

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1951—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 6th January, 1953.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 p.m. today.

Present

His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs. M. E. COX, L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), F. L. WALCOTT, F. C. GODDARD, F. E. MILLER, J. C. MOTTLEY, E. ST. A. HOLDER, C. E. TALMA, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE and L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

INDISPOSITION OF MR. SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members will regret to hear that His Honour the Speaker is indisposed and unable to attend today's sitting of the House.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 12th and 18th of November, 1952, respectively, having been circulated were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. HAYNES entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—On behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I beg to lay the following Papers:—

Report of the Conference of Representatives of Governments of the British West Indies, British Guiana and British Honduras, met to consider finances of the University College of the West Indies, Jamaica, 1st—4th September, 1952.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the period ended on 30th September, 1952, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 9 Order, 1952.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker—I beg to lay the following:—

Post Office Advances for Payment of Money Orders to 31st October, 1952.

The Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau Twenty-third Annual Report of the Executive Council 1951—52.

Mr. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to lay the following:—

The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations, 1952.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to lay the following:—
First Annual Report of the Social Welfare Department 1st April, 1951 — 31st March, 1952.

Report on Barbadian Women Hospital Domestic Workers in the United Kingdom.

Dr. CUMMINS: I might say that this Report has been laid as a result of the trenchant criticism and the many inaccuracies which were made at the last meeting of the House. It was thought that this Report should be laid so that hon. members could be fully informed of the Scheme in all its ramifications from its inception until today.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

Dr. CUMMINS: On behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I beg to present from His Excellency the Acting Governor a Message as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 1/1953

*His Excellency The Acting Governor
To*

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Acting Governor has the honour to refer to the "Report of the Conference of Representatives of Governments of the British West Indies, British Guiana and British Honduras, met to consider Finances of the University College of the West Indies, Jamaica, 1st—4th September, 1952," a copy of which has recently been laid in the Honourable the House of Assembly, and to state that, subject to the approval of the Legislature, it is proposed to express agreement with the recommendations of the Conference with the exception of the recom-

mentation in paragraph 23 of the Report viz. "that the liabilities involved under the quinquennial grant system should preferably be embodied in a local Ordinance rather than in a Resolution of Council," and on the understanding that contributions to the University College of the West Indies should continue to be made on a population basis. A copy of the main recommendations in the Report is attached.

2. The attention of the Honourable the House of Assembly is particularly invited to paragraph 17 and Annexure VI of the Report in which a supplementary contribution of \$37,546 (£7,822) is required from this Government in respect of the deficit of \$507,399 (£105,708) incurred by the University College of the West Indies during the period 1947 to 31st August, 1953, and to the total cost of \$8,253,360 (£1,719,450) to be shared by participating Governments over the quinquennial period 1953—54 to 1957—58, as set out in paragraph 58 of the Report. On the basis of the 1951 population formula the annual contribution which this Government would be required to make over this quinquennial period would be \$110,592 (£23,040). In this connection reference is invited to paragraph 67 of the Report, and to the relevant paragraph on page 20 of the Five Year Plan of Development and Taxation.

3. The Honourable the House of Assembly is invited to agree with the recommendations embodied in the Report subject to the reservations set out in the first paragraph of this Message.

R. N. TURNER,
Acting Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.
6th January, 1953.

The main Recommendations of the Report on the Finances of the University College of the West Indies as they affect this Government

1. That Governments accept their liability resulting from the deficit of \$507,399 (£105,708) incurred by the University College of the West Indies during the period 1947 to 31st August, 1953. (Paragraph 17 and Annexure VI of the Report refer).

The supplementary contribution required from this Government is \$37,546 (£7,822).

2. That Governments adopt the system of financing the University College's recurrent expenditure by annual Block Grants based upon approved quinquennial estimates on the understanding that—

- (a) no new commitments capable of involving Governments in future expenditure, e.g. new departments or activities, should be undertaken during the quinquennium without prior approval of the participating Governments;
- (b) opportunity for review of quinquennial grants upwards at the instance of the University College be afforded, such review to be considered only when exceptional circumstances have been established, and then only after two years of the quinquennium have been completed.

It is not intended that (a) above should apply—

- (i) to shifting of funds from one approved activity to another;
- (ii) to cases in which no commitment upon Governments would ever arise, e.g. should the cost of a new activity be provided for by a Trust Fund or Bequest to the University. (Paragraph 22).

3. That the respective Governments' liabilities involved under a quinquennial grant system should preferably be embodied in a local Ordinance rather than in a Resolution in Council. (Paragraph 23).

4. That a sum of the order of \$384,000 (£80,000) per annum bearing some approximate relationship to the extra cost of the teaching function of the hospital be reflected as University College expenditure as from 1st September, 1953. (Paragraph 32 of the Report refers).

5. That Governments accept the proposal that their contributions be increased to include recurrent expenditure necessary for the purposes of a sub-department of Chemical Technology and the extension of the functions of the Institute of Social and Economic Research to include the teaching of Economics. (Paragraphs 35 and 37 of the Report refer).

6. That the recurrent expenditure in the quinquennium 1953—58 be estimated at \$8,253,360 (£1,719,450) and shared by participating Governments on the basis of annual subventions. (Paragraph 58 of the Report refers). The figure \$8,253,360 (£1,719,450) includes \$384,000 (£80,000) per annum or \$1,920,000 (£400,000) over the quinquennium for the hospital, and requires average annual subventions of \$1,650,672 (£343,890). The Barbados share on the basis shown will be as follows:—

	Basis %	Contributions
(a) Population 1951	6.7	\$110,592 (£23,040)
(b) True local revenue	7.9	\$130,416 (£27,170)
(c) Mean of (a) plus (b)	7.3	\$120,480 (£25,480)

If the population basis is accepted, the annually recurrent contribution of Barbados will be increased by \$57,312 as it is at present \$53,280.

Mr. MAPP entered the House and took his seat.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS for Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947.

Dr. CUMMINS for Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 9 Order 1952.

Mr. ADAMS entered the House and took his seat.

QUESTIONS.

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

1. Is Government satisfied that the amounts expended on Fishing Boats, under the authority of Resolution No. 1/1952 for \$70,000.00, which were destroyed or damaged by high seas on 2nd and 3rd December, 1951, have yielded full value so far as the building of such boats is concerned?

2. Is it a fact that dissatisfaction exists amongst fishing-boat owners to whom the new boats have been allotted, as to the alleged cost of building the same, one-half of which cost is required to be paid in respect of each such boat by the allottee whose vessel had been destroyed or damaged as aforesaid?

3. Is Government aware that such items as (a) anchors (b) chains and (c) iron for ballast, are not included in the total amount of \$1,500.00 stated by the Fisheries Department as being the cost price of each such boat?

Mr. WILLIAMS: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

1. Whether Government is aware of the difficulty encountered by fishermen in the obtaining of

spars from the commercial business houses by virtue of the fact that the necessary stocks are not carried.

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative will Government authorise the Fisheries Department to obtain and carry the necessary stocks?

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

1. Is Government aware that any Fireman of the Bridgetown Fire Brigade has been or is being required by the Fire Officer to perform the duties of a gardener on his (the Fire Officer's) behalf?

2. (a) If the answer to the above question is "Yes", will Government immediately prohibit this practice?

(b) If the answer is "No" will Government cause enquiries to be instituted forthwith?

3. Is it a fact that the said Fire Officer has refused or declined so to arrange the off-duty leave of the Firemen under his charge so as to enable any who may be selected to take part in Trial Matches for Intercolonial Cricket?

Mr. WILLIAMS: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

1. Is Government aware that employers are not carrying out the provisions of the Holidays with Pay Act, and that employees are encountering difficulty in securing the benefits conferred on them under the Act?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government endeavour to ensure that the provisions of the Act are enforced?

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

Does dissatisfaction exist amongst labourers employed by Department of Highways and Transport in connection with their lack of holidays with pay?

2. Is it a fact that when such labourers have been, from time to time, laid off through no fault of their own that the said Department denies them the right of holidays with pay notwithstanding the fact that such labourers have, during the course of the year, completed the minimum number of days' work?

3. Will Government cause an investigation to be made with a view to ensuring that no such labourers are unfairly deprived of a vacation with pay?

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

1. Will the Government state the reason for the delay in making available to workers, other than Civil Servants and Sugar Workers, monies accruing to the Labour Welfare Fund which it is proposed will be used for the purpose of building or repairing of houses?

2. Will the Government in any event immediately undertake a comprehensive survey of the housing needs of such workers and take steps to place and expedite the re-housing of these workers, as contemplated from the same fund?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947, was read a first time.

Messrs. E. D. MOTTLEY and E. K. WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR MR. VAUGHAN

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I am asking for four weeks' leave of absence for the

honourable junior member for St. John as from today.

There being no objection, the leave asked for was granted.

Messrs. BRYAN and ALLDER entered the House and took their seats.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE TRAINING SCHEME FUND BILL, 1952

Dr. CUMMINS:—Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask that Order No. 15 be taken as the first Order of the Day, and I also ask leave to take charge of this Order.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas:—To move the consideration of the Amendments of the Honourable Legislative Council to the Bill to make provision for the establishment of a Training Fund for purposes connected with the improvement and efficiency of the Public Services of the Island by means of training.

These are the amendments made by the Other Place to this Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think it is customary to move that the amendments be read a first time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I think it is customary to explain the amendments and then move that they be read a first time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to make any remarks about the amendments on the second reading of the amendments.

Dr. CUMMINS: The position is this; there are three amendments two of which we propose to ask the House to agree with. There is one with which we are asking the House not to agree and in connection with that amendment we propose to send a Message to the Other Place stating our reasons for not accepting the amendment. Therefore I think it will be rather difficult to move the acceptance of the two amendments until I have explained myself; we can deal with the Message and wait until such time as these amendments are returned to us. To move that these amendments be read a first time is tantamount to saying that we accept them all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A Bill is read a first time, then it is printed and circulated and then it is read a second time or postponed as the case may be.

Dr. CUMMINS: I thought I should put the position as it is before the House. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to:

Dr. CUMMINS: In moving the second reading of these amendments I will now state the position as far as the amendments are concerned. I think that honourable members are very well acquainted with the Bill which was passed by this House a few weeks ago—a Bill to make provision for the establishment of a Training Fund for purposes connected with the improvement and efficiency of the Public Services of the Island by means of training. The first amendment is in the second paragraph of Clause 2 where the word "means" has been deleted and the word "includes" has been substituted therefor. In Clause 4 paragraph (e) has been deleted and we are asking the House not to agree to that amendment for the reason that if this paragraph is deleted, it will preclude the Governor-in-Executive Committee from

recommending for training certain persons who are really not employees of the Government but who are working in the service of the Government. I have in mind at the moment such persons as nurses; if this paragraph is deleted the Governor-in-Executive Committee will not be allowed to recommend for training such persons as nurses at the General Hospital because these nurses are student nurses for four years and at the end of the fourth year they may be those who could very well profit from training abroad. It is persons of that class whom the Government had in mind when we included this paragraph (c) in clause 4. Honourable members will have noticed that during the past four weeks there was an advertisement in the local Press inviting nurses who have had a certain period of training to apply for Scholarships which will enable them to go to Great Britain for training; if this paragraph is deleted these nurses will not be able to take advantage of this training. There are quasi-Government employees whom the Government could very well recommend for training abroad; therefore we are inviting the House not to agree to the deletion of this paragraph. There has been circulated to honourable members a Message which we propose to send to the Other Place stating that we cannot agree to the deletion of that paragraph. Finally, in Clause 5 of the Bill the words "at least once in every financial year have been deleted and the words "not later than four months after the end of every financial year" have been substituted therefor. That is only being a little more specific if this Clause and I think the House could accept that amendment; a statement of the Fund will be laid at least once in every financial year and the Other Place thought that the position should be made more specific and they have made that amendment. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not understand on what I am voting; the Other Place have offered certain amendments and the honourable junior member for St. Thomas thinks that we should agree to two of them and disagree to the other one. I have a Message in my hand and there seems to me that there is some confusion of thought as to what the position is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: According to Rule 261 amendments from the Other Place are read a first time, a second time and agreed to or disagreed to with amendments. Speakers have ruled that the debate should take place on the second reading of the amendments in the same manner as the debate takes place on the second reading of a Bill, and I am following that ruling. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas says that if the House agrees with him he intends to move the passing of a Message to the Other Place and that Message will embody the decision of the House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If we agree to this motion we agree to the amendments.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are agreeing to the second reading of the amendments.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I think that if we agree to this motion now, we agree to all the amendments of the Other Place.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think so: if honourable members will assist me with the application of Rule 261 I shall be grateful.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am not voting for anything which I do not understand. It is my intention to speak on the second reading of these amendments and I do not want to be caught in any trap by one ruling from the Chair and another ruling from the majority that you cannot express any views now. But there are honourable members who are capable of assisting Your Honour and I am sure that

other honourable members are confused over this matter.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move as an amendment to the motion of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas that the amendments of the Other Place be agreed to with the amendment that the House does not accept the deletion of paragraph (e) of Clause 4.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does that not conflict with Rule 261?

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable junior member for St. Thomas has moved that the amendments be read a second time but we are not agreeing to all the amendments. Therefore we agree to the amendments of the Other Place with our amendment that paragraph (e) of clause 4 be re-inserted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Under Rule 261 I cannot accept any motion for the disagreement of any amendments until the amendments have been read a second time.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker.—Do I understand that the motion of the honourable Leader of the House is out of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is my ruling.

