived at. At the second meeting held on the 15th day of June the only business done was to confirm the decision of the previous meeting.

Mr. Brancker then introduced into the House an Address embodying the suggestions arrived at on the

22nd day of March 1948, when the Hon. Dr. St. John was present.

At a meeting of the House on the 22nd day of June 1948, the abovementioned Address was considered and amended to read as set forth in the Address already forwarded Your Excellency.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at next meeting of this House:—

Is it a fact that the Examination for the Island Scholarship was held locally in June this year?

2. Whether in previous years, results of this Examination have been published within less than a month of the last date of such Examination?

3. Whether results of this year's Examination have yet been published?

4. If answer to query (3) (supra), is "No", will Government explain why?

Mr. COX: To enquire from the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present in the House at their following meeting:—

(1) Has the Government under consideration any plan for the implementation of the Address passed by this House in July, 1947, relative to the setting up of a Rent Restriction Board?

(2) If the answer is "yes", how soon does the Government propose to send down the necessary legislation to accomplish that end?

(3) If the answer to (1) is "no", will the Government say why?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present at next meeting of this House:

Whether Government is aware of the existence of dissatisfaction outside the southern and metropolitan parishes, in connection with the current selections of Workers for the U.S.A.?

2. Will Government investigate the present methods of selection, and intimate to those responsible the desirability of picking men by a method which will ensure that a proportionate number—from the point of view of population—will be selected from each parish?

Mr. COX: To enquire from the senior member of the Executive Committee present in the House at their following meeting:—

(1) Is the Government aware that many employees of the Department of Highways and Transport suffer great inconveniences in their attempt to reach their places of work?

(2) If the answer is "yes", will Government consider the advisability of providing adequate transportation for such employees?

(3) If the answer to (2) is "No", will Government state fully their reason?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, a Bill to make provision for the definition and interpretation of certain terms and expressions, for shortening the language used in Acts and Subsidiary Legislation, and for other matters incidental thereto is read a first time.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

MESSAGE NO. 16/1948.

His Excellency The Governor

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to his Message No. 21/1948 of the 24th of August and to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly

that he has granted an extension of ten days' sick leave to the Colonial Treasurer with effect from the 30th of August, and has appointed Mr. V. H. Chenery to continue to act as Colonial Treasurer.

HILARY BLOOD,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
31st August, 1948.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Dr. CUMMINS: Before you proceed to call the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with the Resolution for £248, of which I gave notice earlier in the day.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Rules 88 and 89 be suspended is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Order No. 3—Committee of Supply—be taken as the first Order of the day.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Order No. 3 be taken as the first Order is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

SALARY OF A DISTRICT SOCIAL WELFARE OFFICER

Dr. CUMMINS: The Resolution which I propose to deal with is for the sum of £248 to meet the salary at the rate of £325 per annum and travelling allowance at the rate of £100 per annum of a District Social Welfare Officer from the 1st September, 1948, to the 31st March, 1949.

The position, Sir, is this. The Social Welfare Officer, Mr. L. A. Chase, as honourable members are well aware, has been going backward and forward and has even been visiting different places—Surinam and the U.S.A. for example—in connection with schemes for emigration consequently, some of his work as Social Welfare Officer has lagged. In addition, he is now, I believe, on pre-retirement leave and will be retiring very shortly. Further, Miss Arne who has been acting for him is about to leave the island on long leave in a few weeks' time and, probably, may not return. So you will see that there is need for someone in the Service having a knowledge of this work in order that it may be continued and there is a Barbadian lady, at present in the island, who has had the advantage of being trained in England in social welfare work and is fully qualified to take charge of this work. It is proposed that this Resolution should be dealt with to-day for two reasons. The first is that this lady has been either offered or may be offered a similar position in a neighbouring colony and her services will be lost to the island and the second is that it is advisable to appoint someone as soon as possible to be associated with Miss Arne during the short period prior to her leaving for England. The salary will be at the rate of £325 per annum, with travelling allowance at the rate of £100 per annum. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Before you put the question, Sir, I would just like to say that a case can always be made out, showing the necessity for Social Welfare Officers. So far as we have heard from the senior member for St. Thomas, this person is to be appointed a District Social Welfare Officer but, in the circumstances, we can see that she will have to act for the Social Welfare Officer or the Assistant Social Welfare Officer because the former is about to retire and the latter is about to go on leave in the near future. I would like any member of Barbados Welfare Limited to give me some idea of the duties which this District Social Welfare Officer will have to perform. The next thing I would like to know is this: If we agree to this request and commit ourselves to the appointment of a District Welfare Officer, will we by our act of agreement be legally creating such an office? Another thing is this. I quite realize that until this office is created, it will be difficult to put the officer in the schedule of the Travelling Allowance Act. In the circumstances I agree to this proposal but I would like to voice my disapproval of lump sum payments for travelling. I think it is the wrong method.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I can hardly visualize any opposition to this Resolution for the simple reason that I think we all appreciate the advisability of having on the higher levels of employment in the Social Welfare Department trained natives. I say that for the purpose of emphasizing that I sincerely hope that in the very near future, both of the senior offices in this Department will be filled by qualified West Indians. It is unreasonable to expect that non-West Indians—I do not mind how highly trained they may be—can be of the service to the people of this colony in a field such as social welfare as qualified West Indians can and will be. The latter know more about the sociological conditions of the country; they were brought up among the people; they can more easily and more readily interpret the feeling of the people and appreciate what their reactions at any given time would be. For these and other reasons, it ought to be fairly evident that social welfare in this colony can only be developed along the most effective lines if its development rests to a great extent, or almost completely, in the hands of qualified local people.

Dr. WILSON enters the House and takes his seat.

Dr. CUMMINS: I thought, Sir, that the junior member for the City was fully conversant with all the previous activities of Barbados Welfare Limited, such as establishing playing fields and organizing housecraft centres and things of that sort. If the House passes the Bill to amend the Vestries Act on the Order Paper, the playing fields will be looked after by the Vestries of the parishes in which they are or may be located. Also there is on the Order Paper, for some time now, a Resolution under the provisions of the Colonial Secretary's Office Act for the appointment of a Secretary for Social Services and Local Government whose duties will be to take charge of the secretarial responsibilities in connection with the Departments of Medical and Health, Education, Prisons and Reformative Institutions and this District Social Welfare Officer would naturally work under him.

Mr. SYMONDS enters the House and takes his seat.

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

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the Chairman reports the passing of this Resolution in Committee of Supply.

The House resumes and on the motions of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the Resolution is read a first and a second time and is agreed to.

THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume debate on the motion for the second reading of a Bill to amend the law relating to Income Tax. When the debate was postponed on the last occasion, the senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—I was exposing last week that the premises on which Government based its argument in favour of this Income Tax Bill are all completely wrong and since the premises are wrong, obviously the conclusions would have to be incorrect. It is unnecessary to recapitulate what has already gone before but I certainly will remind the House that the two main premises advanced by the Government to support its present contention are (1) a short crop and (2) an anticipated drop in Customs revenue. Well now, ten months ago every schoolboy and every schoolgirl in this colony knew that we would have a short crop this year but really for the life of me I cannot understand how the fact of a short crop this year is going to be reflected in this year's revenue from income tax. The revenue from income tax, as a result of this short crop, will be reflected in next year's income tax Returns, not this year's. In other words, Sir, the only people in this colony who apparently would assert that the shorter crop this year is going to interfere with the revenue from income tax this year would be the members of the Government. Then, Sir, we were told that the other reason was this drop in Customs revenue. Since last year when His Excellency the Governor inaugurated the present session, he warned us that there would certainly be a heavy reduction in imports from all sources and in his address to the Legislature he also went on to say that such a reduction would be reflected in the colony's revenue figures. Those of us who did not know that before were forced to realize it then. Last week in moving the second reading of this Bill, the senior member for St. Joseph declared that the figures from Customs receipts would be considerably smaller this year than they were last year. That was no original information; it is what we all expected. Then the junior member for the City actually based almost his whole argument on the fact that we are now faced with a deficit from Customs revenue and he asked "how can we balance the Budget unless we get increased revenue from some other source?" He then twitted one of the honourable members on my left for failing to tell the Government some method which would enable it to balance the Budget, faced as it is with this deficit from Customs revenue. Now, Sir, the fact that the revenue from Customs this year will be less than it was last year has as much to do with the Bill before us as the flowers that bloom in Spring tra, la, la, la. We actually budgeted in March this year for the sum of £677,940 from Customs revenue; that is the figure which the same Government felt would be less than last year's, in view of the fact that we would have a short crop this year and in view of our restricted imports; that is the figure which the same Government felt would be enough to assist in carrying on the colony for the financial year 1948-49. The Government budgeted for that amount from Customs revenue and there we are. Now, this is the end of the first four months of this year. The financial year began in April and we have the figures from the Colonial Treasurer for the months of April, May,

June and July. After hearing what the Government's spokesman had to say, it will very probably surprise the House to learn that the actual receipts from Customs revenue for the first four months of this financial year are really about £10,000 more than the average which the Government budgeted for in March. The receipts from Customs at the end of July this year amount to £236,910, 16s. and we have to bear in mind that those first four months of the financial year are, generally speaking, the worst, from the point of view of revenue from the Customs. If even it were based, say for instance, on the claim that the revenue would not be the same every month, that it would fluctuate, that you could not expect to collect £25,000 or £30,000 in April and a similar amount in September, even making allowances for that, those first four months are the worst of the whole financial year for the simple reason that around September and October when the Christmas goods start to arrive, their arrival would always be reflected in a substantial rise in receipts from Customs and, further, considerable quantities of goods are also imported during the closing months of the year in order to cope with the increased spending capacity of the people during the crop season. So that it is safe to assume that for the remaining eight months of the financial year, comparatively speaking, the receipts from Customs will be far greater than they were during the first four months. Therefore, Sir, we see that the argument that there is a drop or an expected drop in Customs revenue does not mean a single thing, and it is certainly inappropriate and unnecessary to compare the receipts from Customs this year with those of any preceding year. If you are going to talk about 1947 you may as well talk about 1937 and say that the receipts in that year from Customs were £100,000 more: they have nothing to do with the present case. The only point at issue is what percentage of the entire amount budgeted for from Customs revenue has been collected during the part of the financial year which has already expired. And if the figures for those first four months are so low that we can justifiably expect to realize less than we have budgeted for, then let us begin to get apprehensive. But I repeat that the figures for the first four months of this financial year, in respect of Customs revenue, are really over £10,000 in excess of the sum which the Government budgeted for in March this year. Now, the Government seems to be rather worried. It has the sneaking feeling that, after all, if it were to go and increase the income tax rate on companies to the proposed level it may in some way or other be doing harm to the industrial development of the country. Even the members of the Government have been able to realize that the income tax rate in any colony, unless you are already giving certain concessions to new industries, will affect the tempo of its industrial development, and that is why the senior member for St. Joseph was at pains to declare that this colony has done no less than any other colony to attract new industries. The junior member for the City, in reference to the same question of industrial development, wanted to know what those new companies wanted. Said he "We have heard a lot about industrial development and companies wanting to come in here. What exactly do they want?" "I do not know what they want", says he. I, therefore, want to quote two paragraphs from the Trinidad and Tobago Aid To Industries Ordinance in the hope that they will convince the senior member for St. Joseph that far from saying "We have done no less than any other colony", we have not begun to do anything at all and at the same time to answer the question of the junior member for the City as to what companies

which desire to establish new industries in this island really want.

The Trinidad and Tobago Ordinance is cited as The Income Tax (In Aid of Industry) Ordinance. It was passed in July last year.

Mr. SPEAKER: You had better give the gist of what you are quoting rather than read it verbatim.

Mr. CRAWFORD: They are only two short sections, Mr. Speaker, and you know what legal phraseology is like.

Mr. SPEAKER: Go on.

Mr. CRAWFORD: To give a précis, it permits any person who incurs capital expenditure on the construction of a building or structure which has been or is to be an industrial building or structure occupied for the purposes of a trade carried on either by him or a lessee to be allowed a deduction equal to one-tenth of such capital expenditure, in ascertaining his chargeable income for the year of assessment. Then, Sir, another important section of the Ordinance permits a person carrying on trade who incurs capital expenditure on the provision of machinery or plant for the purposes of the trade to be given an allowance equal to one-fifth of the expenditure when it comes to rating him for income tax. The Ordinance allows sugar estates which want to construct houses for workers employed by the estates to deduct a sum equal to one-tenth of the capital expenditure, provided that the capital expenditure does not exceed \$4,000. The Jamaica Industries (Tax Relief) Act permits a firm which spends money on new buildings, new plant and machinery, and new equipment, for the purpose of setting up a new manufacturing establishment or of expanding an existing manufacturing establishment to deduct one-fifth of its total expenditure on all such items from its chargeable income subject to income-tax in each of the first five years after the new establishment or extension begins to operate. The Bill itself seeks to encourage the immediate expansion and development of manufacturing industries in order to provide employment, in a wider range of occupations, and to diversify the present economy of the island; it makes possible assistance to new investment in buildings, plant, machinery and equipment which will be additions to the employing-giving assets situated in Jamaica, as distinct from transfers of ownership in existing assets such as land, and finally, Sir, the Bill generally intends to make all profits earned by such assets completely free of income-tax for the first five years, and not to diminish the value of this assistance by making firms who receive it subsequently pay more in taxation than they would otherwise have had to pay.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has quoted enough of those measures.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think so too. Now, Sir, I want to know in which volume of the Laws of Barbados can any such Act be found. If it does exist I make bold to assert that the only person who is aware of it is the senior member for St. Joseph; since he has declared in a most dogmatic manner that we have done no less than any other colony he must have some special knowledge of its existence which is denied to other ordinary mortals in this Assembly. Hence, we can readily see that that is another false premise. We have done nothing comparable to what other colonies have done to attract new industries or to enable them to be started here. We are proposing to put our rates of income tax on a basis which may induce a person who is desirous of establishing a new industry in this island to say "there is no point after all in undertaking the risk of establishing a new industry in a colony like Barbados because there are no concessions to be given, the rate of tax is the same as that in the country in which we are now operating and we may as well stay where we are." It is my contention, Sir, that if and when we shall have made it possible for

potential investors to come here and, as the Jamaica Bill so properly puts it, assist in the economic development of the country, when we shall have done that then it is time for the Government to come to this House and say "we are going to put our rates as high as they are in an industrialized country like Britain." Any imbecile can see that until we have done that, we are certainly going to repel rather than attract new industries to come to this island. And, in passing, Sir, last week I referred to the fact that Pasold Ltd., a European Textile firm, which wanted to come here has been attracted to Trinidad and Jamaica and I also said, in passing, that Jamaica Knitting Mills was importing our yarn, knitting it in Jamaica and shipping to Barbados the finished product for which we have to pay an exorbitant price. The position with regard to the local Cotton Plant is even made more serious because I understand that Jamaica Knitting Mills has since informed us that now that yarn can be obtained from America it may no longer need yarn from Barbados and we may have to close our yarn producing centre sooner or later. When we recall that Pasold's was willing to establish a textile plant here or to make some arrangement to take the yarn we produce we can appreciate how important it is for the country not to place obstacles in the way of permitting new industries to be established in Barbados. So far as I know, Sir, all we have ever been told by the senior member for St. Joseph that the Government is willing to do on this question is to control all the profits and wages—which the Trade Unions will do—or to have government ownership of some or all of the shares—in what does not exist. As a matter of fact, at the same time we had the debate on industrial development in this Chamber in February this year, there was then in residence at Hotel Windsor the representative of an English firm who wanted to establish a confectionery plant in this colony.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am thinking whether the honourable member is in order in bringing that up. You are quite in order in saying that nothing has been done to encourage the establishment of new industries but to mention the names of firms is going a little bit beyond the scope of this debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not intend to labour that point but I should like to state that as a result of that debate, that English representative left and went to Trinidad.

Mr. SPEAKER: Whatever was done in that particular case has nothing to do with this Bill before us.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Government seems to claim that inasmuch as it has given all the assistance it can to new industries, we are at liberty to go ahead and put our income tax rates as high as we like but I am trying to show that that premise is false.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is quite in order to say that this Bill may be preventing the establishment of new industries but what I am trying to show the honourable member is that the firm he is talking about intended to establish here before this Bill was introduced.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will continue that part of my argument by saying that the Government has actually driven out of the colony a potential investor who would have manufactured in this island a line of confectionery, including, for instance, chocolate bars for which we now pay 14c. and 15c. each from England. We can get the same chocolate bar from Canada to be sold here for 6c. or 7c. which would have been manufactured and sold here for 5c., thereby giving employment to people and keeping a lot of money in the country. Last week I dwelt at length on how we lost the big textile firm of Pasold's through the same thing (A VOICE: Who got him?) An honourable member asks "who got him?" I have been informed that Trinidad and Jamaica have him; that he may

establish a plant in each of those two colonies. Now, Sir, as to this Bill itself I am very doubtful whether we are going to get a single cent more by way of income tax as the result of it and implicit in the remarks of the junior member for the City is almost the same apprehension. As a matter of fact, the junior member for the City declared that we have taken no steps to regulate the amount of money which any public company could allocate to Reserve; he mentioned quite accurately, I think, that a country like Canada had done that and the inference was that in the absence of any regulation or law fixing the amount which a large public company could put to its Reserve, this Bill is useless, and in the case of private companies the position may be even worse.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of explanation. I think, Sir, that the honourable member is misquoting me. The honourable member must understand that I was dealing with a deficit in the revenue this year and the Returns to which this tax will apply for 1948 have already been sent in; so that any manipulation would have to take place from next year. I hope the honourable member would appreciate that, when he is making his remarks.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member is reported as saying: "To say that in asking companies to pay an extra 1s. 4d in the pound on their net profits would bring economic ruin to the country was sheer nonsense and only an attempt to sidetrack the issue. It was not a matter of taxing the entire profits of a Company but of taxing what the Company had decided it could put aside as a Reserve against certain contingencies." Then he went on to say that in a country like Canada where no bombs fell they restricted the amount of profits which companies could put to Reserve but that nothing like that was done in Barbados. And I am saying that implicit in his remarks there is apprehension that in the absence of any regulation fixing the amount which a company could put to Reserve or, for that matter, it could distribute to its shareholders it is highly improbable that we would get any more money through fixing the rate of income tax at 8/- in the pound. If even the Income Tax Returns have already gone in, the tax is not there for a year. What I can foresee is this: The big companies in this island, such as West Indian Rum Refinery which is supposed to have a Reserve of about £75,000 would not put a cent more to Reserve. I repeat, Sir, that what I fear is that this increased tax will really hit small companies at the moment harder than it will hit large companies—very much harder. I can visualize, Sir, one or two of the Motor Repair Shops which have been recently established and registered in this island as companies or a small drug store with a capital of £600 making a profit of £160 in the first year with, perhaps, two partners. By the time they have finished paying trade tax and income tax at this proposed rate, they will be left with less than \$15 a month each for a year; whereas in the case of a company with a £50,000 or a £100,000 capital and a profit of £10,000 or £12,000, it does not affect it as much, bearing also in mind that the smaller company may have to look for money to pay part of the capital which it borrowed to start the firm. What the Government should have done, even now in view of all the surrounding circumstances, was to have instituted an Excess Profits Tax. The Government is very fond of asking Mr. H. O. Emtage for advice. On the matter of an Excess Profits Tax, it should have asked him for advice as to maximum percentage to be allowed on your investment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think you can debate that point now. You can say that the Government should have instituted an Excess Profits Tax but I am not going to allow any discussion to-day on the merits or demerits of such a tax. The point at issue is the proposed increase in the rate of income tax on

companies and whether there should be an Excess Profits Tax or not does not come within the scope of this debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to emphasize the point that the imposition of an Excess Profits Tax under these conditions would have been far more beneficial than this proposed increase in the rate of income tax on companies.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can say that if you like but you cannot discuss the merits or demerits of an Excess Profits Tax in the course of this debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If Your Honour rules that I cannot debate it I will not but I am sure that it will be generally conceded that that is the step which should have been taken. Even now the war is over, in view of the absence of certain regulations and certain laws from the Statute Books of the colony, if we really hope to get some revenue over and above what we expect, the correct way to go about it would be to introduce an Excess Profits Tax rather than to suggest an increase in the rate of income tax on companies. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that every single argument on which the Government has based its case has been shown to be wrong, we are forced to ask ourselves this question: "Exactly what is the reason for the introduction of this Bill?" Normally, we fix the rates of income tax very much earlier in the year. This is almost on the verge of September and we are now discussing them. We are faced with a General Election just around the corner and it seems completely certain, Sir, that the introduction of this Bill is not unassociated with playing at politics. Earlier in the year, the senior member for St. Joseph elsewhere than this Chamber, declared that this Government had been able to soak the rich to the extent of £400,000. When we came to the actual facts and figures which were presented to us in the Budget we discovered that the excess over the estimated revenue was really £330,000 and we also discovered that the greater portion of that excess was from Customs revenue and not from the rich. As a matter of fact the same honourable member actually declared during his budget speech that that excess of revenue over and above the original estimate was due to no wilful wangling on the part of the Government; in other words, it was purely fortuitous. But he knows, as everybody else knows, that it is impossible to reconcile the actual facts of the case with his claim to have soaked the rich. This Bill appears to do the latter and he tries to delude himself that he could afford to put the rate at this level, since the Government has taken all the steps it can to attract new industries. Now, Sir, the senior member for St. Joseph also knows that this Bill, even if it is passed by this Chamber, does not have the slightest chance of being passed by the Other Place and, therefore, would not become law this year. As a matter of fact, he knew, as we all read subsequently in the newspapers, that the President of the Other Place, himself a member of the Executive Committee, asked the Governor for permission to oppose the Bill and he also knew, as we all know, that it is extremely unlikely that a member of the Other Place will be found to second a motion for the second reading of this Bill if and when it goes before that Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the line on which you are arguing now has anything to do with the proposed increase in the rate of income tax on companies or with leaving it as it is.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am merely stating that to substantiate my claim that this is an attempt at playing politics.

Mr. SPEAKER: Ah, yes! but I intended to stop you just now when you were speaking about playing politics because that again has nothing to do with the proposal to increase the rate of income tax on companies, as contained in this Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It has a lot to do with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Maybe, but it will not be allowed in a debate in this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I am saying, Sir, is that, bearing in mind the circumstances, the Bill is pure political propaganda at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: That may be an argument which one could use somewhere else but not in this Chamber.