Mr. MAPP: Do I understand Your Honour's ruling to be that if we agree to the second reading of the amendments we accept the amendments as they are without any further amendments?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for St. Thomas will make a motion that the amendments be agreed to with amendments.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: If you look at Rule 174 you will see the equivalent procedure. If I remember correctly, the procedure is that the amendments are read a first and second time and then you either agree or disagree to them or you agree to them with amendments. What we have done before is to agree to the second reading of the amendments and then discuss them in Committee; there is an alternative method that you take the amendments one by one and you agree or disagree to them. That is my recollection.

Mr. BRYAN: As far as I can see, I am being asked to vote on the motion for accepting the amendments of the Other Place and then I am told that I will be asked to vote for the rejection of one of the same amendments with which I am being asked to agree. I cannot get the position clarified.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My interpretation of the Rule is that the honourable member is not accepting the amendments, but the second reading of the amendments. It is the duty of the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker to consent to these amendments being read a second time and whatever is to be done can then be done.

Mr. BRYAN: I do not see Your Honour's ruling clearly and I beg to move that the further consideration of these amendments be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to second that.

Dr. CUMMINS: The acceptance or rejection of these amendments is fairly urgent; the availability of these Scholarships has been advertised and we are hoping that these nurses who are selected will be able to leave Barbados some time during this month. That is the position.

The question that the further consideration of these amendments be postponed was put and resolved in the negative Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER declaring "I think the 'Noes' have it."

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the amendment to Clause 2 of the Bill be now agreed to.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the amendment to Clause 4 be disagreed to.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not agree that this amendment should be rejected. It will be remembered that the Opposition readily agreed that this Bill was long overdue because we have noticed that in other colonies a scheme for training public employees had been gone into and put in practice immediately after the cessation of the last hostilities, and we feel that something of this sort should be done in Barbados. I feel very certain that the Other Place was absolutely correct in making this amendment to this Clause. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas, who should know about the nurses, points out that there are persons employed by the Government, who are not yet qualified and who would benefit from this scheme. If that is so, I suggest that the Government should set out those persons in this Bill, since they know the classes of persons, because the Governor-in-Executive Committee might change overnight and merchants might be sent to England. I should like it set out in this Bill that persons who are receiving remuneration from public funds can benefit from this scheme: it would be much better to set that out in order to avoid giving any blank cheque in this Bill. I feel that if such an amendment is made the Other Place would be unwise not to agree to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee such latitude as to award Scholarships to and provide training for other persons who are not specified in this Clause but who may be receiving their living directly or indirectly from public funds. When the Other Place make an amendment to a Bill you can not always think that they are infringing on the rights of this Place.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think there is any idea that the rights of this House are being infringed upon.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The idea might not be expressed, but it may be implied. I am suggesting that paragraph (e) of this Clause be retained to be read in this way: "Such other persons or classes of persons as may be receiving remuneration from public funds." People may be indirectly receiving remuneration from public funds and training may be of great assistance to them and to the colony; but under paragraph (a), (b), (c) or (d) of this Clause the Governor-in-Executive Committee would not be granting any Scholarship. I do not think that paragraph (e) should be worded "Such other persons or classes of persons as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may from time to time determine"; it should be worded "Such other persons or classes of persons as may be receiving remuneration from public funds." That paragraph as amended would give the Governor-in-Executive Committee the right to give training to all and sundry who receive any kind of salary or payment from public funds. I agree with the honourable Deputy Leader of the House that from time to time there may be coming up cases in which the granting of scholarships is not provided for under any of the paragraphs (a), (b), (c) or (d); I therefore beg to move that the amendment to Clause 4 be further amended by re-inserting paragraph (e) with the words "as may be receiving remuneration from public funds" after the words "classes of persons" occurring in line 1 and that the remaining words be deleted.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am in agreement with the spirit of the amendment proposed by the honourable senior member for the City. When this Bill was originally before the House—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable member is not seconding the amendment he cannot proceed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I may say that I am so much in agreement with the amendment that I will second it. When this Bill was before the House originally I think I stood alone in pointing out the dangers inherent in this paragraph of Clause 4; I pointed out that this paragraph would give the Government extraordinary latitude and I, for one, am not at all surprised that rational people in any part of the Legislature should have condemned it outright. For us to say that we should establish a fund for the training of public servants and then give the Governor-in-Executive Committee the power to utilise the fund in awarding Scholarships to such other persons or classes of persons they may determine, is the nearest approach to a blank cheque imaginable. It is fairly safe to say that this fund would become a patronage fund from time to time. It would be open to abuse and all sorts of favouritism and nepotism. As a matter of fact, there would be no reason why any Governor-in-Executive Committee or any member of the Executive Committee who had a very good friend, a good political canvasser who may be a grave digger falling outside the categories set out in this Clause of this Bill, could not give him a Scholarship to learn to dig graves in Newfoundland or somewhere else. The expenditure under this fund should be restricted to categories of employment in the Government service.

Although I seconded the amendment, I am not particularly enamoured over it from the point of view that the public service or semi-public service should be entirely free from pulling political strings if the Civil Service is to render unqualified support to any Government in power, I do not think the Government itself should have the power indiscriminately to pick out the people from any part of the Service and award Scholarships like that. You do not want to have the slightest possibility of favouritism or abuse in a matter of this sort; the mere fact of putting this power into the hands of your Cabinet signifies that it will not serve the real purpose for which the fund was intended. I should like to see those things separate from any political attachment whatever, but the amendment as moved by the hon. senior member for the City is a considerable improvement to what the House had very unreasonably agreed to before.

Mr. ADAMS: I will be very brief because I have no intention of trespassing on the duty of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who will reply. The hon. senior member for St. Philip has thundered against the Government that we have not dreamed of sending ex-servicemen for training. The hon. member knows that no member of the present Government has the slightest desire—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not referring to the present Government specifically.

Mr. ADAMS: I am saying very little. All that brought me to my feet is the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Philip. We have been told that ex-servicemen got training in England and we have been asked why should they not be given Scholarships? but as soon as the Government puts in a Clause which covers ex-servicemen, the hon. member is opposed to it. None of us want to have anything to do with any selections under paragraph (a), (b), (c) or (d); we are nothing to do with awarding any Scholarship. All this paragraph says is that the Public Service Commission makes recommendations to the Governor and the Governor makes the selections; I would cut off my head before having any say in the making of any selections for awarding Scholarships.

Dr. CUMMINS: I have listened carefully to the amendment proposed by the honourable senior mem-

ber for the City. Evidently he means well, but he has lost sight of the fact that his amendment is too narrow; he knocks it down to a handful of people who might be receiving remuneration from the Government. If there is a brilliant girl who has been trained at St. Michael's Girls' School or Queen's College and wants to follow the career of a radiographer, she can be recommended for a scholarship and be appointed on the staff of the Hospital. The Government cannot be in a position to say that you should study radiography, but you will have to bind yourself to come back here and work for the Government. Suppose there is a brilliant young fellow at any foundry; on the recommendation of the Governor-in-Executive Committee that boy can be given an opportunity to study engineering abroad. Only this morning I was speaking with someone who was going through the West Indies investigating the question of the training of nurses and she pointed out that one of the things in which the training at the Hospital is lacking is continuity; you have people coming down here on contract for two or three years and there is another break of two or three years before you get anybody else. Is it not better to have some of our own people to come back here and be with us for a longer time than other people? That is the sort of things which the Government has in view. You hear the question asked: "What about training people?" and now that we have come down with a comprehensive scheme, honourable members are opposed to it. I repeat that the honourable member's amendment is too narrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I do not think that for the good running of the Government service provision should be made whereby you can go outside and co-opt people into the service by this short route. That will create a lot of dissatisfaction among other people who are in the service and who have given years of service there. From the example which the hon. Deputy Leader of the House has cited in respect of one following the career of a radiographer, a nurse who feels that she is capable might think that if she is given the chance she can take a shorter course.

Dr. CUMMINS: On a point of order. It takes more than eight years' service as a nurse to do radiography.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I do not say that I have all the information at my fingertips as to how long it would take a trained nurse to do the course in radiography, but there is the danger that if what the honourable member has in mind is correct, it will provide opportunities for people being co-opted into the Government service by the short route. That will cause a lot of dissatisfaction among people who are already in the service; you will be trying to get people to join the service. I still feel that from what the honourable Deputy Leader of the House has said, you will be letting people into the service through the back door, so to speak, and a lot of people will think that favouritism is being shown in the matter.

Mr. ALLDER: I did not want to speak after the honourable Deputy Leader has replied, but his recent explanation of this matter has caused me to be more apprehensive than before; the honourable member has made the position worse than it was when he first spoke. In the Message which it is proposed to send to the Other Place, it is set out that--

(i) the Bill is intended to provide training facilities solely for members of the Public Service, and
(ii) there are many classes of persons employed by the Government of the Island who could benefit from any such scheme, but who are not specifically included in the classes enumerated in the Bill.

Yet the honourable member, in trying to justify our giving his amendment our sanction, has intimated

that if an engineer at the Central Foundry shows aptitude for further learning, the Government would select him and send him out to be further qualified at the expense of the taxpayers. I do not agree with that at all. In my opinion, if private concerns want to qualify their employees they are quite capable and ready and willing to pull their pockets and help those employees to go overseas and become further qualified, because in the end the private concerns will enjoy the benefits. As some honourable member has said, the Government's proposal will cause grave dissatisfaction among the Civil Servants. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas went further and said that if a girl from Queen's College or St. Michael's Girls' School shows any promise and desire of becoming a radiographer, the Government would select that girl, who would be a nurse, and send her overseas for training. There is one point which the honourable member has forgotten and it is that such a girl could not show any aptitude of becoming a radiographer because she has never been associated with anything along those lines; but I agree with the honourable member that she might have a desire or her family might have a desire for her to become qualified at the Government's expense.

I do not agree with the Government looking around for people to give them training; I can remember when something similar to this proposal was brought up and objections were raised and warnings given that the money would be misused. Today we are being told not to limit this scheme to those who are employed by the Government, but to give a blank cheque to the Governor-in-Executive Committee to go wherever they like and select people and tell them: "You can go to England or Europe; we are going to pay the expense." I do not agree with that at all. I notice that in the past when any delegates were to be sent overseas, a special Resolution was brought before this House and approved by honourable members; in that way honourable members were able to register their approval or disapproval of the proposals because the names of the delegates had to be forwarded. We have since been asked to agree to a lump sum to be put at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and in the short space of time very few honourable members were in agreement with the delegates who were selected and sent overseas at the expense of the taxpayers; that is something which has caused some honourable members to be more apprehensive and reluctant in giving any blank cheque to the Government to be used as they like. Honourable members are very reluctant in applying a stated sum of money to a patronage fund to be used by those who feel they must help Tom, Dick and Harry although they may not be the most deserving of being helped. I appreciate some assistance being given to local personnel to become qualified and I hope that such a thing will be so successful as to prevent us from having to import strangers to this colony on high salaries: we do not want to pay high salaries to strangers when our people can be assisted both in qualifying themselves and in doing the jobs. After hearing the explanation of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, I feel that if some strong personality on the Executive Committee feels like going to St. Andrew and helping Mr. "X's" family, he can get the Executive Committee to decide that Mr. "X's" son or daughter be selected as a candidate for training overseas. That is what we should not allow; the position should not be that these things can happen more than they have been happening in the past. Before any allocation of money is made, I would like to see the name of the selectee and to know the reasons for the selection of him or her; that information should be presented to this House so that it could be known whether the selection is based on justification or not.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— While I feel that we must differ at times I cannot agree with the honourable member who said that this paragraph should be deleted or that its provisions should be restricted, for the simple reason that if it is restricted to Government employees and the committee feel that they want to help their friends they can select friends from among Government employees just the same. We have been hearing many arguments even in this Chamber that we have too many imported officials in Barbados. I feel that the Government should be commended for including such a clause as this so as to be able to send out some of our people and develop their latent talents. I am particularly glad that some of our girls will be able to go out and get this training. Are not these people also taxpayers? Why can they not be given an opportunity to go out and have their talents developed by training? I agree with the honourable junior member for St. Thomas that when you find a boy or girl in school with ability you should be in a position to help him or her. Why should we just limit this to those who are already employed. It is like seeing a precious jewel and allowing it to lie in the gutter. It is looking at life in a narrow way.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— When this Bill was first before us I went even further than the Government, and I suggested that rather than have the Public Service Commission alone choosing these persons for training I did not see why the Ministers of the Government could not do it. We will in the future have ministers. I can remember the honourable senior member for St. Joseph reiterating very strongly that Civil Servants should be kept out of politics, and that members of the Government should not put themselves in the position of being accused of patronage or anything of the sort. I feel that many of these arguments are a lot of hypocrisy and talk through one side of the month, and that wherever you get politics, especially with people on the other side, you get a lot of helping of one's friends, putting them in good positions etc. It sounded very strange coming from the honourable senior member for the City today the statement that the Government should not be in a position to help their friends.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable member knows that he is a stranger to the truth. He knows that I never said any such thing. I refrained from saying anything about friends. I do not believe in that. I believe that if you do not help your friends when you are in power you will not help your enemies either.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member said that this Government would not be in power all the time and would help merchants.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I never said any such thing.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member knows what he said, but he will not say it. However, Sir, he cannot prevent me from repeating it. He said that the Government would help its friends. I took it that he was speaking of government from his side of the table. If they were in power they would take every opportunity of helping their friends. Even in the Public Service Commission nowadays conservative friends still get help behind the scenes. I know that that is a strong statement to make, but I can bring—however I had better leave it out. A lot of it is mere hypocrisy to say that the Government will go outside and bring in people from private employment. What is wrong with helping an engineer to get training so long as it is laid down that when he comes back here

he must work for the Government of this colony? I see nothing wrong with helping such people so long as there is that guarantee.