VOICES: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am sure you will allow me to say what I am going to say now. As a matter of fact, my colleagues and myself were so sure that it was a question of playing politics that we intended to move an amendment to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable member to abandon that part of the debate altogether. So far, the debate has been carried on on perfectly fair and on good lines. The reasons for and the reasons against the Bill have been stated but you are importing something else into the debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Suppose I put it this way: I can very easily move an amendment to the effect that the proposed rate be 10/- in the pound.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can do that in Committee; you cannot do it now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I meant "in Committee". I can do that and the result would be the same as if the proposed rate of 8/- in the pound were approved by this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before you can move any amendment to the Bill you will have to give it its second reading.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It will not be passed this session; the senior member for St. Joseph was told so at the Executive Committee and we read in the Press a statement to the effect that it will not be passed this session. My opinion, Sir, is that if we were to make this rate eight bobs, ten bobs or 20 bobs in the pound, we still are not going to get another cent more in the Treasury this year and, in any case it does appear to me that it is far better, in the interest of the colony as a whole, to have 200 firms, at least for the next five years, paying the lower rate than to have 100 firms paying a higher rate, in the former instance you make more money, you employ more people. And frankly, Sir, may I be allowed to recall the advice which the senior member for St. Joseph gave in connection with the emigration of labourers to Surinam when he said that even if they were dissatisfied with the wages offered, it was better for them to get there first and start making a row after they got there. I claim that it is far better for us to get the firms here first. After we shall have got them here, then we can, if we like, soak them at the same rate as Great Britain or any other country does but do not start to soak them before they come. Two hundred firms paying 7 bobs in the pound would mean a lot more to us than half the number paying 8 or nine bobs in the pound. Your income tax rates should only reach saturation point, so to speak, or should be placed at the highest possible level when your country has also reached saturation from the point of view of industrial development. Frankly, Sir, this question of industrial development is much too dear to my heart for me to participate in any action which, I think, may hinder it. A few years ago, at considerable sacrifice I went to Puerto Rico to see what they are doing there and what I saw has convinced me more than ever that the only future for this country lies along the path of industrial development.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member can make that statement but beyond that, you cannot carry it any further. You are perfectly in order to say that a higher rate of income tax may hinder industrial development.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I merely say that, so as to emphasize that I am willing from my seat in this

Chamber to vote for income tax at the rate of 8/- or 9/- or 10/- in the pound or even more if immediately before we pass the Bill to that effect we made it perfectly plain to the outside world that people who want to come here and provide work for our people will be given concessions for a certain period to enable them to do so. There is the desire, we know, to get as much as we can out of the old established firms who happen to have reserves and are making money but in the anxiety to get at their profits, do not let us fool ourselves that unless we put the horse before the cart we shall eventually find ourselves in the position in which there will be very few sources from which we can collect revenue. The junior member for the City seemed to have made the point that because the clerks in Bridgetown are underpaid, because they are exploited, because they receive unfair treatment at the hands of their employers, we should go ahead and fix the rate of income tax on companies as high as we can. We all know that, perhaps, more than half of the number of clerks in the City are underpaid; we all know that half the number or more could be better treated. But, Sir, to come to this House and merely declaim demagogically against the evils which exist in the City is not in itself a sufficient reason for hiding the real facts at issue. The junior member for the City is the leader of the Clerks' Trade Union and certainly as a Trade Union leader he has it within his power to lead the members of his Union in such a manner as to see that they get what they are entitled to, that their grievances are redressed along the constitutional lines to which we have grown accustomed in wage disputes. When I feel that any of the people among the workingclasses of this country whom I represent are entitled to proper wages, there is no limit to what I will do (Cheers and Laughter). Some honourable members seem to think that that is a joke. When they were telling the sugar workers in 1945 that they could not get what we were claiming, we brought them out on strike and held up the reaping of the crop, in spite of opposition from members on the other side of the table.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must keep to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I am saying, Sir, is this: It is not enough to claim that because 400 or 500 clerks in Bridgetown are not receiving the wages to which they are entitled and because they have no pension rights, the only way we can do what is right is to impose a high rate of tax on their employer. They do not gain a thing by so doing and at the same time we are preventing potential employers from coming to this country. Let these potential employers come in first and then the leader of the Clerks Union and the leader of the other Trade Unions should know what to do to ensure that the employees get the treatment to which they are entitled. It may appear, on the face of it, to be good politics to say that employees are underpaid and, therefore, the rate of income tax on companies should be fixed higher in Barbados but that does not help the employees. They do not want to know that more money is being put into the Treasury; what they want to know is that the Government is getting its fair share and that they are also getting their fair share, both by way of employment and returns for their employment. And how better can we serve them than by ensuring for them a larger number of potential employers? In that way, their services will be at a premium and if they are being exploited now, other employers may come in and may be more inclined to see that they are properly treated because they are in the habit of treating people better outside. When there is only a handful of employers to whom workers can look for

employment, what is the result? The workers are told "If you do not work with me, you will not work with anybody else." "Who is going to employ you?" they are asked. "You cannot employ yourself, so you either take what I offer you or leave it" and that is why the leader of the Clerks Union finds himself so impotent.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I point out to the honourable member that he is not keeping to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let us face facts, Sir. Let us realize, as even the Government itself realizes, that if proper provision had been made for ensuring the maximum employment for people in this country and no obstacle had been placed in the way of ensuring that, and that if we had taken every possible step to increase our national income, if we had done those things, Sir, then we could hope and say "Well now, that part of the matter has been attended to; let us go ahead now and see to it that we get the maximum contribution from those business firms who, so far, have had full opportunity to exploit the people employed by the commercial firms in the City of Bridgetown." I am in agreement, Mr. Speaker, with the Clause of the Bill which will extend a further allowance to income taxpayers in certain categories and, therefore, I propose to support the second reading of the Bill in order to ensure this relief to those people who deserve it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. George seconded the motion for the postponement of the debate on the last occasion. The honourable member has the right to speak now, if he so desires.

Mr. DOWDING: So much has been said, Mr. Speaker, that I refrain from speaking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I have listened to-day to a long discourse on matters apart from the purpose of this Bill. We have heard a lot of things that could be more applied, may be, when the House is prorogued and there is a General Election but, Sir, with your indulgence I had to endure the talk. I do not want to give this House another exercise, another marathon, another long speech to be recorded in the Debates but I would like to say briefly that the purpose of this Bill is one of those things that we have to do at some time in the matter of taxation, that is, taxing people who can afford to pay. But this age and our times are producing people who are trying to defend the class that really needs no defence by them. I heard, Sir, mention made by the last speaker—and that is the only point that caused me really to make comparison with the speech he has made because for practical purposes I would have ignored it—that he represents the workers which, to my mind, is a misnomer. When the honourable member speaks about 200 firms establishing industries in this island, I would like to know where those 200 firms will come from. Count the number of businesses we have here now and see if there is any possibility of 200 other industrial firms establishing in this island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the senior member for St. Philip was only giving an example. He said that it is better to have 200 firms paying a lower rate of income tax than 100 firms paying a higher rate. I do not think that he was really stating as a fact that 200 firms wanted to establish themselves here.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir, but what is the purpose of giving an example? An example is not only given for the purpose of saying something. You give an example to make an impression on others. Any person who intends to give an example must have some purpose, otherwise he can say 2,000,000 firms and it would mean the same thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member would be quite in order to say 2,000,000 firms.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When someone gets up in this House of Assembly and gives an example, that example should be in relation to certain facts. When the honourable member, Mr. SPEAKER, speaks about these firms which, he alleges, want to come in, what has that to do with the present problem which confronts us? I do not want to go in for personalities but the senior member for St. Andrew spoke on this matter and this is what I want to draw to the attention of this House. Mention was made about companies in this island paying trade tax as well as income tax, but Mr. Speaker, this is no new imposition; this is something that has been going on for the longest time. But you will find in the constituency which I have the honour to represent and where the senior member for St. Andrew is a member of the local Authority, that people who live in small chattel houses and who never paid taxes before are now called upon to pay.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the honourable member to carry that any further.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The reason why I brought that to your attention is because I heard the junior member for St. James and the senior member for St. Andrew make reference to the trade tax which companies pay in comparison with the income tax.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think there was any comparison. What was said was that in addition to the trade tax, a company pays income tax. I should like to point out that a company pays income tax after it has paid its trade tax and that trade tax is allowed as part of the company's expenses in respect of the payment of income tax.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It was argued on the floor of the House that it would be a great hardship on companies if they were made to pay this additional income tax but if individuals who make no money but simply depend on the poor wages they receive and if poor agricultural labourers who never paid taxes before on their chattel houses are now called upon to pay—

Mr. SPEAKER: That is entirely irrelevant because the tax which those people pay is not a trade tax.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I appreciate the fact that that is an occupancy tax.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then it is irrelevant.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. Anyone can understand that the purpose of this Bill is really to tax people who can afford to pay. The junior member for the City made a fine speech on the second reading of it and I do not think I can add to what he said. But in view of what we hear and know the people need, of the social measures for which provision has to be made, of the improvements which have to be made now and which were never made 40 or 50 years ago when the companies paid no income tax, if you can say that there is a lot of malnutrition in St. George and St. Philip, for instance, and that as a result people are dying by the fifties and that the Government must do something to remedy that state of affairs, then I ask "who should pay for these things?" If the companies cannot pay this tax, then no person in the community should pay taxes at all. If this country must be properly run, I am yet to discover the evergreen tree which you can shake and obtain the money necessary to run it. When you hear about poor people in these companies, poor people forsooth! If the people who have investments in the companies are poor, well God help those who have none! I say that the statement that the imposition of 1/4 more in

the pound will keep out new industries has nothing to do with this Bill. I want to say here and now that any company, it matters not where it comes from, which makes money should pay income tax on it. We have to be very careful about this suggestion of exempting new industries from the payment of income tax for three, four or five years. Poor people have to pay Customs duties. Every time a man buys a hat, he has to pay the duty. I have not reached the stage where I am capable of defending the big, rich companies in this island; they are always able to defend themselves. But I repeat that if they cannot pay and it is too hard on them, then let us wipe out all Customs duties, let us prevent the small people from paying any sort of tax because if a man in business cannot pay then I say that we should not worry to make the poor people pay. One shilling and four pence in the pound, to my mind, cannot ruin any of these businesses. The junior member for St. James talked about setting a sprat to catch a whale. Well, I have seen many a sprat in this country catch many a whale. Many a small business in this City has eventually been able to buy some of the big businesses in it. If I were born in circumstances such as those in which the junior member for St. James was born I would do the same thing he is doing, that is, protect my interests. But it is a horse of another colour when you see some of these jackdaws trying to sing the same tune he is singing, a thing he does not want them to do. I am saying that the junior member for St. James and his clique are quite capable of attacking an Income Tax Bill that affects their interests. The senior member for St. Joseph could not expect to bring a Bill of this nature before the House and hope to get the support of the junior member for St. James and his clique because it must affect them. But those who try to join in their chorus are not wanted. As an honourable member has said, the General Election is around the corner.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled that any reference to that is out of order and I hope that the honourable member will not discuss it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not intend to go against your ruling, Sir. The record of this debate is going to be proof positive to the people of those who really represent them.