I feel sir, that it is an error to say at one time that we should help West Indians and Barbadians to secure certain posts in Government Service and then say that the Government should not be free to choose a bright boy or girl and give them a scholarship for further training so that they may be of assistance to the Government. Such arguments have no force. It seems to me that some honourable members are merely opposing the Government and backing up the Other Place and trying to get around this clause. It seems strange coming from members like the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable senior member for St. John. At least they have been listening to the arguments of Government members to-day, and they have been saying in the past that we should train our own people and give them advantages over people from outside.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of order, sir. The honourable member has quoted my name; but the points that he has raised make it seem as if he is trying to misquote me. I am against Government having the latitude to go anywhere and pick out people from outside the Service.

Mr. MAPP: I do not see how the honourable member can say that I have misquoted him. I cannot see any force in the argument that the Government should not go outside the Service and train people. I do not think that the honourable senior member for St. Philip could have been serious when he talked about gardeners and grave diggers, unless he means political grave diggers, and they do not require special training for that. I have not heard any really serious argument against the retention of this paragraph. I thought that the honourable member would have based his criticisms on the way in which the Government awarded Barbados Scholarships in the past—letting the scholars go to work in Nigeria or in some part of the Colonial Service instead of letting them come back here so that Barbados might enjoy the benefit of their experience and knowledge. I thought that the honourable member would have said that the present Training Scheme is alright so long as you guarantee that the trainees will return here and give their services to the Government of this colony. Again it is on so few occasions that the honourable member stands up for the Other Place that I find it difficult to understand what he is getting at.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable member seems to have misinterpreted the situation. I am not standing up for the Other Place. I am not following the Other Place; they are following me.

Mr. MAPP: I have not mentioned the honourable member's name in that connection. I congratulate the Government for insisting on the retention of this part of the Bill.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I do not know that I have much to say. When this Bill was before the House I said that I did not like this clause, and now I find that the Other Place has deleted it. I said I did not like the words "such other persons or classes of persons." I do not appreciate a Socialist Government talking about "classes of persons." (Laughter). I would like to suggest that you delete the words "classes of persons."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that the words mean the various classes of employment in which people may find themselves.

Mr. MILLER: I do not take it that way, sir. The Governor-in-Executive Committee will have the

power to decide on these persons. Take a man of the genius of Mr. Broodhagen. He only got an opportunity to go abroad through the British Council.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that paragraph (e) would cover a person like Mr. Broodhagen.

Mr. MILLER: I observe that. There are people not employed by the Government to whom it is right to give a chance to obtain further training. We have to import a great number of people for certain jobs. That is so because we have no means of training many of the people of this colony. Government should give them some opportunity. I object to the idea that the Government should not go outside of the Service and elect people for training. The type of person who will get into the Government Service is not necessarily the only type of person who will benefit from a training course. I feel that the Public Service Commission with the authorisation of the Governor-in-Executive Committee should be free to select people from anywhere as long as they are satisfied that you have the necessary aptitude. You may have people outside the type who would be accepted into the Service, but who would benefit from a training course, instead of being left in the gutter as they often are.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—As I see it this sub-clause (e) will only be invoked if there are exceptional cases. It is not a question of not making ample provision for members of the Public Service or anyone in receipt of government funds. This sub-clause will only be invoked in very exceptional cases. It will be invoked to meet cases of people with exceptional talent and skill which can be utilised by the Government for the benefit of the island. It is not a question of patronage. It is not a means whereby anything will be done by way of patronage as in the past. It is a question of taking an opportunity to give people who show great promise technically or otherwise a chance to get some training. When we remember that the Gulf Oil Co. is about to start operations here we can well realise that the need for trained local people is great.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I want to call attention to the fact that this Bill is entitled "An Act to make provision for the establishment of a Training Fund for purposes connected with the improvement and efficiency of the Public Services of the Island by means of training."

Mr. TALMA: With all respect to Your Honour the Public Services of the island do not necessarily relate to the Clerical Service.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I drew the honourable member's attention to the title of the Bill because he particularly mentioned the name of an oil company for whom people should be trained to work.

Mr. TALMA: In any case, sir, the question that arises in this sub-clause (e) is that provision is being made to make available for the purpose of development the best possible material which Barbados has to offer. It is not a question of debarring anyone because he or she does not happen to be in receipt of public emoluments. By this sub-clause we are seeking to take advantage of the best possible skill and ability at the disposal of this island and which the government in its wisdom will utilise for the benefit of the public service and the inhabitants of the island as a whole. That is how I understand it. As far as this sub-clause is concerned, when we think of the rampant unemployment that exists in this island I do not think that the Government can be accused of abusing the powers which this sub-clause seeks to give. If you are thinking of the Government in power, in all probability this argument

may not have taken place this afternoon. But no matter what Government is in power in this island none will abuse a sub-clause such as this which will be a means of advancing technically and otherwise the best possible talent and ability at our disposal.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I regret very much that I have to join in this useless debate. But the arguments used by the honourable junior member for St. Thomas have been so amusing that they have brought me to my feet. Now, sir, this Bill, this Address —

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking the honourable member not to refer to the Address. It is not before the House at the moment.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Then this is useless.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Address will follow in due course. The honourable member will have ample time to speak on it.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: The Bill only mentions the Public Services, sir, so what is the need for all this argument? It seems to me that the honourable member was trying to camouflage the issue, and I want to use some strong language. It is a dishonest attempt to throw dust in our eyes, and an attempt to railroad through a Bill with a clause of this nature for reasons of personal aggrandisement, because we are still in the Christmas season and the minds of honourable members are not clear enough to study this Bill.

The honourable junior member for St. Thomas argued in support of this Bill which is to benefit Public Service and Parochial Employees and School-teachers and now we come down to sub-clause (e) which talks about such other persons or classes of persons." I think that that is ambiguous. I think it is unnecessary. I think that the argument by the honourable senior member for St. Michael —

Mr. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I object.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I mean the honourable senior member for the City will take care of these nameless persons. I do not think that we, as a responsible body, should sit here and agree with something like this; because it will cause trouble in the near future. I would advise Government not to press this sub-clause. I am supporting its deletion. I hope that honourable members will put aside personal interest and only seek the interest of the men and women whom we are supposed to represent. According to this Bill we are supposed to be looking after the Public Service. Those outside can be taken care of by those outside.

This is a time, sir, when we should be dealing with more important things that will interest this community. Look at the many things on the Order Paper in my name. I hope that Government members will see the wisdom in refraining from forcing this sub-clause through the House because it will come back later like a boomerang and cause confusion in this House.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker. —I wonder if the honourable junior member for St. Thomas would accept an amendment that after the word "classes of persons" you insert the words "employed by the Government". (A MEMBER: No.) That is strange because that is the written policy of the Government. The Bill is solely for members of the Public Service, and there are many classes of persons employed in those Services. The amendment that I was suggesting is in keeping with the written policy of the Government. I am sure that if the honourable senior member for Christ Church who is now reading it very carefully had read it before he spoke he would not have fallen

into the error in which he fell. Government has told us in writing why we should not oppose this sub-clause, and now Government has been caught by what it has written.

All that the argument of the honourable senior member for the City amounts to is to limit the classes of persons mentioned in the sub-clause (e) to persons employed by the Government. And that is exactly the position on which the Government has come here to-day. The Bill sets it out clearly in the heading, and the Government, consistently, has stated it to-day in writing. Now we are hearing argument after argument. It seems that the members of the Government have not read their written policy, because they are talking contrary to it. This Bill is solely for members of the Public Service. Now Government has told us here—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must not refer to that.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I am referring to the written policy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will have to be apprised of the written policy.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: We have got to assume that the Government knows what it means. What greater proof can you bring than this?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member need only confine himself to what is before the House.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: What I am saying is very simple. The classes of persons mentioned in (e) should be the equivalent of those mentioned before except that they should be Government employees. The arguments used by members on the other side have been contrary to the written policy of the Government. It is not my word against anyone else's word; but my word backed up by Government's own written policy. I am going to vote for the amendment because it does seem to put in words which the honourable junior member for St. Thomas intended should be embodied in this sub-clause.

On the motion being put that paragraph (e) of Section 4 read: "Such other persons or classes of persons as may be receiving remuneration from Public Funds" the question was decided in the negative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD.—(8).

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MAPP, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. ADAMS, Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. COX and Mr. BRANCKER.—(13)

The motion that the amendments of the Legislative Council to Clause 4 be disagreed with was put and carried on the declaration of Mr. Deputy Speaker that the "ayes" have it.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox the amendments to Clause 5 were agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—At this stage I will proceed with the Address to the Other Place. I understand that a matter of this sort is provided for in May's Parliamentary Procedure. I beg to move that the following Address to the Other Place do now pass:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

The Honourable The Legislative Council

The House of Assembly has the honour to acknowledge receipt of the Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill entitled "An Act to make provision for the Establishment of a Training Fund for purposes connected with the improvement and efficiency of the Public

Services of the Island by means of training" with amendments thereto and state that it accepts the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to Sections 2 and 5 of the Bill but since—

- (i) the Bill is intended to provide training facilities for actual and/or potential members of the Public Services and,
- (ii) there are many classes of persons employed by the Government of the Island who could benefit from such a Scheme, but who are not specifically included in the Classes enumerated in the Bill,

the House of Assembly cannot accept the Council's amendment deleting paragraph (e) of Section 4 of the Bill.

The House of Assembly now has the honour to return the said Bill to the Honourable the Legislative Council.

Honourable members will notice that the Address I have just moved deviates from the printed copy by deleting the word "solely" and inserting the words "for actual and/or potential".

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Bill as I have got it says the Public Services. I do not know if that is a misprint or not. The Bill with the amendments of the Other Place says Public Services.

Dr. CUMMINS: It is not a misprint. It was put in deliberately.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This Bill has already passed this House. I do not know that the House can insert something entirely different now.

Dr. CUMMINS: Your Honour drew to my attention that Public Services was mentioned in the original Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am talking about the insertion of the words "actual and/or potential."

Dr. CUMMINS: They are not to be inserted in the Bill, but in the Address.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I am acting on a theory which I have acted on in the past. If you speak first you give the others a chance to pick a hole in your arguments. What has happened this afternoon is only a repetition of what happened when the Bill was first before the House. All these points were threshed out then. It was pointed out that you were giving the Government a blank cheque etc. The members of the Other Place repeated the same arguments. I have been told that some of them did not know it had been threshed out here and that the Government had pointed out certain facts. It was made clear that there were certain people who did not really come within the category of public servants, but who, nevertheless, were employed by the Government; and they might be deserving of training and of being put subsequently into the Public Service. Cases like that would come up to the Executive in the category of potential government servants. When the honourable senior member for St. Philip talks about patronage he forgets that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I objected to it, and no reply on the point was made by any government member.

Mr. ADAMS: I must protest against members who only have the right to speak once getting up and making another speech. If I have said anything wrong the honourable member can get up and speak after me. Government was stressing the case of people like student nurses, agricultural officers, veterinary officers, people who are not actually in the Service. There are very few vets in the Service. If you confine yourself to people in the Service you will rule out people like that. If it were true that the Government was extending patronage—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the speech which the honourable member is making now is one which he should have made when the ques-

tion of amending the clause in the Bill was before the House.

Mr. ADAMS: Unless I am out of order in making a speech on this motion I can speak when I like. With the greatest respect if I make it now or if I made it then is neither here nor there. When we put in the words "actual and/or potential" it is to show —

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are merely putting those words in the Address?

Mr. ADAMS: I am saying that it is necessary to make it abundantly clear that this is no new departure by the Government. I cannot stress that enough. We mean today the same thing that we meant when the Bill was first before the House. Two or three honourable members talked about a blank cheque. I repeat that I have spoken to members of the Other Place and told them what took place in the House. They said they did not see it in the newspapers. But although I told them so before their debate some of them repeated the same arguments. It is not and was never the Government's intention to pick up people from here there and everywhere.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip has said that British Guiana gives scholarships to ex-servicemen. Those are scholarships for training people in rice production. That is not a normal government service. Obviously you are going to help people in the Government Service first; but you will also have to help people who deserve help and whom you put in the category of "potential" government servants. It is also obvious that we should make it a condition that trainees must come back and give us the benefit of their training. All over the world Governments give scholarships on that condition. I have always been in favour of putting that in. I have also said what all the English Universities tell me: It is alright to put those things in, but it seldom works. I can only remember one case in which we made it a condition where a girl was getting a scholarship that she should come back, and she got married and her husband paid back the Government. But if students do not come back are you going to go into court with them and sue them each time? I say put in the condition, but do not be surprised if it does not work in a hundred per cent of the cases. It is true that some West Indian scholars go into the Colonial Service. If we have one and instead of coming back here he goes to Malaya are you going to sue him and collect the money in the High Court of Malaya? If honourable members feel that putting in that condition is a waste of time we will not worry with it. If honourable members feel it would be a good thing to make such a trainee sign a bond to return here no one would be more willing to press that view in Executive Committee than I. We will put in the condition that the trainee must come back and give, say, five years service, or the Government will sue them if it wants to. I give the assurance that if the other members of the Executive are willing that will be put in I myself think it is perfectly reasonable.