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER adjourns the House until 2.45 p.m. in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

RESOLUTION *Re* DEATH OF MR. C. H. KINCH.

On re-assembling,

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to move the passing of a Resolution of sympathy in connection with the death of Mr. C. H. Kinch.

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

Mr. WILKINSON: When I opened my paper this morning I read that Mr. C. H. Kinch had passed away. I remember when I first became a member of this House about 16 or 17 years ago, that he was one of the senior members of the House. Mr. Kinch was not one of those persons blessed with a flow of oratory, but he was sincere in what he said. He was absolutely fearless. I do not think that he was ever selected as a member of the Executive Committee. In those days we did not have the present system and Mr. Kinch was a fierce and fearless attacker of the Government on anything which he thought was not for the benefit of the island and particularly for the parish of St. Andrew. I think it would be very fitting for the House to pass this Resolution; that this House desires to record its appreciation of Mr. Kinch's services in this House as a representative

for the parish of St. Andrew for so long a period; and to express its sympathy with his widow.

Mr. HAYNES: I was privileged to have Mr. Kinch as my colleague for three years during my membership of the House. I did not always identify myself with his views but I always felt that he was genuine and sincere in whatever he supported. He was a member of this House for about 22 years and at the time when he regrettably lost his seat he was the senior member of this House. I beg to second the motion of the hon. junior member for St. James for the passing of this Resolution.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, hon. members standing in their places at the request of Mr. SPEAKER.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 61 (A) AND 61 (B)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) in order to continue Government Business.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to make the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) be now suspended.

Mr. BLACKMAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: When the adjournment for lunch took place, the motion for the second reading of a Bill to amend the law relating to Income Tax was under debate. The honourable junior member for St. Peter was about to speak.

Mr. HUSBANDS: It is with much gratification that I note that those who spoke in opposition to this Bill are yet praising the Government for its laudable aim in introducing a Bill that will make provision for the many social enterprises to which the Government has committed itself, enterprises such as educational facilities, improved health facilities, road construction and so forth; and it has been declared by the honourable mover that since there is a deficit in the Estimates of public revenue, there was no alternative other than introducing a Bill of this nature. I have listened with pains to see if any of those honourable members who are opposing this Bill would have been able to offer any alternative other than increasing the income tax rate on companies, but none of them has done so. It was amusing to me to listen to some honourable members; I think it was the honourable senior member for St. Philip who very amusingly said that the correct way to go about replacing this deficit in revenue would have been to do something. Well, we have to do something now and that is, as I see it to increase the income tax rate on companies in this island. As regards what we have heard mentioned about the setting up of industries, it has never struck me that, in the matter of introducing a Bill to increase the income tax rate on companies, the Government should declare its policy as to the concessions which it would grant to would-be foreign companies operating in Barbados. We have had to suffer the indulgence of having to listen to speeches which have been distinctly away from the point of increasing this tax. It is superfluous to repeat that this deficit in revenue still remains and whatever criticism may have been offered against what the Government may have done, it does not in any way remedy the position. In my routine as a Trade Unionist I have been asked by people in business as to what my views on this Bill are. I have told

them that if this Government as a Labour Government must continue its policy as regards social improvements, it must see to it that the revenue of this country is kept up to the extent at which it can carry out that policy. That is my view and I am standing by it. Some of what I have heard amounts to a threat that this Bill might be defeated: as a matter of fact, one honourable member, I think it was the honourable senior member for the City, glibly passed over a condition which, in his opinion, might obtain if this Bill became law. He says that companies might over-capitalise, and that to my mind, is really a reflection on the honour of the people of this island who conduct such businesses. It has been suggested that people would do such and such a thing just for the sake of defeating this Bill, and I feel that the sooner such people leave us the better it will be for them. The honourable junior member for St. James has mentioned that companies must make provision for capital and loss and depreciation, but companies have always in the past been making provision for these matters. These things are not contingent on the introduction of this Bill; companies which are properly run will continue to be run so that it does not matter when you introduce a Bill of this nature. The immediate aim of this Bill is to replace a certain deficit and nobody can gainsay that. The hon. senior member for St. Philip in explaining the reason for the deficit, thought that he was making a strong point against the Bill when he was doing nothing of the kind. As soon as a man begins to explain a thing he admits it. We are faced with a deficit and the only means for meeting it that would not work a hardship on the people who are least able to bear additional expense, is to impose this additional tax on companies.

Mr. GARNER: There is not much that I can say on this Bill: because I think nearly every point has been made by other honourable members and after hearing the pros and cons in respect of it I can come to no other conclusion than that this is the wrong time for the introduction of such a Bill. I agree with my colleague when he said that if the Government had made certain concessions or had put an Act on the Statute Book before they brought forward this Bill, then we, as Labourites, would, in duty bound, have to support this Bill. But because things were not done in that way, we find ourselves obligated to vote to the contrary. First of all, I would like to point out that there is a fairly healthy state of affairs where our Treasury is concerned coupled with the fact that we have a very recalcitrant Government. We have been intimidated for the past two years by His Excellency the Governor and his Executive.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the honourable member to refer to the Governor at all; the honourable member knows the Rule.

Mr. GARNER: I have before me a list of Addresses which have been passed in this House over the past two years. Quite recently they have been flouted, not one step has been taken in connection with them and they are very urgent measures. At a time when this island was passing through travail we gave a mandate to the Executive Committee; and time and again they have refused to implement the Addresses which we have sent to His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member arguing that the non-bringing into effect of these Addresses has anything to do with this Bill?

Mr. GARNER: Yes, Sir. I will get to that point later. I am saying that because if this Government had embarked upon these schemes for help-

ing unemployment at the time when we passed the Addresses, they could certainly come to this House and get our support without our questioning for what purpose they want the money. But they have done nothing: they have spent no money, they have turned down everything that we have sent up because of Party Government and now they come and ask us to help them with their schemes and they are not doing anything for the country? That is my chief reason for not supporting this Bill to-day; they have not shown themselves—responsible creatures to help the country. If they had done that, do you think a born Socialist and Labourite like me would refuse to support this Bill to-day? I repeat that the Government have done nothing; they want money to show that the Labour Government have not gone bankrupt. After all, you can only judge people by the work which they have done. I have a list of Addresses which this House passed with solemnity and we sent them up with the expectation that the Executive would have coerced those who are in power to see that the Addresses are implemented. But what do you find? Your humble servant had the honour of bringing forward an Address relative to the reclamation of the Constitution Swamp. That has not been done. Again your humble servant presented an Address relative to the construction of the proposed East Coast Road and the Cycle Track and they have turned down that. My colleague brought forward one for the relief of land tax and that has been turned down. I brought forward one for the development of the Airport at Seawall and the construction of the Runway for use by larger aircraft and that has been turned down. A Measure was passed in connection with the repair of the Wharf Walls and nothing has been done. The Government brought forward a Resolution for the construction of schools and so forth, and as I predicted nothing has been done. The matter of the laying of standpipes and water mains has also been turned down. In the face of all these relief measures, this Government has failed miserably to do anything for the masses who expected to get some employment; and now can we vote to put more money in the Treasury to make the Government the biggest capitalist we have in this country? They have the money and therefore we asked them to spend some of it so as to relieve human misery. As a matter of fact, this Bill seems to be spite work because they have not made any plans for it. Let us be serious; let us be men; apart from Party allegiance let us face facts. I ask Your Honour to give me some latitude. (A MEMBER: Within the Rules). Everybody knows that this is the machine age so far as agriculture is concerned: we know that we cannot employ more than a certain number of people, and it is our bounden duty—those who know what is going on—to see that we encourage foreign capital so as to find work for our people other than by way of agriculture. That is what our Government is supposed to do. We are supposed to exploit every avenue to see that our surplus population obtain work in fields other than agriculture.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member arguing that the imposition of another 1s. 4d on the companies' tax will stop foreign capital from coming into this country?

Mr. GARNER: I think that if we were to encourage new capital to come into this colony we would be helping the unemployment situation in that where we have completely failed to use all the employables in agriculture, these new industries would absorb them. If this Government is really alert to what is going on today it will take positive steps to encourage new capital and new industries to come

into this country so that they can absorb our unemployed people. I want to make the point that we have a surplus of eight million dollars and I think it is good for Barbados that we should be healthy financially, but not at the expense of human misery. We have to look at this matter in a realistic way. It is not enough every now and again to come to this House and pass an Address asking that somebody be sent to some foreign land to get employment for our people. That is all right, but it is not an answer in itself to what we want, it does not cover every phase of our requirements. It is our bounden duty to see that we create within our island enough employment to absorb as many people as we can.

Mr. SPEAKER: The whole point is whether the imposition of an increase of 1s. 4d. in the companies' tax will prevent foreign capital from coming into this colony.

Mr. GARNER: Yes, Sir. I do not think that any sensible firm would come to this island and run the risk of paying that tax if it is just going to begin business. It is all right in the case of firms which are here and which have made money; and when you come to that point, even there I can see the evil. I know the honest purists will say "Just as a man thinks so is he". I anticipate them and I know what they are worth. A capitalist is a capitalist wherever he goes, and I heard an honourable member say that if he were a capitalist he would do the same thing. No businessman wherever he is, no firm wherever it is situated, is going to allow Government to tax them and they do not find ways and means to make profits on their investments. Do not let anybody be so foolish as to think so. What I envisage is this: in Broad Street where a clerk has got \$50 as a bonus at the end of the year, he will be given \$15 and he will be told: "That is what the Government did for you; we have to pay extra tax and we cannot give you any more." The people who subscribe their money will see to it that they get returns. This Bill is going to work a hardship on employees before it helps the Government. It is all right for people to bring forward this Bill just before the Elections and make long speeches and say "you did not vote for it"; but I hold up my head high and say that I cannot vote for this Bill on the face of it. There are many people who have met me and begged me unceasingly not to vote for this Bill because it may hamper them in respect of the cost of living having regard to where it is today. They depend on their bonus at Christmas. Any firm will see that the shareholders get their premium and the employees go bare. As trade unionists the proponents of this Bill should know that they must bring in something that will help the workers as well. This Bill cannot help the workers because self-preservation is the first law of nature and the firms will see that they do not lose anything by this Bill. They will lay off some of their staff or reduce salaries wherever they can and that will be social retrogression. I am sorry that I have not got more time in which to speak on this matter because I would like to make myself indelibly clear. If this Government had lived up to its responsibility; if they had been persistent and consistent in doing what the House asked them to do from time to time, we would have been in duty bound to help them in their endeavour to put more money in the coffers of the Treasury. But no work has been done so that there cannot be any payment made. They have done no work and it is therefore useless to ask for more money until they bring forward a programme and let us see what they are doing or what they intend to do. We would be making the Government the biggest capital-