It is unfortunate if the Bill has been worded to give the wrong impression. But although we did not mention Mr. Broodhagen by name, I said that the Government should not be prevented from going outside the Public Service to provide for suitable cases. I am glad to see that all are agreed that that is how it should be.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—It is unfortunate that the speech which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has made this afternoon was not made when this Bill was first before the House. Let any member of this House if he wants to stifle his conscience say that the im-

pression that has been given this afternoon was given when the Bill was first discussed here. If that had been said it would have been suggested that you should call the Bill one to provide for Adult Education or for General Training. The argument used today was not used then.

I do not know if the Leader of the House finds himself in such a position that he has got to get out of it somehow. Although Your Honour ruled at first that the Address should not be referred to, I want to know how anyone could say that the Bill was intended to provide solely for Public Servants—which is exactly what it was when it first came before the House—and now amend it by saying "actual and/or potential members of the Public Services." Every member of the public is a potential member of the Public Services, a potential employee of the Government. Is this a general training scheme? If the argument today had been used when we first discussed the Bill we would have said this is not a Public Service Scheme at all. They did not say Civil Servants; they said Public Servants. Every living soul, from the labourer at Dodds to the Colonial Secretary is a public servant. They went on to say Parochial Employees, Secondary School teachers etc. But none of the arguments used today were used then. I do believe that it was only after they heard the arguments of the Opposition that they had to say that this is a general training scheme. Now look at what they say in paragraph 2 of the Address.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is in the Bill is in the Bill; not in the Address.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Your Honour knows that this Address is absolute nonsense. This amendment—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not an amendment. It is a consequential Address on something that the House has done.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Yes, sir, but you will agree with me that it is nonsense. No one is saying that the honourable member should not come with a Bill for providing for general training, but how could that be a Bill to provide training facilities for public servants? The honourable member suggested the amendment to the Address.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member suggested no such amendment. He was justifying these words in the Address.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am dealing with what is before us. How can he justify putting in the words "actual and/or potential" when in saying why the House cannot accept the amendment of the Other Place we see, "there are many classes of persons employed by the Government of the Island who could benefit from such a scheme, but who are not specifically included in the classes enumerated in the Bill." They are going to send this Address to the Other Place. What folly in saying "let us have the power to let all these people in the Service benefit. Although you suggest that this paragraph (e) should come out we think it should stay in because there are a number of people employed in the Public Services of the island who are not included here."

All I am saying, sir, is that if the arguments used now had been used before, the paragraph would not have been cut out. The Opposition would not have wasted time in saying a lot of the things that they said. I am not prepared to bandy words with the honourable Leader of the House, but I am sure that if you can pass a Bill to provide training for the Public Services and then come back with an Address to make it provide for actual and/or potential members of the Public Services, what you needed originally was a Bill to provide for the general public. Members of the Government find

themselves in this position today because of the fact that they had to put this new point of view before us today. They themselves did not understand what they wanted when the Bill was first before the House. What happened was that the Other Place supported the view of the Opposition of this House and the Government was obliged to prepare this Message and bring it here today so as to save the situation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your amendment said persons drawing money from the Public Service

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The only thing that the Leader of the House has said today is that to give people who are not already in the Public Service scholarships there should be a condition that they serve the country for a period of years. I want to say this in answer to the Deputy Leader. The qualifications of nurses or members of the Public Service are settled by the Public Service Commission. Therefore these qualifications are not confined to those of a scholastic nature or other qualifications for the particular type of work. They are open to every Barbadian and therefore the fact that this is open makes it sufficient to say that a Public Service Bill should confine itself to the Public Service, and not be a general Bill. My argument is that this Address is a thought up thing to save the situation. (A MEMBER: A man with your type of mind would think that). My type of mind can never be like his. It has always risen above the gutter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Whatever is in the Bill that is signed by the Governor will become the law of the land. This Address can never be considered as the law of the land. I say that because the honourable member seems to be perturbed about the Address.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Government members cannot come at the last minute and tell us that this is a general bill. I repeat that when they brought the Bill before the House no such argument as has been used to-day was used then.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please pass on.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The amendment that we suggested, sir,—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That amendment has been dealt with, and it is no longer before the House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I know that, sir, I am not going to vote for the Message because the Bill deals with the Public Services and the Message deals with a general bill. I am convinced that the Government only came in with these arguments because they heard the arguments of the Opposition.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—The most powerful argument which can be adduced for the extension of the provisions of this Bill—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member speaking on the Address?

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on the Address.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This Address is consequent on the amendments made by the Other Place. If the honourable member can point out to me that the wording of the Address conflicts with what has been done today I would be grateful.

Mr. BARROW: The most powerful argument that could be used for the extension of the provisions of the Bill to these other persons and classes of persons mentioned in paragraph (e) has not been used—that is the possible cessation of the activities of Colonial Development and Welfare—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is obviously taking this opportunity to make a speech which he should have made at an earlier stage.

Mr. BARROW: What I am saying is nothing to do with any earlier stage. I am speaking on the

Address, but Your Honour has not allowed me to come to the specific part of the Address to which I am alluding. I am saying that the most powerful argument for the retention of this paragraph is the possible cessation of the activities of C.D. & W. and the British Council, and the Government has admitted that it has failed to point out to the members of the Other Place how desirable it is that this paragraph which the Other Place deleted from the Bill passed by the House should be retained so as to cover a wider class of persons than members of the Public Service or people receiving emoluments from the Treasury. It is unfortunate that the Government did not make that point abundantly clear at an earlier stage. If they had, a lot of time would have been saved in the discussion which has taken place.

I would like to make one observation on a point raised by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. He did it out of defence to the remarks made by the Opposition. I still feel that to make a promise that the Government will exact an undertaking from potential employees that they will come back after their training and give the island the benefit of what they have learned for a limited period is impracticable and inadvisable. It has been the experience of C.D. & W. and the British Council that on such times as they have tried to make such stipulations relative to the granting of scholarships it was impossible to pin the person down to the terms of the agreement.

Government having sent down a Bill to provide for training for members of the Public Services and then having enlarged it to include potential members, I would like to ask what yardstick will be used to determine if a person is a potential member of the Public Services or not. For the sake of giving away money you may send a man for training and have no guarantee that you will have a job for him when he returns, or a man who, before he left Barbados for training was a potential member of the Public Service may cease to be such because he has failed his course of training. But having already spent a good deal of the taxpayers' money on him someone may say that he is a potential member of the Service.

I am saying that this is a matter which the Government should only embark on after careful deliberation; because it is apt to cause discontent among members of the Civil Service, who, no one will deny, have great potential capacity for improving the Civil Service if given the necessary training. Also, a man who is already in the Service is far more likely to return and get his pension rights than a man who was never in the Service or who may not have been in the island for the last eight years because he was studying in England, and you decide to give him a prolongation of his stay away from Barbados. If they embark on a course which may be one of injustice to their present employees in favour of potential will advise the Government to be very careful before employees.

That is a consideration which, I feel, must be borne in mind all the time. It is unfortunate that the Government thought it fit at this stage to assume some of the functions already exercised by the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation and the British Council. I hope that, as this Message now stands, the Government has finally made up its mind to do what it wants to do.

The question that this Message do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER declaring "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

Dr. CUMMINS: At this stage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 70, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew.

NOTICE

Mr. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask leave to give notice of a Resolution of which I should have given notice earlier this afternoon. It was an oversight on the part of the Secretariat.

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

Mr. COX: I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations, 1952.

RESOLUTION TO SANCTION "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PAYMENT OF PASSAGES) (AMENDMENT) NO. 2 ORDER 1952."

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to take as the next Order of the Day, Order No. 9, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and I am asking leave to take charge of it as well.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to sanction the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages) (Amendment) No. 2 Order, 1952."

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—This is a Resolution which seeks to amend the Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages) Order. According to the Regulations now in force, the maximum amount of passage allowed an officer who is coming to this colony is £300, and recently there have been cases in which officers coming here have had to spend more than that amount in order to get here. That state of affairs is having an effect on our obtaining suitable officers in this colony, and therefore the suggestion has been made that this Order should be amended and brought into line with conditions obtaining in the colonies; that is to say, the full amount which it costs an officer to come to Barbados should be paid by the Government. As far as Barbados is concerned, we are reluctant to adopt such a change, but the position obtaining at present is certainly having an effect on our obtaining officers to fill certain vacancies. At the moment the office of Deputy Director of Agriculture is vacant; there is an officer who would come to Barbados on the condition that the full cost of his passage be paid by this Government instead of the amount of £300 which is allowed at present. He would not accept this office until that matter is settled, and it appears to me that if we want to get these fully qualified men we will have to relax and fall into line with other colonies. Barbados, the Bahamas and Bermuda are the only three colonies which are holding out about having the payment of

these passages in full. I understand that while Bermuda will not make a general regulation to that effect, yet when cases do occur, they are dealt with by Resolution passed in the House. I think that our waiting to pass a Resolution might militate against our getting scientific men; these men are scarce as we know and they can get appointments anywhere. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: I would like to know if a special Resolution to make provision for paying the passage of this particular officer should not be brought here instead of putting the matter on a permanent basis. What I mean is this; to spend the amount of £300 in bringing an officer here is a reasonable amount and there should be some stipulation as regards the maximum amount which should be spent in bringing any officer here. I would like to hear from which country this officer is coming and what is the cost of the passage from that country here. Further, I thought that if an Englishman who might be wanted here for a particular post, were in any part of the British Empire, inasmuch as his residence might be in England, we should consider paying his passage here from there. There might be some people who feel that they must travel by the best liners, and some maximum amount of passage should be set out. I am wondering if this matter should not be dealt with by a special Resolution rather than change the Act; this sort of thing might be carried too far. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas has not said that the cost of this officer's passage is "X" or "Y" pounds and the matter needs some clarification.

Mr. GODDARD: Like the honourable senior member for St. John, I feel that a special Resolution should have been brought down to meet this case. We need this officer badly and we are prepared to bring him down here; but to amend our Act so as to provide for all occasions means that we are opening the field widely to bring in officers from any part of the world. By this amendment we will have to pay the necessary extension of passage money to bring an officer from anywhere, and can we afford the necessary funds to meet all this expenditure? We have just provided leave passages in order to attract people to this colony and I think that a special Resolution should have been brought down to meet a case like this where we have to bring in this officer without widening the field in any general way. I quite agree with the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. John; what he has said was my first reaction when I saw this Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: We can only send down a special Resolution when we know what it will cost an officer to come down here. I think provision has been made for this officer, his wife and two children; this gentleman must have heard something about Barbados and he says that he is not leaving South Africa until this matter has been settled. He has to make a circuitous route and it is impossible to say how much his passage will cost. I know of two cases within recent years in which people had to spend more than what was allowed so as to come to Barbados. I agree with the honourable junior member for Christ Church that nobody would like to go in for any excessive spending, but at the same time when we are faced with conditions like these, where an officer of this sort has to come from that distance and he is not leaving there until this matter has been settled, we cannot do any better.

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

SUGAR INDUSTRY (LABOUR WELFARE)
(SPECIAL LEVY) BILL, 1953

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 7 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Peter:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to impose a special levy on Sugar and Fancy Molasses manufactured in this island in the year, 1952.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This Bill seeks to impose a levy on the sugar industry to provide money for the Labour Welfare Fund out of the marginal difference of \$3.48 per ton in the 1952 price of sugar in favour of Barbados. A special formula was used in 1952 to determine the price to be paid for sugar in the Commonwealth; the reason for the marginal difference is due to the fact that the levies payable into the three Funds—Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare—which amount to \$13.20 per ton, were taken into consideration and in applying this formula to Barbados we have this marginal difference in these Funds is equivalent to \$3.48 per ton. Negotiations have been going on for some time and there was a difference of opinion as to how this money should be used. A certain section felt that the marginal difference should be divided between the three Funds, but the Government gave consideration to this matter, and after giving what I regard as close and prolonged consideration to it, we felt that in the circumstances, this marginal difference of \$3.48 per ton should be put into the Labour Welfare Fund, especially when it is regarded that housing presents a very pressing problem. I think it is obvious to any sensible person that taking these three Funds into consideration, this money should be applied to the Labour Welfare Fund. One school of thought considers that this money should be paid to the peasants as a sort of window dressing, and the factories might say that they should be given this money. In New Zealand this marginal difference would not have arisen but the composite figure of 26.3, which is the overall figure, has placed Barbados in the most favourable position.

I will explain why the Government has decided to place this money in the Labour Welfare Fund: the total amount of this Fund is \$1,350,000, the amount reallocated is \$1,239,000 and the repayments including interest amount to \$180,000. The number of persons who have received loans is 3,973 and the number of applications awaiting attention is about 3,000. If approximately 4,000 people have received nearly \$1½ million and there are another 3,000 people waiting to receive loans, you can see what a demand is made on the Government and that the problem of housing is a very pressing one in this community. Anybody who pays attention to what is happening will know that people are asking if you can find accommodation for them at the Bay Estate or the Pine and I think that the Government is wise in using this money on housing. If we had adopted the attitude which some honourable members would have liked us to adopt in 1947, the money have been included in wages, the workers would not have been able to make this saving and the Government

would not have been able to provide this one million dollars for housing. I think that this island can take credit in leading the West Indies in this respect. At this point I would pay tribute to the Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank who has been favoured with an honour from the Queen; I think that he has been recognised for rendering worthwhile service; he has done a good job. It is not always easy to have Government people being praised, but we have here an honest man who has to deal with an enormous amount of money and nobody has made any accusation against his integrity and honesty as a public servant.