ist in this island if we give them more money because they are hoarding it. We do not want that; we want the Government to spend money and find work for the people to do. When the Government initiates something like that and they say they want money. I will say: yes, tax the rich to the hilt. I am not mining any matters; when the Government bring forward a programme, when they are doing work, when they show that they are in earnest, then I will say: tax the rich. I may even go a step further and say: confiscate their property, but I have not yet got to that point because this Government have not shown any initiative. I cannot help the Government in this movement today because they should be censured. As I said before, we have brought forward a list of things which they have said they are not doing. Mr. Speaker, there is no need for this money; there is a healthy state of affairs where the Treasury is concerned. The Government have not done anything so that it could be said that they have run out of money: they have said "No" in connection with schemes for the relief of the unemployed and nobody with any sense of responsibility in this House could subscribe to that way of thinking. I know too well that if we had a proper Coalition this catastrophe could never have occurred. Power in the sense of power is not the thing; power must be utilised for the good of all, and if the power cannot be used in formulating schemes for the benefit of the masses then I say it is useless. I am not going to vote for this Bill today; but perhaps if my constituents favour me and they return me to the House, at some future date when the Bill is properly brought in, when all adjustments are made it will gain my support. It is premature now and I would like to be given something on facts and not fiction. To support this Bill now would be to throw a wedge in the wheels of what I would call progressive measures; because we must open our doors and encourage new industries and new capital to come in so that they can absorb some of our unemployed. It is not enough for us to go to other countries and beg them to be kind enough to give us a little help for our people; we too must be constructive and rise to the hour; we must see to it that we take some of this island's wealth and help our people; we must also aid new industries. After all, we have accumulated a little wealth and we must show statesmanship; we must rise above what the Conservatives have done in the past. By that I mean that we must have schemes; we cannot follow in the old path, just voting money so as to show how much we have in the Treasury. We must have concrete schemes whereby we will try to ameliorate some of the wrongs. We find that no plans are coming forward and more money is asked for. If they go on like this, the Public Treasury will be full of money and the people in the street will be starved to death because of unemployment while the "Bushe" set-up is idle and doing nothing to help them. It is regrettable that this set-up—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member is straying from the point. He is quite in order to show that nothing has been done by the Government but he is going off to something else now.

Mr. GARNER: All I am saying is that the Executive Committee as it is constituted to-day, is incapable of doing anything for the masses of the people of this colony. In Mexico I have seen that they have opened their doors to new industries.—

Mr. SPEAKER: That is going outside the scope of this Bill. The honourable member can show that the Government has done nothing, but there is no reason to go into what other countries have done.

Mr. GARNER: The point I want to make is that other countries have made concessions to foreign companies and can it be that they are wrong and the four members of the Executive Committee in

this colony are right? All these countries have made concessions so as to invite foreign capital to come in—Puerto Rico, Mexico, Trinidad, British Guiana—can they be all wrong and four members of the Executive Committee in Barbados right? They have said that they have done what other Governments have done; but they are wrong because we have no such law on the Statute Book as exists in other countries. They have just brought down this Bill impromptu and expect us to swallow it as a pill; but we must have facts and we must see progress being made in respect of the things for which we have asked. Apart from that, Election time is just around the corner and perhaps it is a good thing for certain speakers to say at their meetings that certain Congress members did not vote for this Bill. I challenge any member to stand anywhere in this island and say that I did not support this Bill because I can answer that question. This recalcitrant Government refused to implement measures which have been sent to Government House and they have not done any work to help the unemployed. I defy them to show what they have done to help the people. It is not enough to say that you must have a Labour Government; you must do the things which Labour demands.

Mr. COX: I did not think it necessary for me to speak on this Bill because I thought it was a foregone conclusion by the majority of members in this House who claim to represent labour that when the Government needs to carry out social reforms, we should tax those who are best able to pay, but after listening to the speeches made by some honourable members I am obliged to speak because, in the first place, people are being misled into thinking that this Bill will create unemployment, that it will prevent new industries from being set up and that it will prevent those which are now operating from expanding. I think that there are something like 63,000 people in the parish of St. Michael and I know that this parish will be harder hit than any other parish if, as the honourable junior member for St. James says, the passing of this Bill is going to result in a lot of people being put out of work. Therefore I think that I should speak, being one of those whom the people of the parish of St. Michael sent to this House to represent them for the past four years. Before going further I would like to say that the Opposition can almost be congratulated in that they are in the minority—at least those who represent the companies are in the minority—and yet it appears as if they will win a victory even although it might be a pyrrhic victory. I also want to congratulate the remnant of that group which also claim to be representing Labour for courage in standing on the floor of this House and completely changing the pledges which they made to the people of this island in 1946. It shows that something is wrong somewhere. It would appear as if the people of this island are not up to the standard which we should like them to be in so far as seeing things as they are rather than as they appear to be. I feel that if some honourable members did not feel that the masses of the people are ignorant they could not have spoken as they have spoken unless they do not want to return to the House. What is the position? The Government says that there is a deficit in revenue and the best method or the only source from which this deficit can be obtained is by way of increasing the rate of income tax on companies. As has been clearly pointed out by almost every speaker, it is not a question of taxing the gross profits of companies but their reserve profits. The people are already paying an excessively high price for their rum, cigarettes, food, clothing and everything else; the people

in the middle and lower brackets are heavily taxed and we want some money with which to carry on the Government. What must we do? We must tax those who cannot feel it. I am bound to support the Government 100% because it is trying to carry out what it pledged the electors in 1946 and perhaps many years before then. We have heard a lot about companies being prevented from expanding, that people will be thrown out of work and so on, if this Bill becomes law. I have here the debates of this House for the year 1942 and they show that when the Income Tax Bill was being dealt with, the same cry was made on the floor of the House. It was said that businesses would be closed down, but instead of that we find that more businesses were opened. Nobody has become bankrupt; everybody is flourishing. It will be remembered that in recent years after Trade Unions came into being in this island, the capitalists came together and began to import machinery so as to do away with the manual labour. Today you will find one tractor managed by two men doing the work which about 50 men would have been doing formerly. Where has the money which has thus been saved gone? In 1931 when the Income Tax Bill in relation to companies was put on the Statute Book the companies paid 2/6 in the pound. They knew what was taking place in the industrial world, they knew that industries should be established and what did they do?—Nothing. There was only one industry started; the Soap Factory was erected and what good has it done for Barbados? It has made people pay more for their soap than they would have paid for it if the soap was brought in from outside; and half a dozen people at a few shillings a week are employed! As for reserves it was said that it has a reserve of \$39,000. That industry caused the people of this island to pay twice as much for their soap as they would have had to pay otherwise. It will be seen therefore that the industries, of which some people so glibly talk, are merely for the purpose of swelling the coffers of a few people to the disadvantage of others. Even in America it was known that President Truman—I do not know if he can be called a Conservative—sent down a Bill to the House of Representatives to have an increased tax placed on Companies.

Mr. SPEAKER: What President Truman did has nothing to do with what is before this House; and we do not know what the conditions were. It cannot be argued that because President Truman did something it must be done in Barbados.

Mr. COX: I am prepared to bow to Your Honour's ruling. Let us look at Trinidad; the honourable senior member for St. Philip has told us that people who would have started industries here had gone to Trinidad. There is no point in saying that because you increase the rate of income tax on companies you prevent people from coming here; because, at the same time, they left here where the rate was 6/8 and went to Trinidad where it was 8/-.

Mr. GARNER: On behalf of my colleague who is not now in his seat, I should like to say that he made reference to what was done in the law before they introduced the higher rate of income tax in Trinidad. My colleague made specific reference to the concessions made.

Mr. COX: I was saying that in places like Trinidad and British Guiana the rate of income tax on companies has been increased and industries are still being carried on by people. Therefore there is no point in saying that if you increase the rate in Barbados you will prevent people from coming in. Some honourable members spoke about the little companies, but from my personal experience I find that

in many cases these same little companies are worse than the large companies. It is far better for a big company to deprive a worker out of a shilling a week—a company which employs about 100 people—than for a little company which employs about six or eight people to rob an individual out of five shillings per week.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the honourable member should use the word "rob."

Mr. COX: I will use the word "deprive". The little companies want to do the same things as the big ones. I know that there are people who say that they cannot pay their servants a living wage but they want to live in the same manner as the rich. I say that some little companies are more exploiting than big ones in many cases. The reverse of what some honourable members have said in this connection is true. It is common knowledge that if the Government is prepared to take a large share of the reserves which companies put down, they will not put down these profits. They will sell goods cheaper because they are always unwilling to contribute their fair share to the Government by way of taxation. They will say "Whenever I put down these reserves the Government will take them away." If you look back at a speech made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip in 1942 relative to the rates of Income Tax Bill and compare it with what he has said today—

Mr. SPEAKER: That is nothing to do with the matter. The year 1942 and the year 1948 are two different years.

Mr. COX: This is a debate in a previous session of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me hear what you are going to say.

Mr. COX: This is what the honourable senior member for St. Philip said in 1942:—

"In a community like Barbados where 14/- out of every pound produced falls into the hands of 2% of the population and the other 6/- is divided among the other 98%, is it not fair that we should tax that 2% as heavily as possible?"

The honourable member said that in 1942 and it is an argument for raising the income tax rate in 1948.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I would remind the honourable member that that is precisely what I also said today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not allowing the honourable member to debate that. The quotation is nothing to do with the debate which is before the House.

Mr. COX: Sir it is income Tax with which we are dealing. The question of unemployment and that of increasing the rate of income tax on companies are very far from each other. They have nothing to do with each other. The Government is merely saying that it has made a pledge to the people of this colony and it is going to carry out that pledge. During the War the rich people in this colony built up large reserves and the Government is saying: "I am going to tax you now and get some of that money to provide the various things which the community needed years ago." I remember that when the War began we used to buy two tins of condensed milk for 10 cents and the same milk took a rise to 12 cents a tin. We know that the merchants used to hide away many items until a new shipment when the prices would be raised.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the increase in the prices of articles anything to do with the increase in the rate of income tax?

Mr. COX: I just want to show how the reserves have been built up without any increase in the income tax rate; and the time has come when, in order to carry out its programme, the Government has to tax these reserves. This is the only colony where an Excess Profits Tax has not been levied; such legislation

was passed in other colonies but not in Barbados. It has been pointed out from figures that there is a deficit in revenue and, as we know, people are saying that the Government has done nothing. Recently we passed a Resolution for £158,000 for the purpose of starting capital works in this colony such as building schools and carrying out many other schemes. It is an easy thing to say that the Government is doing nothing if people can veil their eyes and their conscience; it is an easy thing to abuse the Government and appeal to the sentiments of people—not to their reason because as soon as people can see things for themselves the position is changed. I regret that I was unable to develop certain points which I had before me on account of Your Honour's ruling but I would just like to suggest that everybody can see from this debate what is happening. As long as I have a seat in this House—whether my opinions meet with popular approval or not—as long as I know that I am doing that which is just and right in the interest of the people I will rise and speak on the floor of this House. I will not do like other people who change their politics and then be compelled to erect a lightning conductor so as to protect their guilty conscience from a supposed indignant God.

Mr. ADAMS: I desire to reply on behalf of the Government. It is right that if any honourable member wishes to criticise the policy of the Government he should do so before the reply is made.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sixteen honourable members have already spoken on this Bill.

Mr. WARD: A member who has already spoken might want to make clear a point which has been made.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no Rule to prevent a member from speaking after the Government member has replied; but I think that the general practice should be observed.

Mr. WARD: In case the Government member said anything which needs an explanation a member can make the explanation after the Government member has spoken.