As I have been saying, you can see that with 3,000 people awaiting loans, the Government has chosen a wise policy in using this \$3.48 per ton in the Labour Welfare Fund, which will give this Fund for 1952 an amount of over \$500,000. Even with that amount I do not believe we can say that we are going to begin to go into the heart of housing, because we can see from all quarters that there is much more to be done than has already been done.

There are some typographical errors in the Bill to be corrected, like changing the figures "1952" to "1953". I do not think it is necessary for me to elaborate on this Bill any longer because I do not believe that anybody could begin to question this matter; I think it is agreed that this money should be used for housing. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I congratulate the Government on putting this entire difference to the Labour Welfare Housing Scheme, but I must say I am sorry that with a windfall of this sort, the Government did not find it possible to arrange this money so that it could be extended to workers other than those who are in the sugar industry. As the honourable junior member for St. Peter has said, there is a pressing need for housing, but if it is so pressing among those who are actually in work in our staple industry, what does the honourable member expect of those who are not in such regular employment? I throw out the suggestion that a windfall of this sort should be used for making loans to people other than those who are covered by the Labour Welfare Fund; I am sure the honourable junior member for St. Peter will agree with me that we are still collecting money for these Funds from the consumption of sugar and the people who are buying and consuming the sugar are not entitled to benefit under the Scheme at present.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am in sympathy with Mr. Deputy Speaker, but in the Five Year Plan we made provision for people other than sugar workers; the sum of \$750,000 has been earmarked for that purpose. This money with which we are now dealing has come merely from the sale of sugar and we cannot earmark it for anything other than what is concerned with the sugar industry; we would be criticised with justification for using in a general way money which has accrued from a certain source. I can assure Mr. Deputy Speaker that while money

is raised from the local consumption of sugar, yet we have made provision in this Bill that the money accruing from sugar which is not exported would have to be used in the same way as that for which we made that special enactment to prevent the price of locally-consumed sugar from rising. We have followed the suggestion of Mr. Deputy Speaker in a slightly different way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All the consumers are really paying for the sugar they consume so that a particular class of worker might benefit.

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

Clauses 4 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. Cox in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUGAR INDUSTRY (REHABILITATION LABOUR WELFARE AND IRRIGATION) BILL, 1953

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, —I ask leave to take Order No. 8 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Peter:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the disposal of certain moneys accruing in respect of sales of sugar to Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom including the provision out of such moneys of funds for research and investigation concerning irrigation in the Island and for the establishment of a Board in connection with such research and investigations and for matters incidental thereto.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, —This is another of those Bills relative to the fact that this island has been fortunate along with other sugar-producing territories as a result of the sale of sugar by the British Government to the Canadian Government, and the British Government is giving the profit to the Territories. The amount which has accrued to us in the years 1950 to 1952 is \$1,500,000 and the Government has agreed that this money should be divided into three equal portions for Irrigation, and the Rehabilitation and Labour Welfare Funds. Some people are of the opinion that the Government should erect a sugar factory for the purpose of grinding peasants' canes: well there are some people who believe in having a motor vehicle without having the wherewithal to run it, but a prudent man always likes to own something for the upkeep of which he can pay. Anybody can tell you that at to-day's cost it would be fantastic madness for the Government to spend the taxpayers' money in running a sugar factory on a competitive basis, because no peasant will send his canes to the Government factory if the Government is not paying as much for canes as other factories are paying. The Government, in its wisdom, has decided that it could not undertake to run a sugar factory at this stage. The best way of testing anything is to see how you can run it and anybody who knows what it is to run a sugar factory would not agree that we should undertake to run one out of this sum of \$1,500,000.

I will make the statement that the Rehabilitation Fund has benefited the island as a whole; if you do not rehabilitate the factories, it means that the many people who earn their living in the sugar industry cannot hope for improvement. If you are taking 10 tons of canes to make a ton of sugar, you have to see if by taking 8 tons of canes to make a ton of sugar, that would not afford something more for the peasant grower. A determining factor in determining the price of canes is also the efficiency of the factory to make a recovery, and in looking upon these ventures objectively it is necessary to look at them from the point of making the industry efficient.

The Government has agreed to establish a new fund in connection with irrigation. Some honourable members have been asking the Government to embark on a system of irrigation but here the Government could not embark on a system of irrigation until it has a lot of information about irrigation. The Government has to set up an Irrigation Board and we will get an expert to advise us before we even attempt to spend this money on irrigation. We have to know what type of irrigation we need, what types of soil we have and in what areas we can use irrigation. Before we attempt to spend any money on this scheme we are prepared to have that information by setting up an Irrigation Board.

As regards the Labour Welfare Fund, the same argument as that I used just now applies; we cannot put too much into the housing loans, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, we hope that some day we will get a windfall with which to deal with the workers which you mentioned when we were in Committee on the other Bill. Honourable members will agree that if this money is to be used for a special purpose we cannot use it for other purposes and we will have to find ways and means of doing something else to help other sections of the community. We do not want to upset the general equilibrium of the whole Colonial Empire and we have agreed that this money should be used in effecting improvements in the sugar industry as a whole. When we are convinced that enough has been spent on rehabilitation, we will be satisfied that rehabilitation should come to an end. Rehabilitation is something which the Ministry of Food has provided and when the Ministry of Food says that there is no need for the same amounts for these special Funds, the Ministry of Food will not give this money.

The establishment of an Irrigation Board is something new and everyone will agree that where the rainfall is considerably low we will have to consider the use of irrigation for the benefit of the island. There is the suggestion that the plantations can have their own irrigation plants; well, the Board will go into that question. The Government has embarked on making loans to small people who cannot provide funds for this purpose themselves; I mention that point now rather than have any honourable member make a big issue of it. If there is asked any sensible question which needs to be answered, I will endeavour to answer it. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: There has been agitation for some time in connection with the Government purchasing a sugar factory or setting up a sugar factory in the areas where the peasants are not sufficiently serviced. I think that Jamaica has decided to utilise their share of this money in erecting a factory in those areas where the peasants find it difficult to get their canes ground. But suppose that is not so; the left on the ground for several days and the canes lost Barbadian peasants have been suffering very badly

in recent years in getting their canes ground. There are many occasions as recently as last year when peasants suffered because their canes were cut and left on the ground for several days and the canes were cut and some of their weight. Be that as it may, I feel that it is definitely necessary for the Government to safeguard the peasants in getting their canes sold. Not only could a factory be set up for the benefit of the peasants, but the Government already owns about three plantations which produce canes and every year they advertise for contractors to buy their canes from the plantations. The canes from these plantations could be sent to the factory and the Government could make sure the proper running of the factory from the point of view of getting a regular supply of raw material. The honourable junior member for St. Peter says that the Government cannot see its way to run a factory of this sort, but in another breath the Government can see its way to nationalise the Barbados Electric Company. By saying that, the Government is saying that is capable of running a more difficult set up than a sugar factory. Now the setting up of a sugar factory is something which could relieve the peasants of this colony.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : I must rise on a point of order. What I did say was that the Government does not intend to use this money for the purpose of running a sugar factory; I am not responsible for the honourable member making the deduction he has made. The Government does not intend to embark on the scheme both from the point of view of the cost of setting up the factory and the running of it.

Mr. ALLDER : The honourable member said that a sensible Government would run something about which it knows.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : I said that any sensible Government would count the cost before setting out to do anything.

Mr. ALLDER : There is a general clamour among the peasants of this island for some guarantee to be given them from the point of view of reaping their crops; the peasants have to accept an arbitrary price for their canes without the possibilities of bargaining. Running a sugar factory would give the Government the necessary experience to embark on expanding its interest in the commercial field if there is any possibility of nationalisation.

As to the composition of the Irrigation Board, I feel that the matter is being carried a bit too far. Clause 4 (1) of this Bill says :—

4. (1) There shall be established a board to be known as the Irrigation Board which shall consist of—

- (a) the officer for the time being lawfully discharging the functions of Director of Agriculture;
- (b) the officer for the time being lawfully discharging the functions of Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department;
- (c) five other persons to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, of whom—
 - (i) one shall be a member of the Executive Committee of this Island;
 - (ii) two shall be persons nominated for the purpose by the Barbados Sugar Producers Association;
 - (iii) one shall be appointed to represent the peasant sugar producers of this Island; and
 - (iv) one shall be nominated for the purpose by the Barbados Workers Union.

As I have said, that is going a bit too far; this is an administrative Board, there is a quasi-Govern-

ment Department, and I cannot see the reason for putting the name of the Barbados Workers' Union in a Bill of this sort, as a Body which can nominate a member of a public Board. As a matter of fact, it is wrong to put the name of any particular Union or private body in a Bill. There are always possibilities with certain private organisations; in case the Barbados Workers' Union ceases to exist, what are you going to do? You will have to change the Bill. I do not want to deprive any Union of the privilege of asserting itself in the interest of the workers, yet I feel that a Government Board should not have a member of any Union on it; but if you must have a member of a Trade Union on this Board you should not set out the name of the Trade Union. What is more, that is putting a private organisation ahead and giving it a greater privilege than members of the Legislature have. I have not seen where any member of the two Houses of the Legislature has been named as a member of this Board. The Bill goes over the head of the Legislature and puts forward a member of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I will remind the honourable member that this Clause of the Bill has not yet come up for consideration; the honourable member can speak on this Clause when it comes up for consideration.

Mr. ALLDER : I am not viewing this matter in any sentimental way, that because it is the Barbados Workers' Union and because I may have sympathies for it, its name must be mentioned in a Bill of this sort; the next thing will be that a particular club will be given authority to have members appointed to this administrative Board. This is a dangerous precedent; I have never seen anything like it. If you say that a Trade Union must be represented on a Board, that is all right; you can give a Trade Union a reasonable number of seats on an Arbitration Board and let its officers have the privilege of bargaining in the interest of the Trade Union; but when the Government sends down a Bill setting out the name of a particular Trade Union, that is wrong. Could you see anything like this obtaining in Trinidad or Jamaica?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The honourable member will have to use that argument all over again, and I suggest that he hold his argument until when the particular Clause of the Bill comes up for consideration. We are now debating the principle of the Bill. I suggest to the honourable member that he is at no disadvantage in following my suggestion.

Mr. ALLDER : I am quite willing to follow your ruling. I hope that honourable members will be reasonable and impartial enough to view this matter as it should be viewed, not only for the good name of this Place but even in the best interests of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. HAYNES : I think that if the peasants would cut their canes by arrangement and not all at one time, none of them would suffer. The habit is that in one week the peasants in a whole district will cut their canes, but the factories can only take a certain number of tons of canes per hour and that is where the hardship comes about. If the honourable member would consult his constituents about this matter I think that the reaping of canes would come out of the picture. I think that this Irrigation Board has been well selected having a member of a Trade Union on it, which takes away any suspicion of any special privilege being given to any special class. I think that this Clause has been very well set out.

Mr. SMITH : I welcome a Bill of this sort, but, definitely, the peasants need more help from the beginning to the end. Every year there are a few factories going out of existence and the canes have to be

reaped by other factories which have already had a sufficient quantity of canes. As the position is now, the peasants have to wait on the managers of plantations to be allowed to send in so many loads or tons of canes per day. I do not close my eyes to my brother peasants, but some of them see anything that is hard to get their canes loaded. Then the people at the factories are so independent that if they see one little bit of trash on the canes, the canes have to be taken out of the yards of the factories and washed; there is where I would say that the Government should try and come to the rescue of the peasants by establishing a sugar factory. That is the only way in which the Government will be in a position to say; "We are buying your canes at so much per ton; we see our way to pay so much per ton" and the other factories would have to pay the same thing. I repeat that every year the factories are going out of existence and the peasants are experiencing a very hard time. Believe me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the peasants want the necessary help from the Government, even in the matter of paying for reaping the canes. I know it will be said that the peasants should form an association so as to get proper representation; well, we know it is hard to get these people together, but in the same way that the price is being fixed for reaping the canes at the plantations, the price should also be fixed so that the peasants can get their canes reaped. When a peasant holder has one acre of canes to be reaped and he is only allowed one load of canes per week, the labourers will run all about; they will go to the plantations where they can get work readily and when the peasant is ready to reap more canes there is nobody to help him. That is due to the fact that the factories are not in a position to take all the crop from the peasants as well as from the plantations.

It is time that everything be priced and fixed for the peasants. You will be surprised to know that some people who are heading canes will charge \$2.40 per day; it would be all right for the peasants to pay that \$2.40 per day, but the labourers are not giving them an honest day's work and something should be done in this matter so as to help the poor peasants. I have seen labourers break their bundles and take out some of the canes. I call them robbers; they will go to the plantations where they work by task and they will have to work so as to get money, but they simply wait to rob the poor peasants. The peasants are ignorant enough not to get their own help by combining and forming an association; however, if the peasants do not organise we should try and help them because, definitely, some of them barely get back the money which they spend. Some times some of these peasants lose money; I know a man called James Leach who, when he got his money for his crop, had to sell his pig so as to finish paying his expenses. If other people can make a profit, we should do something to help the poor peasants even in the matter of taking their canes to the factories. Some of these factory managers are very hard; if you have a blade of trash on the canes the lorry has to take the canes back out of the factory yards and come again. I am glad to say that the time is soon coming when we will give the peasants some assistance by way of ploughing their land in order that they will get better production; I have heard that land which is ploughed yields better returns than that which is forked and I am glad to say that the peasants will soon be getting tractors to help them. But I would like to see some assistance given to them in the matter of getting their canes reaped and transported to the factories; I would like to see everything made as easy as possible for the peasants of this colony.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I shall not be very long in speaking in this debate at all. As regards the question of establishing a sugar factory for the benefit of the peasants, the matter is not an easy one at all. I can imagine the difficulties which will confront any Government which establishes a factory, but there are difficulties with which the peasants are confronted. There is the difficulty experienced by peasants in getting their canes reaped; I have seen peasants' canes cut and lying on the ground and they must lose weight. I have made it my business to enquire as to what is going to happen with the sugar industry in later years; it is the opinion of many factory managers that the present capacity of the factories in Barbados is much below that which is necessary to take off the exceedingly good crops which we have been enjoying. I do not know whether the arrangement by factories of allocating to peasants so many tons of canes per week would work out so well. I am one of those persons who regard human nature as I see it; I would agree with the honourable junior member for St. Joseph that there are some planters who might be spiteful enough as to hold out against peasants, and as I see it, the question of peasants getting their canes ground must be gone into. As regards the peasants getting a proper price for their canes I would like to have an assurance that—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This discussion does not fall within the ambit of this Bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Seeing that the privilege was allowed to other speakers—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committees cannot speak while he is in the Chair and therefore I allowed him some latitude.

Mr. WILLIAMS: However, I hope that the Government will bear in mind the complaint which has been made as to the price of peasants' canes—a complaint which has been made on several occasions by a number of people.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In entering this debate it is somewhat difficult not to begin where the last speakers have left off. In matters of this sort the peasants seem to be the forgotten men in the industry; when anything extra has accrued to the industry the peasants are left out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable member tell me if the peasants will be left out in this scheme? The peasants are already getting money for irrigation from the Peasants' Loan Bank.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The plantation owners get money from the Rehabilitation Fund and they will also get money here. With the creation of the Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare Funds the peasants do not benefit specifically because, although they were entitled to some money out of the Rehabilitation Fund, the conditions under which they were to get it were such that there were very few, if any of them, who got any help from this Fund. For some time after the Funds were established, the peasants had to be able to satisfy the authorities that the money from the Rehabilitation Fund would be used for capital improvement, and there was no capital improvement which the peasants could undertake to justify their getting money from this Fund. Now we have some extra funds accruing to us as a result of the difference between the pound sterling and the Canadian dollar, we are told that the British Government has agreed to make these extra funds available to the colonial territories which produced the sugar. I do not see any generosity about that; if we produced the sugar, are we to understand that it is a special generosity for the British Government to give us back what we made out of our sugar? It is a question of honesty to give

us what is our just due. Now that we are getting this extra money we are allocating it to three different sources; we are putting some of the money into the Rehabilitation Fund, some to the Labour Welfare Fund and the remainder we are putting into a special Irrigation Fund. The argument has been advanced that we should give the factory owners one-third of this Fund although they have a special Fund of £1 per ton and although they are allowed to take a certain amount of money for depreciation. Now we are giving them a special amount for depreciation with an apology that it must benefit the peasants because the more in order the machinery is, the better the recovery will be and the more the peasants will get for their canes. That argument would be tenable if we had the machinery for fixing an equitable price to be paid to the peasants out of the price of sugar; but in the absence of anything like that, we have absolutely no guarantee that the extra benefits which accrue to the factory owners from the improvement in the machinery or the expenditure on rehabilitation, are going to be passed on to the peasants.

It is easy to see that this extra rehabilitation will benefit the sugar producers; unless and until we have some special machinery for ensuring that it is passed on compulsorily to the small producers, all the extra money spent on rehabilitation either from the £1 per ton or from this special fund, will go to augment the profits of the sugar producers. I am amazed at the argument that this money should not be used for the establishment of a sugar factory; anybody with the sense or knowledge of running a sugar factory would use the money in this way. This money is obviously not all that we expect to get from this source so that the money we get this year is not the beginning or the end of these funds. If our desire is to put down a plant, we would have acquired a certain amount of the money and eventually we would embark on the erection of a factory. I know I will be told that you cannot erect a factory in Pie Corner and expect people from St. Philip to send their canes down there; but a factory of this sort would be viewed not in the nature of a centre which would accommodate every single peasant in this island, but as a private plant which would provide you with a certain amount of information with regard to the operation of sugar factories, and you would be given information as to the "know-how" which you do not know. The only way to know about a thing is to begin it; when you establish one factory you will get information which will be of use to you with regard to the entire production of sugar throughout the colony — information as regards operating costs, recovery and the amount you could equitably pay the people who supply you with canes. In the interest of the small producers and the general economy of the island, the Jamaica Government has decided to embark on the production of sugar on a limited scale as an experimental proposition, and if the Government of Barbados or any other Government ever decides that it would be useful to itself and the small producers to have this information, that Government will take steps to embark on the establishment of a centre for the manufacture of sugar.

In the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, sir we are told that the money will not be expended in the interest of any one section of the Industry. Every single cent that we are putting to the Rehabilitation Fund means that in actual fact we are not carrying out the objects of the Bill as stated in that sentence of the Objects and Reasons. If no

single section of the Industry is to benefit then not a single cent should go to the Rehabilitation Fund. It seems to me that there are more or less there important sections of the Industry—the manufacturers, the small employers and the labourers, and since we are endeavouring to introduce irrigation into the Industry on a fairly extensive scale, let us say that there are four funds which should benefit from this special amount of money. A certain amount has been provided for irrigation, and that it is all well and good. In order that the workers may get their share you may put some into the Labour Welfare Fund, although that benefit is limited since in this country the money from that fund is handed out as a loan which has to be repaid. Incidentally, when the manufacturer gets his money from the Rehabilitation Fund it is a gift; so even when the labourer benefits from the Labour Welfare Fund he does not benefit to the same extent as the manufacturer.

If you give the Labour Welfare Fund so much, and irrigation so much, dividing the irrigation money between the small producers and the big producers I believe that the safest way of assisting these two sections of the industry would be to give the funds for the big producers to the Agricultural Bank, and the funds for the small producers to the Peasants' Loan Bank, and let them help these two parts of the Industry from these funds. It may be argued that at the moment no big producer ever fails to get money from the Agricultural Bank; but we also know that the Bank borrows money on which it has to pay interest; so if the capital of that bank is augmented so that they pay out less interest, it means that sooner or later their capital will expand. Similarly with the new proposals for the Peasants' Loan Bank. I am sure that that Bank could do with a little more capital. Instead of having to allocate money to it from general revenue you can with this money augment their capital to the point where they can carry on their new proposals without having to get money from the Government. But what is the use of saying that no one section of the industry is to benefit and then turning around and giving the sugar manufacturers a third of the money as an outright gift? It is discrimination in favour of the sugar manufacturers. That is all that it amounts to. They get a free gift from the Rehabilitation Fund to expand their capacity. As the honourable junior member for St. Joseph has pointed out, arising out of these special conditions and others, a lot of the small producers are closing down. You are giving the big producers new capital all the time. It should not be done in a case like this where you claim that no special section of the industry is to benefit in preference to another.

The Rehabilitation Fund was going long enough for factory owners to offset the special conditions arising out of the war. Instead of acknowledging that they have reached saturation point as far as rehabilitation is concerned you give them \$500,000 and bring down legislation which will establish a basis for existence on this scale as long as these special conditions continue.

DINNER ADJOURNMENT

I believe, sir, that it is the desire of honourable members that we adjourn at this stage for three quarters of an hour, and I now make a formal motion to that effect.

MR. MAPP seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the adjournment the honourable senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will make a few final remarks, sir. On the adjournment I had reached the point where I was saying that the sugar factories are already benefiting very considerably from the Rehabilitation Fund, and I did not see any justification for giving them any greater allowance. I think it is a mistake to claim that by spending the maximum amount possible on rehabilitation we are indirectly helping the small producers in the sense that the more efficient the factory the greater the price that would be paid for canes. That, I said, was pure theory, and in the absence of any machinery to guarantee that the benefits of increased efficiency were passed on, one was fairly safe in assuming that the resultant profits went into the pockets of the sugar manufacturers. I expect to hear it claimed in refutation of that argument that under the provisions of the Domestic Sugar Agreement the small producers are protected. It would be impossible to answer that question as it should be answered tonight because I would be really out of order. I think it has been already explained how in actual operation the Domestic Sugar Agreement does not work to the best interest of the small producers. The basis of allocating price for canes is not as efficient as it should be and too much allowance is paid for difference of recovery and that sort of thing.

I repeat, sir, that if we are interested in ensuring that one particular section of the industry does not benefit from this windfall to a greater extent than the others, it might have been better to divide your money into four funds—an irrigation fund and special loans for agriculturists and sugar producers. And there again the facilities which factories have for obtaining loans small people do not have. As I was saying you should use some of the money for augmenting the funds of the Peasants' Loan Bank, the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank and Irrigation Fund and you will guarantee a more equitable distribution of this special windfall.

In this connection, sir, I hope that in the future some attention will be paid to the closing down of such a large number of factories in various parts of the island. I think that on careful consideration it will be seen that there is some connection between the extensive financial assistance which factories are getting now and this cessation of operations on the part of a number of them. And while to some extent the case of centralisation can be argued, concerned as I am and as we should be with the position of the small producer, we have to bear in mind whether he will get the benefit of any increased efficiency, and whether or not if he does get any benefit, this benefit will be offset by an increase in transport costs. The cost of transportation has risen by at least 350 per cent. in the last five years. So the few extra dollars paid for cars cannot offset the increase in the cost of transportation.

Like the honourable senior member for St. John I do not appreciate the advisability of including by name in this Bill the particular Trade Union which has the right to nominate a member of this Board. It would be more in keeping with practice not to specify the union by name. If you want to ensure that one representative should be nominated by a trade union, say by one trade union or something like that. A trade union has no state of permanence

attached to it, and the time may well come when the very introducers of this Bill may have no say in the control of this particular organisation. I think that if a rather distasteful precedent is not to be established, for the purposes of this Bill and the purposes of legislation there should be no designation of a particular trade union or labour organisation.

It is also difficult not to agree with the argument advanced by the honourable senior member for St. John that the Legislature has been over-looked although it may be claimed that the member of the Executive Committee on the Board may also be a member of the Legislature. But it does appear to me that the electors' branch of the Legislature is entitled to some nominee or nominees on this Board. I am going to propose at the proper time the deletion of sub-clause (a) of Clause 3, Part II, because as I have said earlier I cannot see the reason for granting further financial assistance to the Rehabilitation Fund, more especially the amount we are proposing to grant under this Bill. Do you mean to say that in addition to the over three and a half million dollars which this Fund has had we are going to add another half million dollars to be divided between less than two and a half dozen sugar manufacturing concerns? Are we really rehabilitating factories or rebuilding them from the foundations? It is high time that this House consider the final extent to which it intends that the Rehabilitation Fund should be allowed to go.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— This Bill, Sir, has I think met with general approval except in so far as one or two speakers are concerned. The last speaker criticised because he felt that too much money is being given to the Rehabilitation Fund. Well, sir, I do not know if mention was made of the amount at present at the disposal of the Rehabilitation Fund, but I think we should be told. In fact we should have an annual report on this fund, and we should know what is the total amount given by way of this Fund; what each factory received etc., I say that quite seriously. I am told *sotto voce* that a statement is laid about these funds every year. Let us look at the position as far as sugar factories are concerned.

Year after year there is more and more centralisation going on. They are concentrating on buying up the smaller factories and making the bigger one bigger. They are cutting down production costs and increasing the efficiency of the factory, because if you increase the capacity of a factory you do so in the hope that some of the profits accruing will be passed on to the workers in the industry. But the whole point is that while the capacity of the factories has been increased by the establishment of this fund the benefit has not been passed on to the peasants. That is why I asked for a statement on the funds. I know for instance that in some islands the peasants are assisted as far as lorries are concerned. I am hoping that the Government will seriously consider using some of this money, or at least consider that some of this money put to the Rehabilitation Fund be used for the purchase of lorries, which can be rented on easy terms to co-operative peasant groups. I know one of these groups has been trying to purchase a lorry and has met with some difficulty. I cannot see why some of the Rehabilitation Fund should not be used to purchase lorries which can be rented to these co-operative groups. It will assist them and at the same time help solve the problem of transportation. I say that because transportation costs have risen tremendously in the recent past, and it must impose a very heavy burden on the peasants.

The honourable junior member for St. Andrew has given gratuitous and free advice that we should advise our various constituents who are peasants to regulate properly the cutting of their canes. I understand that the factories can only take a certain amount from each person at a certain time. With the difficulty of getting labour it is difficult for the peasants because the factories can only receive so much and only at certain times. It is very difficult at times for these small holders to get their canes ready by a particular date. You sometimes find that the factories cannot take them a particular week, and then when the factories are ready to take them the peasants cannot get them cut. One or two members of this House, however, have assured me that the honourable member knows nothing of what he is talking about in this connection. Anyhow I feel that if the Government can help promote the co-operative groups among the peasants, they will not be only helping the peasants themselves, but they will be helping them as regards transportation costs, and in the matter of getting their canes to the factories. There will thus be less chance of the peasants having their canes left in the field with a consequent loss in sucrose content.

The Rehabilitation Fund is now nearly four million dollars. If the factory owners share that four million dollars among the peasants I cannot see why some of the money could not be shared between peasant owners to help them with the purchase of lorries for the transportation of their canes. I hope that the Government will consider that very seriously, and try to put it into operation before the next crop. The honourable senior member for St. Peter said that when you assist the factories you assist the island. I would remind him that the factories are still in private ownership, and as far as the Rehabilitation Fund is concerned you are capitalising the industry by that amount more. You are increasing the wealth of the island, and you are also increasing the wealth of private owners by many times that amount; I do not think it is too much to say that these lorries should be bought out of that fund.