Mr. ADAMS: I am going to reply not with any hope that anything which I may say will alter the attitude of honourable members on my left. If any argument were needed to show the soundness of the Government's position apart from the obviousness of it, that argument would be supplied by the speech of the honourable junior member for St. George who is normally somewhat fluent in dealing with the necessities of the poor and the duty of the Government to provide those necessities. Further confirmation of what I have said is amply given by what we have learnt to expect from the honourable junior member for St. Philip, that fervid religious revivalism which inspires his utterances on the floor of the House when he begins to talk about the evils of capitalism or the miseries of the poor. If the honourable member cannot do himself greater justice than to say: "I have nothing against your Bill but I suggest that you have not spent much money and I am not voting for it although if I am returned to the House"—and the honourable member need not be so fearful of his being returned to the House; if he is returned to the House he will vote for the Bill against which he is going to vote today.

Mr. GARNER: The honourable member must not misquote me. I have said that when the Government does some work and they bring down a Bill like this, if the people send me back here, then I will gladly vote for the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not know in what respect I have misquoted the honourable member; he is not going to put me off what I am going to say or make me alter my opinion. I want to get out of the way one or two things from the gutter which were inevitable, but which were not in evidence when the debate first started. I think it is fair to the honourable junior

member for St. James to say that he made an unusually long speech, and from his point of view it was well made, but not from the point of view of the community. The position was well put from the point of view of the rich capitalists and the honourable member did not descend, as we know he will not descend, to make evil suggestions or suggestions of ulterior motives. I hope that his newly-found friends who are attaching themselves to him will copy his example and decent people will not pay much attention to them when they descend to the gutter. This Bill was introduced in this House in June; no Elections were around the corner so that it is not a question of playing politics.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to leave out the political question.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not pressing that; I am just replying to the points which have been made.

Mr. SPEAKER: I stopped the honourable junior member for St. Philip when he began to speak on the political question and I hope that the honourable member will observe what the honourable junior member for St. Philip had to observe.

Mr. ADAMS: I hope that Your Honour will stop me if I go further than deny what has been said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will do that.

Mr. ADAMS: I am merely emphasising that in actual fact because of the date when this Bill was introduced, there is no question of playing politics, and in moving the second reading of the Bill I think I referred to the fact that it was not the latest date on which income tax legislation has been sent down. It has happened before and the Chamber of Commerce seem to have forgotten that Bills have been sent down to the House and they did not know where they were as regards income tax in times when Conservative Governments were in power. I would remind honourable members that the honourable junior member for St. James who has been the chief opponent of this measure, was a member of the Executive Committee and largely because of his undoubtedly outstanding ability, he was the chief adviser on money matters on previous Executive Committees. Mr. Speaker, I also want to get out of the way—I shall refer to it later—the repetition that was made from time to time as a means of bolstering, I would not say a weak case, but a means of bolstering the stand which, against their conscience, people like the honourable members for St. Philip have adopted. The argument which was trotted out both last Tuesday and today as to there being some connection between the Government's policy in respect of industrialisation or the encouragement of new industries and this Bill, has arisen in the fertile brains of the Chamber of Commerce; and it has been repeated here by the honourable junior member for St. James and has been twisted in order to help the honourable senior member for St. Philip to accuse the Government of not—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise to say that the first person in this debate who attempted to mix the Government's policy as regards industrialisation with the question of income tax was the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. The honourable member said that the Government has done everything possible to encourage new industries and that they had done nothing less than what other colonies had done. Does he not expect the Opposition to answer him when he is misleading the House?

Mr. ADAMS: Is Your Honour allowing the honourable member to make more than one speech? I said that the argument as to there being some connection between the Government's policy as regards industrialisation and this Bill originated in the brains of the Chamber of Commerce and I was hoping that honourable members would not waste any time by trotting out that argument. If I misquote the honourable member he is entitled to interrupt me: but I

appeal to Your Honour not to allow any interruption for the sake of making extra speeches.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot make any extra speeches.

Mr. ADAMS: I remind the House again that I quoted from the petition of the Chamber of Commerce in which they said that this Bill would stop new industries. I appealed to honourable members not to use the argument of the Chamber of Commerce because I anticipated that sort of argument; and I pointed out that there was no connection between this Bill and the encouragement of new industries. You can impose any taxation on companies and yet tell new industries to come in; there is no more connection between this Bill and the encouragement of new industries than there is between malnutrition and Imperial economic policy. I will deal with that argument later on; I just wanted to get that red herring out of the way. The imposition of increased taxation on the undistributed profits of companies could in no way be linked with the question of the encouragement of new industries unless the Government had declared its policy of linking them. Perhaps at this stage inasmuch as I have referred to the question of industries, it might be best for me to deal with that aspect of the argument and the strictures of the Opposition. I have been most careful in any pronouncement I have made as regards new industries not to say one word of exaggeration. It is not my fault if some people are born with perverted minds and cannot argue anything without deliberately twisting what people have said even after correction. I was at pains in a previous debate not to use the word "rich"; I was accused of using it and the newspapers even after my correction repeated it. When a lie gets a lead it is very difficult, no matter how much you contradict it, to overtake it. I have never said what the honourable senior member for St. Philip with that peculiar mind of his has made me say in connection with new industries during the course of this debate. I most carefully chose my words and I have got them written down here. I will only say in reply to the statement that this taxation will prevent companies from expanding or new industries from being started, that this Government has done nothing less as regards its willingness to welcome new industries in this colony than any other colonial Government has done. That is gospel truth. I give the lie direct to any man who suggests that this Government has done anything to discourage industries from coming into this colony. I will not pull any punches this afternoon; I have one prevailing vice and it is that I let too many libels, lies attacks and slanders pass by feeling that they will not matter. But there comes a time when you have to nail lies. If Mr. Bryden, Mr. Cuke, the honourable senior member for St. Philip or anybody else says that this Government has discouraged any new industries from coming into this country he is telling deliberate reckless lies.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the honourable member is referring to the part of my speech in which I said that the Government has done less than what has been done in other colonies, why does he bother to refer to Mr. Bryden and Mr. Cuke? I quoted the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. ADAMS: I appeal to Your Honour not to allow these extra speeches by the honourable member. He has not risen on any point of order or explanation and he will continue to do that all afternoon as soon as he thinks that I have made a point.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I cannot allow the honourable member to misquote me at all.

Mr. ADAMS: Statement after statement has appeared in the Press and none of us have taken any notice of it; but I will take notice of it this afternoon. Hon. H. A. Cuke is reported to have said that there are those who assert that they are in favour of new industries but they bring in the question of Govern-

ment participation which makes him doubt their sincerity as to whether they really want new industries. I say here and now that none of the four members of the Executive Committee in this House has the slightest thing to regret or to be ashamed of with regard to this question of new industries or the advice which they have tendered to other members of the Executive Committee. I deny that this Government has been approached with concrete proposals by more than one English firm of textile manufacturers who were willing to come here and their suggestions were: let us come in and bring in our machinery free at once; let us be free from income tax for a period of five years and have tariff protection; you build a factory and lease it to us, or if we can get the materials you lease us some land and let us build a factory. I was in my chambers one day when one of the Directors of that firm called and asked me what was the attitude of the Government towards his proposals. He had in the meantime dropped the suggestion of asking for any freedom from the payment of income tax, and all he was asking for was that the Government build a factory or lease him land to build one, and protection as regards other textile proprietors. That was all. I put it to him that we have been preaching that if the Government aid private enterprise, the Government should, in some cases, control that enterprise, and in other cases it should merely have a Director on the Board of Directors. In some cases the Government should merely participate in the shares with a controlling interest. I told him that we would like to have a co-operative organisation in which the profits would be divided among the management, the shareholders and the workers. To my surprise, every single point I put to him he agreed with. I told him that we would have to fix the prices, that he could not sell any merinos or shirts dearer than how an agricultural labourer could buy them; that we may have to control his profits; that if his profits were "X" pounds and his wages were "Y" pounds we might have to reduce his profits and he agreed as to Government participation. I reported to my colleagues the substance of our conversation. The Director was accompanied by a big merchant in Bridgetown who took part in the conversation and did not seem to me to be unwilling for private enterprise to have Government support under the conditions. The Pasolds firm made tentative approaches to the Government on the clear understanding that they would not be putting forward any concrete proposals because Mr. Pasolds was to come to Barbados in September and then approach the Government with concrete proposals. He wanted to set up a textile factory. Perhaps I should not say this but no official pronouncement of policy in the Other Place takes place unless the Colonial Secretary first shows me; not that I have ever demanded it but it is a realisation that with the present set-up, the policy of the Government in both Houses of the Legislature should be the same. The Colonial Secretary has not at any time suggested that the Government has been approached with any concrete proposals from any company for bringing any industry into this colony, proposals which the Government has considered and turned down; the Colonial Secretary said that enquiries have been made as to setting up of industries, but no official approach to the Government has been made by any company, whether American, English, Canadian or otherwise. The honourable member for St. Philip knows what I was referring to when I spoke about lying. In the issue of his newspaper of August 21—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the honourable member can quote from the newspaper; he can only refer to it.

Mr. ADAMS: May I refer Your Honour to Rule 122 affecting newspapers? You can read from a newspaper, the only thing is that it can become a

document of the House. This sentence appears in the issue of the newspaper: "While the teeming thousands in this country are forced to remain in unemployment, dependent almost entirely for an existence on emigration projects, offers from European, Canadian and American industrialists to establish plants here are disencouraged," God knows what language that is, "and turned down to the benefit of other West Indian colonies, who make every conceivable concession to attract them, is it not a curse that an important textile firm would have erected a plant in Barbados, had Mr. Adams and his cronies not infested the councils of Government, and that Jamaica Knitting Mills Limited now imports our cotton yarn with which it manufactures hose, underwear and sports shirts and exports the finished product back to Barbados?" The man who wrote that is capable of plain murder. I do not know who writes these articles.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that what is stated in a newspaper is a matter for debate in this House.

Mr. ADAMS: With the greatest respect what is mentioned in the newspaper has been repeated in this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member can take an extract from a newspaper and debate it in the House.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not debating it here. The matter has been repeated on the floor of the House and I intend to nail the lie. I categorically deny that any company but one has ever made any concrete proposals to the Government, and the Government did not turn it down. It has been said that the Government has turned down this, that and the other; and because of the attitude of the Government Jamaica is taking stuff which has been spun here and she is knitting articles and sending them back here. The honourable member who said that forgets that Sir Frank Stockdale brought that plant into this colony as part of the Colonial Development and Welfare Scheme and from the beginning yarn was sent to Jamaica. The suggestion is that that is what is happening because the Government turned down this firm; that the articles would have been cheaper but this inept Government turned down this firm and the stuff is sent to Jamaica.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is a deliberate distortion of what I said. I did not say that the yarn had to be sent to Jamaica because Pasolds was refused coming here.

Mr. SPEAKER: What did the honourable member say?

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I said was that Jamaica Knitting Mills are producing articles with cotton imported from our cotton-spinning plant and those articles are shipped back here to be sold to the people of this colony. I have not said what the honourable member said.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member will persist in his interruptions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has a perfect right to make an explanation.

Mr. ADAMS: He has the right to make an explanation and it is for Your Honour to rule. The honourable member said that if Pasolds had not been discouraged by the Government, this yarn would not have to be sent to Jamaica. If I have misquoted the honourable member I will not stand for election next year. I am quite willing to be guided by the Official Reporter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I cannot sit here and allow the honourable member to misquote me; I have not said that the yarn was sent to Jamaica because Pasolds was discouraged by the Government.