I would like to know from the honourable member for St. Peter if the Board will actually operate the irrigation scheme. I feel too, sir, that while it is very necessary to assist in increasing the productivity of the land, Government should make sure that those people who rent land are given greater security by carrying out the promise which we made at election time. The Leader of the House has said that the Government is considering the matter. These people should be given more security of tenure. It is absolutely no use trying to increase the productivity of the land and then having insecure terms of ownership or rental. We promised the people that. We promised to lay it down that you must give the tenant on agricultural land at least a year's notice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does that mean that no one will irrigate their land unless they have security of tenure?

Mr. MAPP: What I am arguing is that you cannot promote productivity unless you see after these things first. These schemes for lending more money to peasants, extending the facilities of the Peasants' Loan Bank, lending more money for irrigation schemes etc. will fall short of their objectives if you do not first make more secure the terms of tenancy under which people occupy land in this

island. Anyone who cannot understand that must have a very impervious mind, and if you scoff at these things nothing better can be expected of you. You are failing fundamentally in your duty. First things should come first. It is time that people stopped making sport and got down to business.

I am hoping that this irrigation board will be a success, and that it will result in greater productivity in the island as a whole. I do feel that at this particular time the Government should concentrate more on the production of foodstuffs. I have been hearing this week that there is another shortage of sweet potatoes, and that is only one of the products that there is a frequent shortage of. I have not heard what is the real cause of the shortage. At one time we hear that it is the result of a lack of rain, and at other times we hear that it is because they do not get a proper price for them. If the irrigation scheme is successful it will take care to a certain extent of the lack of rainfall. Anyhow I hope that the Government will concentrate first on foodstuff production and secondly on a greater production of canes; because to my mind there is a limit beyond which you cannot successfully go in the West Indies as far as the production of canes are concerned. You may find that you will have nowhere to market it. The British Government has fixed the quota and they will not extend it during the time of the agreement. I cannot see the object of increasing the production of cane to the detriment of local foodstuffs. I hope that the production of locally grown foodstuffs will be considerably increased and the price brought within the pocket of the working class people of this island.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I would like to commend the Government for the manner in which this money is being distributed. I will just raise two grave grievances which peasants have. I refer to transportation difficulties as mentioned by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, and also the price paid for peasants' canes. I know that the latter is a very difficult point to handle, but I am not satisfied that any serious attempt has been made to satisfy the peasant on that point. I would like Government to approach it in this way: The fact that a sugar factory in a certain district does not get as high a recovery as another factory is no fault of the peasants, and it seems to me that the price of peasants' canes should be based on what is paid by the factory with the highest recovery and the deficit made good out of the Labour Welfare Fund or from windfalls of the nature of the one we are discussing in this Bill. It is no fault of the peasant that he had to send his canes to a factory with a high recovery. I am saying that the onus is on the Government to see that the Rehabilitation Fund is spent to the best advantage, so that factories will get more or less a stable recovery so as to ensure a stable price for canes. That is at the bottom of the troubles of peasants. I hope that on the next occasion that this matter comes before us the Government will see whether it is possible to recoup the peasants for the loss sustained through having to live near a factory which gets a low recovery.

As far as transportation is concerned I would like to endorse the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas and to express the view that the facilities given now by the Peasants' Loan Bank should be extended so as to assist the peasants with transportation. That is not an easy matter either it will be difficult to handle; but it should be given close study. You may not be able to help individual

peasants with lorries, but you can help the co-operative groups, and that will mean that the better the peasants are organised the more the Government will be able to help them with their transportation problem.

I am going further, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The \$500,000 for the Labour Welfare Fund should be utilised by the Government in establishing a lumber yard. If you are helping sugar workers in the building and repairing of their houses why can the Government not have its own lumber yard? Instead of distributing this \$500,000 the Government should start off with its own lumber yard, assist the workers to the fullest extent, and make the money go as far as possible. You can give the workers tickets for so much lumber. The money will go much further that way, and many more houses would probably be built. Government would not be expected to make a big profit on the transaction as would a private lumber yard.

As it appears to me the Rehabilitation Fund is being spent to good advantage where the factories are concerned. When it comes to the Labour Welfare Fund the money is just being piled up. That money could be used to greater advantage. I think that practical irrigation schemes should be implemented as soon as possible. Let us hope that there will be other similar windfalls in the not distant future.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I think that my views on the distribution of this windfall should be pretty well known. What amazes me is that in dividing this money into three funds nothing has been said about the small primary producer. It is true that his position has always been unfortunate. He has always got less and has always been placed at the mercy of the factory owners.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: How about irrigation?

Mr. MILLER: If irrigation is to mean anything to the Sugar Industry early experiments would have to be carried out, and the peasants would never have a chance. It will mean more water, and you will have to look for the machinery to make the water available. There is the Domestic Sugar Agreement. Any man working more than 20 acres of land is not regarded as a peasant. That is very unfortunate. No one, Government or otherwise, can justify giving this half million dollars for the rehabilitation of factories. You cannot justify it by any sane reasoning. The peasant has always been unfortunate. The factory owner gets his money from the Rehabilitation Fund, and the Trade Union fixes the rate of pay for workers in the field. Transport is controlled by the factory owner. It is a reckless thing to give this half million dollars to the factory owners. They were expected to give it to the Harbour Fund. You may take it next year. It was expected that it would be done in 1952 but they went back on that.

The Domestic Sugar Agreement gives the factory £1 per ton, and the greater production capacity of the factory the less the overhead expenses. After all these expenses are paid and the profit for the factory is taken out one asks on what will we agree on for the primary producers? the peasant is always in a state of bondage. The factory owner is well provided for, and the worker is represented by the Union. I think that this half million dollars should go to the peasants and not the factory owners. You cannot change it today, but it cannot be justified. When the factory owners put the sugar on the wharf they have already had their profits. It is the peasant who has to wait for the crumbs.

I have my feelings and I voice them; and I

know that I am not alone in this view. As regards the question of irrigation, a half million, dollars is a small sum when you are thinking in terms of irrigation to increase production. But you cannot justify giving this money to the factories. I can discuss this with anyone. It is something that I know.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I propose to reply to some of the remarks used on this Bill. It is also true that anyone having read this Bill. It is true that we had Christmas season in which to read and study this Bill. It is also true that anyone having read and studied the Five Year Plan of which the subject of this Bill is an item and then hearing the speeches of some honourable members—

Mr. MILLER: The honourable member must not forget taht in discussing the Five Year Plan I objected to this.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member may be quite busy in his walk of life; because if he had had the time to read this Bill he would not say that we are giving factory owners a half million dollars. This is something that every country in the Empire that has Rehabilitation Funds had to do. But the honourable member knows nothing whatsoever about it.

Mr. MILLER: When the information about this money was released the Government was given authority to deal with it as they liked.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member does not know what he is talking about. If he is being advised he should get good advisers. This money has come from the sale of sugar in Canada. There was a specific direction from the Secretary of State to all the colonies who have these funds. When the honourable member is seeking knowledge or advice he should come to the members of the Government.

I have referred to members who on a previous occasion have made speeches saying the opposite of what they said today. The honourable senior member for St. Michael has challenged the honourable senior member for St. Philip on the political metamorphosis that he has undergone. Now when you look at Trinidad, Jamaica and the Leeward Islands see what they had to do with these funds. The Secretary of State for the Colonies has given a direction that the money should be applied in some way to capital improvements or rehabilitation of the sugar industry. You cannot use this money apart from the direction of the British Government. If this money had come back directly to the sugar factory owners and peasants you would have heard a different criticism. What is the position today?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Deputy Speaker,—The honourable member is misquoting what I said.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have not quoted the honourable member at all.

Mr. MILLER: Here we have the Objects and Reasons saying that—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: How can the honourable member get up to object and then go on making a new point? When he speaks in here he is speaking to men; not to children. Honourable members go to the extent of saying that the Government is doing this to please factory owners. If the honourable junior member for St. George does not know what the windfall is to be used for he should ask some question about it. The honourable senior member for St. Philip said that the peasants have been left out. Some honourable members speak without defining what they mean. Does the honourable member mean some of the same workers who are peasants? Who are peasants in this island? There are few independent peasants.

The Government is giving one third of this windfall to Rehabilitation, and under that peasants and cane growers are entitled. If the Government had given all this money to the Rehabilitation Fund the criticism of honourable members would be justified. When you put money into the Labour Welfare Fund it means that peasants also can borrow money to repair their houses; yet you get honourable members saying that the Government is giving all the money to the factories.

Mr. MILLER: The honourable member has no need to misquote me.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would give way if the honourable member had risen to a point of order. Now, sir, let us look at irrigation. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has been stringent in his criticism, telling the Government that we should embark on irrigation schemes. What has the Government earmarked a part of the fund to do? Now to reply to the argument used by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, I would like to ask if before you begin the division on this fund you have to pass a law dealing with land tenure. Is that practicable? The honourable member should know the policy of the Labour Party and what they wrote in their manifesto about land tenure. It applies to house spots all over the island.

I repeat, sir, that it is not true that the peasants have been left out when you give them a marginal difference of one-third of the amount and then a share in the irrigation part of it.

Mr. MAPP: In what sense? Do you mean that you are giving it all to the peasants?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When you put that money there every peasant is qualified for a loan. Does the honourable member think that the only way in which you can help a peasant is by giving him a lorry? Everything that I do as a member of this Government I do thoroughly. When the honourable senior member for St. Thomas challenged members of the Government on being unbusinesslike I accept that from him.

Mr. MAPP: When have I challenged members of the Government? I challenged the honourable member.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I understand that. I do money there every peasant is qualified for a loan. I can defend anything that I do as a member of this Government. Where these three funds are concerned no one can challenge the Government on the ground of acting contrary to its policy. There is one other point I would like to deal with. When the honourable junior member for St. John raised the stupid argument about the Barbados Workers' Union—

Mr. ALLDER: I must object to my argument being described as stupid.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Cannot one use polite terms now? What is wrong with the name of the Barbados Workers' Union being mentioned when it is the only organised union in Barbados? If there was a rival, organised union it would be a different matter.

Finally, sir, I would say that I do not want at this stage of my life to tell people who know their job better than I would know it as if they were babies. I am sure that when the debates are read in the future it will be seen that the position of the Government was justified on this matter.

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

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and

the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Part III stand part of the Bill.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In connection with the appointment of the Irrigation Board, paragraph (c) of Clause 4 (1) says: "five other persons to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, of whom—(i) one shall be a member of the Executive Committee of this Island"; The wording of this paragraph does not seem to run smoothly there. Then in sub-paragraph (ii) I think the wording should be; "two shall be appointed to represent the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association".

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: As a layman like the hon. member, I cannot say anything as to the question of drafting; I will draw the point which has been raised to the attention of the Attorney General so that if there is anything wrong with the draughtsmanship, amendments can be made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am interested to know why a member of the Barbados Workers' Union should be appointed on the Irrigation Board.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am sure that Mr. Deputy Speaker will realise that what is evolving in the world to-day is that wherever workers' interests are involved, representatives of the workers should be put on these Boards wherever it is possible to do so. It has been held that where the workers' interests are involved, the Union will be asked to represent the workers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for the explanation.

Mr. MAPP: I should like to know whether the Board will fix salaries for the employees without any reference to the Executive Committee. I think that the Government should approve of the salaries to be paid to these employees; I would not leave it to the Board to fix salaries without any reference to the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: In the final analysis the matter has to be referred to the Executive Committee so that the Board can get approval for paying the money; a member of the Executive Committee will be there, but these Boards are always subject to Government scrutiny. The Government generally leaves the members of these Boards to fix the salaries and submit them to the Government; there is no difficulty in that.

Mr. MAPP: That argument is all right, but this Board is a bigger Board than that in respect of the Rehabilitation Committee. It seems to me that you are giving this Board power to employ what may amount to a fair number of persons. You may find that this Board has quite a few employees under its control and I will ask the Government to consider the point of having the matter of salaries referred to the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Clause 10 (1) of the Bill says this:

"10. (1) The Governor-in-Executive Committee may make Regulations for the better carrying out of the purposes and provisions of this Act and, in particular and without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing provision, may make regulations

(a) Prescribing the terms of employment of Officers and servants of the Irrigation Board;

the other hand in connection with quite a few of them, it is impossible to agree with the proposal that a tax should be paid. It is true that there are other colonies in which you find that an entertainment tax is collected, but I think the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will also willingly concede that in many countries where such taxation exists, the proceeds of the taxation are not used merely to augment general revenue, but are generally earmarked for some special purpose. The argument is advanced in certain quarters that the expenditure on education has reached the maximum amount which the general revenue of the colony should be called upon to bear and no greater portion of the public revenue should be spent in this direction; but there are a number of things which remain to be done in the matter of education and which the Government may not find itself in a position to do in the near future out of our funds. If the Government had suggested that a special entertainment tax should be levied for the purpose of building new secondary schools or for giving assistance in that laudable purpose, there might be some justification for levying this wholesale taxation in this island; but merely to levy this tax to augment the general revenue when we are taking this same revenue and squandering it in so many directions, is quite unjustifiable.

If we had not squandered funds earlier, we would not be collecting this money now. I think that all of us would agree that we should pay some form of entertainment tax, but I sincerely hope that the Government which imposes this taxation will take the most stringent steps to see that no increased cost is passed on to the public. I have had it on good authority that the prices for admission to the cinemas have been increased; in recent years increases have been put on the charges for admission to the theatres and no reasons have been given the public for so doing, and one is left to assume that since there is no price control so far as the cinemas are concerned, the people who run these cinemas have been doing as they like with the prices they charge for admission. I therefore feel that this tax cannot be easily absorbed by the cinemas themselves and those who run them will resort to increasing further the prices of admission. It is to be hoped that steps will be taken to ensure that the large section of the population which patronise the cinemas and which is deprived of almost any other form of entertainment will not be further penalised by the cinema proprietors as a result of this Bill if and when it becomes law.

With regard to the Barbados Turf Club Race Meetings, I feel that the Grand and Field Stands should produce greater revenue to the colony. In so far as cricket and football matches are concerned, there is no reason why the public should be made to contribute to this taxation. Where efforts are being made to encourage dramatics in the country or where you are promoting any entertainment except it is a religious concern, people must pay a tax for admission. I do not think that this Bill as it stands is the best that can be done in the circumstances, and I, personally, would not willingly support it unless I have the assurance that these funds will be devoted most specifically to some laudable purpose and not merely to be put to general revenue to be squandered in the most indiscriminate manner, to be misspent as such a large portion of the public revenue has already been spent.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I regret that such an important Bill is being dealt with by this House at this late hour of the night; I know that there was a possibility of such a Bill being considered and that is why

I have remained here. I want to say that if the contention of the theatre owners is that their marginal revenue is very small, it means that an increase must be passed on to the public. We have got to expect that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I said that no increase should be passed on to the public and I hope that the Government will take steps to see that it is not done.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I cannot see how the theatre owners will not pass on an increase to the public: I am not an ardent cinema goer and I cannot entertain the hope that an increase will not be passed on to the public.

It has always been said that hon. members will be allowed to criticise these Measures in respect of the Five Year Plan when they are brought down individually. I am not prepared to go into the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill, but what I am really worried about is the method which the Government hopes to employ to make sure that they will get the maximum returns where this entertainment tax is concerned. Unless they use the direct method of putting the tax on the ticket itself, there are many loopholes which can be employed.

Relative to the powers of entry, Clause 10 of the Bill says that if any person wilfully prevents or obstructs the entry of a person who has been authorised to enter any place of entertainment with a view to seeing whether the provisions of the Act are being complied with, he shall be liable to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or to imprisonment for three months or to both such fine and imprisonment. I have never advocated any terrible fines being imposed on people, but in some cases people who would try to contravene the provisions of an Act like this, could afford to pay a fine of one hundred dollars. It is therefore my feeling that this fine is not heavy enough; it looks to me that the fine should be one of five hundred dollars.

I would like to have a little more information as to what is meant by paragraph (b) of Clause 4. Clause 4 says that no person shall be admitted for payment to any entertainment where the payment is subject to entertainment tax except (a) with a ticket stamped with a stamp (not before used) denoting that the correct amount of entertainment tax has been paid; or (b) in special cases, with the approval of the Commissioner, through a barrier, or by means of a mechanical contrivance which automatically registers the number of persons admitted. Are we going to have automatic machines which will be checked? As I have already said, unless this tax is directly imposed there are several methods by which it can be evaded, and if you are not getting the tax which you should get, it is altogether a waste of time collecting it.

Mr. MAPP: We are one of the unique spots in the world where an entertainment tax is not paid. I did not think that after the debate on the Five Year Plan there would be much debate on this matter. I consider that we pay an entertainment tax in the form of our receiving sets and Radio Diffusion sets and that is a peculiar kind of entertainment tax in this island. In Great Britain the tax which is paid on receiving sets goes to finance the B.B.C. Here, the Government does not make use of Radio Diffusion; they are not going to nationalise it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not remember the Government saying that they are not going to nationalise Radio Diffusion.

Mr. MAPP: They said that they do not propose at this time to nationalise it. I am hoping that the proceeds of the tax on radio receiving sets will be devoted to providing entertainment in the country

areas. You do not want to tax a man for having cultural entertainment; having imposed this tax at an early date, I am hoping that the Government will also extend these facilities at an early date.

Barbadians are becoming as heavily taxed as were the Chinese about three years ago. Of course it was a good thing for the Chinese, because it brought about the breaking down and destruction of the feudal system. I can hardly think of anything not yet taxed in this island. Although we cannot bottle or bag the air I am looking forward for that to be taxed soon. Any sane government should be careful in laying taxation; because the same evils that you start taxation to relieve might be the cause of creating further evils, a cycle starts; and so long as you start a system of indiscriminate taxation you cannot stop. The only thing to stop it is a revolution or some serious political upheaval.

While this may appear to be progressive it is not as progressive as it appears because you will get a population already suffering under the burden of a high cost of living being made to suffer more. We have just made it possible that every single commodity consumed by the people will cost more, and now we have come to deplete their spending power still more to the extent of another \$50,000 a year. Of course it will be more than that. This is a conservative estimate. But what are you doing? You are putting \$50,000 out of circulation. When you increase taxation it means that you reduce the spending power of the people; you cannot get away from that, and when the Government takes this \$50,000 and does not spend it in any beneficial way it means that they are merely taking advantage of the people. If the money was spent in a manner that would benefit the majority of the people it would not matter. But to take it and just spend it as proposed is wrong.

Another thing is that when the Government decides to collect taxation like the one we are discussing at present it does not see to it that proper safeguards are there by which the burden is not passed on to the people. Shortly after the Five year Plan was discussed the various theatre magnates met, and there was dissension among them. I have it on good authority that some of them felt that the profits at present made by theatres could sustain any entertainment tax; but the Government has brought it down in a one-sided manner and there are no safeguards to make sure that all of this taxation is not passed on to the Barbadians who attend these cinemas, the most of whom are people who can least afford to pay any increased charge for their theatre tickets.

Of course I know there will be regulations; but the first thing the Government should have done was to go into the theatre business and get an idea as to what profits are made and what it costs to run the theatres; what the films cost etc. and then come down with the necessary provision for taxation. Government's aim should be to reduce some of the huge profits that the theatres are making. I agree that the majority of those who crowd the theatres are those who have to be provided for in their old age by the Government. But nevertheless you should make sure that the whole burden of this taxation is not passed on to them.

Government cannot just tax and tax without caring. That is being like a burglar. The burglar wants money and he does not care how he gets it. You cannot just say "I want a million dollars and I must get it by the 1st of the month." There are many social benefits for which there has been agitation over a period of years, without the least attempt

being made by the Government to provide them. We have a case in point. Every vestry has appealed to Government for the erection of a Tuberculosis Sanatorium. Even the colleague of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph argued in favour of it. Bodies like the vestries which should be abolished are asking for things which a Labour Government refuses to show even the slightest intention of considering. All that you get is taxation all the time.

Another thing, sir, is that although appeals have been made for the postponement of this Bill the Government is still forcing it through.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House gave permission for this Bill to be gone through.

Mr. ALLDER: I am wondering if the Government's mind is like that of a petty shopkeeper who refuses to close his doors lest he should lose six cents. I am reminded that cricket starts soon and there is money to be gained. It is likely that the Income Tax Commissioner will be very busy. I hope that he will not be too busy for the Government to catch up with him with the recommendation that theatre owners, as well as the patrons, share the burden of the entertainment tax.

Question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and agreed to.

Clause 2 reads as follows:—

2. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires—

"admission" means admission as a spectator or one of an audience;

"payment on admission" includes any payment made by a person who, having been admitted to one part of a place of entertainment, is subsequently admitted to another part thereof for admission to which a payment involving duty or more duty is required;

"admission to entertainment" includes admission to any place in which the entertainment is held;

"Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Income Tax and Death Duties;

"entertainment" means any form of entertainment set out in the Schedule to this Act to which persons are admitted on payment;

"place of entertainment" means any place adjoining the spot where the entertainment is given from which it can be seen or heard;

"proprietor" in relation to any entertainment includes any person on whose behalf payments for admission to such entertainment are received or any person responsible for the management thereof.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman,— Speaking on the passing of this clause, I have a suggestion to make. I would like to draw it to the attention of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that this is a Bill to impose a tax on entertainments to which the public are admitted "for payment". But in this clause where entertainment is defined the words "on payment" are used. I am wondering if for the sake of uniformity the same form could not be used throughout.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not see that it matters very much; but for the sake of uniformity I will accept the honourable member's suggestion.

The Clause was agreed to.

Clause 3 was called.

Mr. ADAMS moved, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS that Clause 3 stand part.

It reads as follows:—

3. (1) There shall be charged, levied and paid on all payments for admission to any entertainment a tax (in this Act referred to as an entertainment tax) at the rate of ten per centum of the amount of such payment exclusive of the tax; Provided that—

(a) Where the tax, calculated as aforesaid, would be or include a fraction of a cent less than half a cent, the fraction of a cent shall not be charged, and

(b) Where the duty, calculated as aforesaid, would be or include a fraction of a cent, the duty shall be charged as a cent equal to or greater than half though the fraction of a cent was a cent.

(2) No tax shall be charged on payments for admission of less than five cents.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In this clause the tax is referred to as "entertainment tax". If you look at clause 11 you will see that it is referred to merely as "the tax".

The Clause was agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 8 inclusive were called and agreed to.

Clause 9 was called.

Mr. ADAMS moved seconded by Dr. CUMMINS that the clause stand part.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would suggest that the word "regulations" be spelt with a capital "r".

Clause 9 was agreed to.

Clause 10 was called.

It reads as follows:—

10. (1) Any person generally or specially authorised by the Commissioner in writing for the purpose may enter any place of entertainment while the entertainment is proceeding, and any place ordinarily used as a place of entertainment at any time, with a view to seeing whether the provisions of this Act or any regulations made thereunder as to entertainment tax are being complied with.

(2) If any person wilfully prevents or obstructs the entry of any person so authorised, he shall be liable on conviction by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or to imprisonment for three months or to both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. ADAMS moved seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, that the clause stand part.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to inquire from the honourable senior member for St. Joseph if permission has been obtained from the Secretary of State for the Colonies for imposing both fine and imprisonment for the offence. I have heard the honourable member say recently that such permission is necessary.

Mr. ADAMS: The Secretary of State may express his regret that we should do it. But we have not got to ask his permission. I know that the Secretary of State has asked on more than one occasion why impose both; but it is no question of getting his permission. Considering the number of precedents that we have for it I do not think that we need worry.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Only recently the honourable member asked if permission had been got from the Secretary of State.

Mr. ADAMS: Would I have asked that? I have come across in a file that the Secretary of State said it was unusual and he asked why we did it. But it is not a question that you cannot pass a law without getting the prior consent of the

Secretary of State to do so. Even if he had asked that recently it could only mean that he was satisfied that the Barbados Government or Legislature would exercise its discretion whenever such a penalty clause was put in a Bill.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 11 was called.

It reads as follows:—

11. (1) Any person who shall do or omit, any act, or shall be a party to the doing or omission of any act, with the intention that the payment of tax, or the full tax, shall be evaded, shall be guilty of an offence against this Act; and if any such act shall be so done or omitted by a servant or agent of the proprietor, the proprietor shall be guilty of an offence against this Act unless he proves—

(a) that he was not a party to the act or omission; and

(b) that he had taken all reasonable steps to prevent it; and

(c) that on hearing of it, he forthwith gave full information concerning it to the Commissioner or a member of the Police Force at a police station.

(2) Any person guilty of an offence under the provisions of the preceding subsection shall be liable on conviction by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars or to imprisonment not exceeding six months or to both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. ADAMS moved seconded by Dr. CUMMINS that the clause stand part.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has the honourable senior member for St. Joseph checked the point I made about having "entertainment tax" in one part of the Bill and having merely "the tax" in this clause?

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member looks at clause 6 he will see that sometimes the words "entertainment tax" are used, and sometimes the words "the tax". When you say the tax surely it must refer to entertainment tax. It is true that there would be no harm in putting in the word "entertainment" before the word "tax" all through the Bill. If it would save any ambiguity I would say yes.

The Schedule was called.

Mr. ADAMS with leave deleted No. 7 and had the other items renumbered accordingly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If any person or set of persons held a race meeting at the Garrison would they not have to pay entertainment tax? The Barbados Turf Club is covered by a special Bill; but it seems to me that we should put race meetings in the Schedule of the Bill before us. If anyone else rented the Garrison and held a race meeting they would be able to get away without paying entertainment tax.

Mr. ADAMS: It is unlikely that any Turf Club would start to run races in this island in competition with the Barbados Turf Club. The Barbados Turf Club, the Barbados Workers' Union is almost unique. There is only one Turf Club, and until another one arises there is no point putting in what the honourable member suggests.

The Schedule as amended was agreed to.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in committee and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title was read and agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS asked for and obtained leave to take Order No. 11 as the next Order of the Day.

The Order is as follows:

To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to authorise the necessity of a loan to meet the cost of schools and other buildings, housing and other supplies.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— In moving the second reading of this Bill I would say that there is nothing in it except that some honourable members may feel that the rate of interest is too low or too high. As honourable members can see, we have, as we have to do frequently, made advances from the general revenue pending the raising of loans. The Government after inquiry is of the opinion that they can get these loans at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Although it was two years ago that we could have got them at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. things have changed and we are instructed by the banks and other people that it will be necessary to offer more, say $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

I move that the Bill be read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

The three clauses of the Bill were called and agreed to.

The Schedule was called and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS.

Mr. Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title was read and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—In moving the adjournment of the House I will suggest that Orders Nos. 1 and 2 go to the bottom of the Order Paper and that No. 5 become No. 1. I beg to move, Sir, that the House adjourn until this day week, the 13th of January, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion.

The question was put and agreed to without division and Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.