Mr. ADAMS: The question about Pasolds coming here has never been decided simply because Mr. Pasolds said that he was coming here himself in Sep-

tember to discuss matters with the Government. Far from turning down Pasolds, the Government has sent a cable to Mr. Pasolds asking him if he is still coming in September to carry on negotiations which had only been tentatively begun. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has said that we have not done this and that and Pasolds have gone to Trinidad and Jamaica; since they are setting up more than one factory in the West Indies, has the honourable member got any assurance that they are not putting up a factory here too? (Mr. CRAWFORD: "Yes"). I repeat that only one firm has ever approached this Government with any concrete proposals. As far as the question of stopping people from coming here is concerned, it was discovered after negotiations with that firm that machinery can come in free, because the Act says what is the equivalent of saying that machinery for turning yarn into cloth is duty free. When the public know these things, they will know how much truth there is in the accusations that the Government is not giving this concession. The honourable senior member for St. Philip talks about Puerto Rico—

Mr. SPEAKER: I ruled that out.

Mr. ADAMS: I will not say anything along the honourable member's lines. I will only say that as far as the Labour Party is concerned, whether people like it or not, we are the Government of this country. Much as we have been hearing for so long about a vote of "no confidence", this Government will live until the appointed time for it to go out. The people who form this Government have evinced Socialist principles which we have adopted as part of our inmost belief, and we have attempted to put them into practice in the face of the opposition and frustration as was to be expected in the present circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is getting away from the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I am dealing with the arguments most of which have been in respect of industrialisation. I am merely saying that far from this Government being opposed to industrialisation, it has always been in favour of industrialisation, the only difference between us and other people in this Chamber who call themselves Labourites is that we do not pander to the rich. We do not hang behind in the hope of so much reward as we may get. We have no cause to apologize for taxing companies.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member began this debate on a plane on which I hope he will keep.

Mr. ADAMS: When I am dealing with honourable members on the level of the street it is necessary—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think it is necessary to make that remark at all.

Mr. WILKINSON: What does the honourable member mean by the level of the street?

Mr. ADAMS: I mean above the level of the gutter as distinct from those underground. (Laughter). Those honourable members who keep their arguments on a high level I will meet on that level. I realise that it is difficult to fight a man in the gutter without you yourself having to go down into the gutter.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member will set an example—

Mr. ADAMS: I am endeavouring to do so. (Hear, hear). Honourable members are both complimentary and facetious. It is a fact that if you deliberately manufacture things which are not true, whether you say them on the floor of the House, on the floor of the Chamber of Commerce, in the columns of newspapers or anywhere else, people who hear and read them will believe that they are true. People will believe that this Government has done something to discourage industries from being started here. Not only have we preached industrialisation—from the

time when Lord Moyne first came out here that was our attitude as can be seen in the Memorandum which I submitted and the Memorandum of the Progressive League. We pointed out that one of the remedies for the conditions in this island is industrialisation. Mr. Hugh Springer and I—

Mr. SPEAKER : I do not think that any member of this House has suggested that the Government is opposed to industrialisation. The accusation is that the Government is not helping industrialisation.

Mr. ADAMS : Surely when honourable members say that the Government has driven people away from this country—

Mr. SPEAKER : You have already answered that point.

Mr. ADAMS : I am going further to substantiate my contention that the Government has not discouraged any new industries. The Government is in favour of the colony being industrialised and the only qualification which we make is that it must not be industrialised at the expense of sweating labour. I was saying that the former Secretary of the Labour Party along with Dr. Arthur Lewis and I presented a Memorandum to the Colonial Office in connection with the industrialisation of Barbados as the one great centre of the West Indies. It is an easy thing to say Tuesday after Tuesday and Saturday after Saturday that the Government is not doing this or that and give the impression that the Government is doing everything to hurt the community. I have also to reply to the infamous suggestion that this Government knowing that this Bill is likely to be thrown out by the Other Place, is bringing it forward. I say this: if the Other Place has any feeling that we are going to trim our sails to suit their wind, they are sadly mistaken; we will ask the Colonial Office to restrain them—

Mr. SPEAKER : That has nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS : The suggestion has been made that if we pass this Bill it will be thrown out by the Other Place, and this Government is sending a word of warning to the Other Place. If they want a constitutional row they can have it at any time. After all, up to now what has been the attitude of the persons whose pockets will be affected by this increased tax? Nobody likes to pay taxes; it takes a man with an advanced sense of social justice to pay taxes and to continue to pay increased taxes. There are some people who will say that it is unfortunate that they have to pay more taxes but it is for a good cause. It is not to the point to use arguments as to what the attitude of a body of people who may be more rich than ourselves may or may not be. I poise this question to the honourable junior member for St. James if the catastrophic calamity of a majority of Conservatives being returned to this House were to befall Barbados: What does he propose to do when he is sending down the Estimates next March? Add to the personal rates of income tax, increase the price of the people's food or take this 8/- in the pound from Companies? This same Chamber of Commerce which is howling to the moon about the price of British goods, if you carry their argument to its logical conclusion they are saying: "Let us take down the Union Jack and haul up the Stars and Stripes." But America is only coming here to establish naval bases and so on. I ask: if the Conservatives come into power how do they propose to raise revenue with a short crop and with smaller imports? I know that nothing I say will win a vote, but I say that we have come to the House with this Bill solely because of the short crop and import restrictions. I have a copy of the Resolutions of the Associated Chambers of Commerce in the West Indies; they say that they are appealing to the Colonial Office, but I leave them to their folly. They are not appealing

from Caesar to Caesar but from a proconsul to Caesar. Let them appeal to the Secretary of State—

Mr. SPEAKER : I do not think that that is necessary.

Mr. ADAMS : I am replying to the arguments made on the floor of this House. I say that the argument as regards British restrictions has been trotted out to show that the British people have done this and that. Faced with a short crop what can any Government, calling itself by any name, do but make hay while the sun is shining? There is a chronic letter writer, a member of Your Honour's profession who occasionally beguiles the unaware, and I see that another has recently come into the correspondence columns. What is the Government to do in the face of a short crop? Wait until next year when we see the result of the short crop, when money is short, or levy a tax this year on last year's savings? The honourable junior member for St. Philip has trotted out the argument that the poor shop assistants will suffer by the passing of this Bill and the senior member for St. Philip has suggested that people put by reserves without taking into account the tax which they have to pay. I say that if a business is run in the way as set out by the honourable member, it does not deserve to be run at all. The two Boanerges for St. Philip have not realised that it is the undistributed profits that are being taxed and the honourable junior member for St. James makes it clear that shareholders will not suffer. It makes it all the more wonderful how honourable members could trot out the argument about unemployment if they know the way in which profits are declared. If a firm says: "We have made enough profits to pay our staff and put by reserves, but if you touch these reserves we will fire some of our employees" when we are not touching what they are paying their employees—any firm which does that is looking for the trouble which they may get. I assure honourable members that this Bill has nothing whatever to do with the attitude of the Government towards the setting up of new industries. I have seen some preliminary work by the Caribbean Commission with which they propose to deal at Guadeloupe in December. I have seen a Memorandum on the history of the industrial development of Puerto Rico and I may say that we had a discussion in 1944 after the Caribbean Commission sat here in Barbados as to the proposed industrialisation of Puerto Rico. We all know what has taken place in Puerto Rico but it does not necessarily follow that every British Caribbean territory can be guided comma after comma by the law of Puerto Rico.

Mr. SPEAKER : I do not think that we should deal with Puerto Rico.

Mr. ADAMS : According to my reading of Parliamentary procedure we have no right to criticise the Governments of other colonies, but when one remembers the snags attached to industrialisation without proper preliminary planning, let alone proper preliminary original planning, one will begin to hesitate as to accepting every line of what may be proposed. Some honourable members think that I have qualified that too much; but if a firm came out here to make lipstick why should the Government want to nationalise it? Lipstick is not a necessity although some women think so. A firm might want to make Rolls Royce motor cars but they are not necessities.

Mr. SPEAKER : What is the honourable member referring to?

Mr. ADAMS : I am dealing with the arguments with regard to industrialisation. It has been said that we should copy Trinidad and Jamaica before we increase this tax and I am merely making general observations to the effect that you have to deal with applications as they come. A particular company may come in and—

Mr. SPEAKER : There is no particular need for enlarging on that.

Mr. ADAMS : I am sorry if I was doing that. Nobody believes in nationalisation at large; sometimes Governments should not interfere with industries at all. In some cases they should control the prices and profits and participate in the running of the show. Lord Trefgarne made it quite clear that the Development Corporation would make loans to private firms. What I am endeavouring to point out to the House is that this Government must take applications as they come and do everything it can to encourage new industries, but avoid the mistakes which have been made outside. What is the use of quoting Jamaica? In Jamaica Bustamante says: "I take off Excess Profits Tax because I think you can help me, and I put it back on because you will not help me." The enactment of a particular method of legislation in one colony should not be blindly followed by another colony; the matter of new industries coming in must be carefully watched and the Government should have some measure of control. I repeat that every application has to be treated on its merits. Because the Government has not come out in a Press Communique and stated what their position is, it must not be said that we are not encouraging new industries. As long as this Labour Government is in power, it will safeguard the interests of the majority of the people as against the minority—the 2% which the honourable junior member for St. James seems to throw at me. I have only this to say now. I speak now not to our capitalist friends in the House but to those members who went to the country in 1946 and promised that they would endeavour to raise the standard of living of the masses, and would endeavour to do that by the use of the Socialist weapon of taxation. I appeal to those members to be true to the masses of the people of this colony who still look to the Socialist members of this House to pull them out of the misery in which they now live. I appeal to them to look ahead and see what the conditions are likely to be next year, what the anticipated revenue and expenditure are likely to be, and to take taxation from people when they have it because you cannot take it from them, no matter how much you try, when they have not got it in liquid cash, so to speak, and the community is suffering. I will quote something now which the honourable junior member for St. James will be glad to hear. The former Attorney General in introducing the Rates of Income Tax Bill in the 1944-46 session said this:—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member in order to quote from the report of the debates of a previous session?

Mr. ADAMS: Yes, Sir. I refer Your Honour to Rule 121. This is what the former Attorney General said when introducing the Rates of Income Tax Bill in 1945:—

"We have to remember that this is a tax not on this year which is now running and getting towards autumn, but it is a tax on last year." This is even more true to-day than when the honourable member spoke. "Therefore, if last year were a good year, or if this year is not a good year for income tax purposes, or is not as good a year as the others have been, you will find that next year you may not be able to raise as much money as you would like, and certainly not as much as you are likely to raise this year. Therefore when the going is good it is as well that you should get some of the money that is going from the Government's point of view, because when the going is bad we will still need the money to carry on with the schemes on which we have embarked, apart from having to find money for schemes of further improvement which we may desire."

I commend that policy from the apparent Leader of the Electors' Association to his followers on my left. (Cheers).

Mr. LEWIS: I call Your Honour's attention to Rule 151 and ask you to rule on it before the vote on the question is taken. There are members who may

have a pecuniary interest in this matter and that will affect their voting on this Bill. It may be a question of their paying more income tax or otherwise.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is always open to any honourable member, if he thinks that any other honourable member should not vote, to raise the question that his vote be disallowed; but I do not think that there is any question of pecuniary interest arising now.

Mr. LEWIS: All right, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this Bill be now read a second time. An amendment has been moved that the words "be now read a second time" be deleted and the words "be rejected" be inserted in place thereof. The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SMITH, SYMONDS, BRANCKER, HUSBANDS, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, GARNER and Dr. CUMMINS—16.

Noes: Messrs. HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD and MOTTLEY—7.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, sixteen honourable members voting "Aye" and seven honourable members voting "No". The question now is that this Bill be now read a second time. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The second reading was passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1, the title Clause, was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. Section ten of the principal Act as amended by the Income Tax (Amendment) Act, 1945, shall have effect as if for the words "six shillings and eight pence" wherever those words occur, there were substituted the words "nine shillings."

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to amend this Clause by deleting the word "nine" and inserting the word "eight" in place thereof. I hope you will permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is not true to say that the Government has been scared or anything of that sort. The Government has been informed by somebody who is supposed to know, that the British Guiana and Trinidad rate is 9/- in the pound and the Government accepted that figure as being accurate. We have made certain discoveries and I am asking leave to amend this Clause in the way I have intimated.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to amend the Clause.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part of the Bill.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 2 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. HUSBANDS, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and Dr. CUMMINS—10.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SYMONDS, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD and Mr. SPEAKER—13.

Clause 3, renumbered 2, was read as follows:—

"2. Sub-section (1) of section twenty of the principal Act as amended by the Income Tax (Amendment) Act, 1944, shall have effect as if for the words "forty pounds" wherever those words occur, there were substituted the words "fifty pounds."

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 3 renumbered 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY : I beg to move that the word "fifty" be deleted in order to insert the words "one hundred". I feel that fifty pounds is not a sufficient allowance for children; I feel that the allowance should be one hundred pounds. I hear some honourable members say that my amendment will be creating a charge on the Treasury and I would like you Mr. Chairman, to give your ruling in the matter.

Mr. SYMMONDS : I beg to second that amendment.

Mr. WARD : I think that this amendment would be creating a charge on the Treasury because the Government would be getting less revenue than that for which they have estimated. Although I feel that this allowance of fifty pounds in respect of children is too low under the present conditions, yet I think it would be better for us to pass this Bill as it is. If we increase this allowance to one hundred pounds we do not know what extra charge would be laid on the Government. We have just said that the Government has plenty of money in the Treasury and we are not giving them any more just now; therefore I think that it would be the wrong procedure to amend this Clause as it is proposed to do.

Mr. HAYNES : I suggest to the honourable senior member for the City that he should add to his amendment a proviso to the effect that it should be proved that this one hundred pounds is spent on the education of children. I do not think for one minute that there should be a general reduction of income tax; I believe that the matter should be dealt with as it is dealt with in Trinidad so that this money can be accounted for.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : I do not know if this amendment has been moved in jest or if it has been moved seriously; but it is a sad reflection on responsible people in this community. Imagine that an honourable member can vote against the Government's collecting more money from income tax and then move an amendment to increase the allowance for dependants so that the Government will collect less money! If we go on like this we will have a reflection such as that of the French Revolution in France. What I want to say is that somebody wants to make up for lost ground and he thinks that it would be well for the electorate to feel that he voted against an increase in the companies' tax but he voted in favour of increasing the allowance for children. I say that if you do not take a firm stand against this movement it will reflect like the French Revolution and we will not keep a Government for three months. Let us be serious at some times and let us not allow personal animosity to sway us. I am surprised that the honourable senior member for the City, after making the speech he made last Tuesday, could move this amendment to-day. This is not a consequential amendment; the honourable member refuses to allow the Government to collect more money and moves an amendment whereby they will collect less money! The honourable member has an Address on the Order Paper in connection with an amendment to the Special Exemptions granted under the Act, and you find that the same people who ask for an increase in the allowances are saying that we should not increase the tax in respect of companies. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew is a member of the St. Peter's Vestry, and people who have never paid taxes in their lives are now paying taxes on their dilapidated buildings.

Mr. HAYNES : When that matter was settled at the St. Peter's Vestry I was not present. (A MEMBER: You should have been there).

F. L. WALCOTT : I thought that the honourable member was going to say that he is not a member of the Vestry. It is all right for honourable members to get here and make statements, but in an agricultural community people who can ill afford it, have, for the first time in their lives, to pay heavy taxation and no increased tax is put on the land! Any

of us who comes to this House must have the courage of his conviction. I know myself too well to be caught in any trap; I could not be caught in this trap even if I were blindfolded. I hope that the members of the Government will take note of what is happening. When you have money you hear people make the criticism that you have too much money; but it is worse for the Government not to have any money at all. I am in favour of the allowance which has been made; the Government has brought back the allowance where it was and it is an allowance which places the small income tax payers in a better position. I want to make it clear that attempts are being made to embarrass the Government. This amendment, as far as I see it, is only a trap and I do want you, Mr. Chairman, to give your ruling as regards its being a charge on the Treasury. As regards the technicalities, I leave them for the lawyers to work out. I say that I cannot support the amendment having regard to what the Government has sent down. I feel that in times like these it is a very serious thing for the community when we have in public life people who are persistently disregarding all codes of moderation, a sense of honesty and, what is more, a real desire to be sincere.

Mr. ADAMS : I speak with personal knowledge on this particular point because I myself have raised it during my junior days. It was raised by the Speaker that an amendment such as this would have the effect of creating a charge on the Treasury. I draw that to His Honour's attention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : I rule that the motion is out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY : Having made the motion in good faith, I crave your permission, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHAIRMAN : I have ruled the motion out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY : I want to reply to the honourable senior member for St. Peter. If people harangue I can do it too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : I rule the honourable member out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY : I am speaking on this Clause. If you say that the amendment is out of order I will bow to your ruling; but I am not sitting down without replying to the harangue of the honourable senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : Bear in mind if the honourable member is referring to local government where vestrymen are concerned I am not entertaining it.

Mr. MOTTLEY : When I am teaching the honourable member about local government, that will be done in my office. With reference to the Clause in respect of which I moved an amendment, the honourable senior member for St. Peter seems to think that I did so without having taken any thought. I should like to remind the Committee that I have given notice of an Address dealing with allowances under the Act including allowances for children. I moved the amendment in good faith and I intended to show, if it was not a question of creating a charge on the Treasury and if you, Mr. Chairman, had not so ruled, that for the past six years, in each year in which the Government estimated for income tax, they have actually collected more than £100,000 in excess of the estimate. My argument would have been that, in view of the fact that this amount in excess of the estimate has been collected, a greater allowance should be given to people in respect of their children. I am surprised at the honourable senior member for St. Peter thinking that I have come into this House unprepared. I have heard so many wrong rulings here that I was inclined to press the point. However I am asking leave to withdraw my motion. (Mr. ADAMS : A motion which is out of order!)

Mr. TALMA : I have sat and listened to this debate and I must say that I am certainly appalled at the antics and tactics which have been displayed

this afternoon in so far as this political set-up of Labour members is concerned. The whole object of the Bill has been cut out and no Bill is being passed now.

Mr. COX : I appreciate the increase made in the allowance, an increase from £40 to £50, but when it comes to increasing it to £100—

Mr. CHAIRMAN : The honourable member is out of order.

The question that Clause 3 renumbered 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS : I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee with an amendment.

Mr. TALMA : I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS : Before the question is put, I would like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to give an opinion as to whether an operational Clause should not be added to this Bill. The rates of income tax have been passed and I want to know if this allowance will be taken off for this year, if it will apply in respect of the returns which were supposed to be made by persons in January this year. On occasions we have inserted a Clause saying that the Act should come into operation on such and such a date; and if necessary we may have to add a Clause relative to the assessment for this particular year.

Mr. ADAMS : It was intended that the allowance should operate from this year. The Income Tax Commissioner is going to have some extra work to do and he is waiting on us to pass this Bill so as to make a final assessment.

The question that the CHAIRMAN do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee with an amendment was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Mr. ADAMS : I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time. In doing so I should like to say that while there is no Rule which says that if you agree to the second reading of a Bill you must stick to the principle of it, that is certainly a Parliamentary principle. I just want to point out that a precedent of this sort may be followed to the detriment of what one might call orderly legislation. You can disagree with the principle of the Bill on the second reading but there is a vast difference between agreeing with the principle of the Bill and then voting against it. It was up to hon. members on the second reading to take the view—

Mr. SPEAKER : I do not think I can allow you to debate that. If I allow you to speak on this matter I cannot stop other hon. members from speaking on it.

Mr. ADAMS : I was merely pointing out how a similar happening can be avoided in future.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion for the third reading of the Bill which was agreed to.

On a similar motion, the Bill was passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. ADAMS : I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to Thursday next at 2 o'clock p.m. If the House agree to meet on Thursday we will deal with minor matters such as the Petroleum Bill which we have nearly finished, and so on, matters which are non-controversial.

Mr. TALMA : I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER : I promised the hon. member to attend on Thursday but not at that hour. I beg to move as an amendment that the words "2 o'clock p.m." be deleted in order to insert the words "4 o'clock p.m."

Mr. SMITH : I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS : I accept that amendment.

Mr. WILKINSON : I beg to move that the words "Thursday next at 4 o'clock p.m." be deleted in order to insert the words "Tuesday next, the 7th September, 1948, at noon."

Mr. SYMONDS : I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER : A motion has been made that this House do now adjourn to Thursday next at 4 o'clock p.m. An amendment has been moved that the words "Thursday next at 4 o'clock p.m." be deleted in order to insert the words "Tuesday next, the 7th September, 1948, at noon". The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it. The question now is that the words "Tuesday next, the 7th September, 1948, at noon" be inserted in the blank created. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The following division was taken :—

Ayes : Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SYMONDS, BRANCKER.

Noes : Messrs. SMITH, HUSBANDS, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP.

Mr. LEWIS : (Sitting). I desire some information on the taking of this division. If the motion for the insertion of the words "Tuesday next, the 7th September, 1948, at noon" is lost, what will be the procedure after that?

Mr. SPEAKER : Any hon. member can make a motion for the adjournment to some other date.

The division was taken as follows :—

Ayes : Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SYMONDS, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—12.

Noes : Messrs. SMITH, HUSBANDS, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, and Dr. CUMMINS—11.

Mr. SPEAKER : The question has been decided in the affirmative, twelve hon. members voting "Aye", and eleven hon. members voting "No."

SPEAKER INFORMS HOUSE OF HIS LEAVING FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. SPEAKER : Before I put the question for the adjournment, I should like to inform hon. members that I shall be leaving the island for the United Kingdom on Tuesday morning next and therefore I shall not be present at the next meeting of the House. I hope to return about the 15th of November.

Mr. ADAMS : I am sure that all hon. members will join with me in wishing Your Honour a pleasant journey, a pleasant stay in the United Kingdom as our Representative at the Empire Parliamentary Association Conference and a happy return. I think that we might go a little further and wish Your Honour a happy return to your seat. (Cheers).

Mr. SPEAKER : I thank hon. members very much.

The question that this House do now adjourn to Tuesday next, the 7th September, 1948, at noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.