

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st July, 1953.

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

Present:

His Honour, Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*),
Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Mr. A. E. S.
LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. M. E. COX Mr. L. E.
SMITH, Mr. R. G. MAPP, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr.
E. St. A. HOLDER, Mr. C. E. TALMA and Mr. L. A.
WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Messrs. GODDARD, HAYNES, ADAMS, CRAWFORD
and F. L. WALCOTT entered the House and took their
seats.

MINUTES :

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on
the 7th July, 1953, having been circulated, were taken
as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENTS :

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform
the House that I have received the Financial Report
of the Accountant General for the month ended 30th
June, this year.

Mr. VAUGHAN entered the House and took his
seat.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: I have the honour to present
from His Excellency the Governor, Message No.
19/1953 to the Honourable the House of Assembly.

The Message reads as follows :—
MESSAGE NO. 19/1953

*His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable The House Of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to
refer to the Address dated the 26th of May from the

Honourable the House of Assembly forwarding a
joint Address of loyalty passed by both Houses of
the Legislature for transmission to Her Majesty the
Queen on the occasion of her Coronation, and to for-
ward for the information of the Honourable House
the following telegram which he has received from
the Secretary of State for the Colonies in reply :—

“The Address has been laid before the Queen,
who has commanded that an expression of warm
appreciation of the loyal greetings and good wishes
offered on the occasion of her Coronation by the Leg-
islature of Barbados may be conveyed to them on her
behalf.”

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.

16th July, 1953.

Mr. ADAMS: I am also commanded to lay the
following :—

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amend-
ment) No. 4 Order, 1953;

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allow-
ances (Scheduled Officers) Regulations, 1953.

PETITION

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a
petition on behalf of the Vestry of the parish of St.
Joseph praying this House to authorise them to make
a loan of \$9,600 for the purpose of repairing the
roof of the Rectory and other matters connected
therewith. The Petition is respectfully worded and
I ask that it be taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to give notice of a reso-
lution to approve the Civil Establishment (General)
(Amendment) No. 4 Order, 1953.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SMITH: I beg to give notice of a Bill to
authorise the Vestry of the parish of St. Joseph to
raise a loan of \$9,600 for the purpose of repairing
the roof of the Rectory and other matters connected
therewith.

Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took his seat.

In that report on page 10, it will be seen: "The necessity or otherwise of shipping fancy molasses in tank steamers rather than in packages was one of the major causes of our enquiry, and we obtained the opinions of all witnesses who appeared before us on this important issue. The opinions expressed were most conflicting, and it was difficult to draw any definite conclusions from the evidence submitted."

In its recommendations the Committee states: (see page 24) "We have not been convinced by the evidence put before us that the shipment of fancy molasses in bulk to the Canadian market is necessary at the present time in order to maintain our present exports. We estimated that bulk shipment of fancy molasses was unlikely to decrease the cost of the product by more than two cents per quart package, and there was a general opinion that such a reduction would not affect sales since the present prices of competitive products are as high or higher than those of fancy molasses. At some time in the future, it is possible that such competition will have to be met, and the price of fancy molasses will have to be brought to its lowest possible level." I need not read any more because it is on this report and this recommendation that the Government acted.

After that investigation by the Committee, there were a series of meetings between the various groups concerned, and subsequently, a committee of employers themselves visited Canada to deal with this question. Today, the situation is that although some of the employers in 1950 did not welcome the question of bulk shipment it is now under the present circumstances a must. You either ship fancy molasses in bulk or you do not ship any at all. Why has this taken place? It must be remembered that the price of sugar on the world market has fallen since 1950. The situation was not the same then as it is today, consequently, even with the Commonwealth price for sugar today the situation is assuming the proportion that the British Government is paying Commonwealth territories more money for their sugar than it can buy it on the world market. I must however point out that this market price for fancy molasses is not tied on to the price of sugar given to the Commonwealth territories but to the world market price. So it is obvious to see that the price of fancy molasses would automatically drop when the price of sugar on the world market drops because you have to sell fancy molasses at world market price. This regrettable future for Barbados fancy molasses is one which is purely the result of circumstances outside the island. Any one with socialist tendencies must resist to the utmost any attempt to reduce the earning capacity of workers and I make no apology to say that in any field of industry in this island in which I have any concern, I will hold up to the last any attempt to reduce the earning capacity of any worker. I say that because I could never agree to bulk shipment when I know it will affect the earning capacity of some workers, but although that is my attitude so far as workers are concerned, with the prevailing circumstances in the industry being what they are, and over which I have no control, and finding that the industry as a whole will collapse if something to meet the situation is not done; then any measure which would maintain some employment for the people of the island, I will do it.

The situation today is one in which Canadian importers have been persisting in their claims for receiving our molasses in bulk. I should, however, tell the House that if they read the Report of the Committee, they will see that some of the Canadians in 1950 did not agree to the expedience of having

molasses in bulk, but today the situation is altered because some of the importers in Canada are importing molasses from Cuba in bulk therefore, it is making those Canadian importers who import from Barbados in our package containers to feel that their competitors can sell at comparatively cheaper prices, and because of that, they must do something about it. I feel this brief background is necessary so that honourable members can appreciate why this Bill is before the House today.

There is another aspect to the matter, apart from the question of bulk shipment. It is a fact that there has been a gradual decrease or closing down of many of the syrup plants in the island and there is some sympathy for some of the questions which some honourable members have raised on this matter. At any rate, honourable members are aware that the price of molasses and the quantity that was shipped from the island have been reduced considerably. The reduction in the quantity of fancy molasses shipped coupled with the reduction in the world market price for sugar made it inevitable that the number of people who were manufacturing this product be reduced. Anyhow it may be possible for some of them to manufacture more sugar. This is not a very serious matter for the industry as a whole, but I will say here and now that Government is considering ways and means for the setting up of a committee to investigate into this question of the closing down of these syrup factories and the effect it will have generally on workers, and the question of rehabilitation.

Sir, the mechanics of this Bill seeks to make a few amendments to it. One of the amendments concerns the question of the definition for fancy molasses and provides that instead of making fancy molasses in the manner in which it was made originally, it is now open that you can make it in open tayeche. Another amendment seeks to abolish the system of the appointments to the present Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board which is set up by the Legislature and the Governor. It has been stated on the last page of the Committee's report: "The Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board is a most important body and should be truly representative of all branches of the industry. The present method of appointing members to the Board is open to criticism, and we recommend certain alterations. We agree that the Chairman should continue to be the Director of Agriculture, but consider that the rest of the Board should be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and shall include two members of the Sugar Producers' Association and two members of the Exporters' Association." The Government has accepted this recommendation. What sums should be raised each year as an additional cess on fancy molasses to be paid into the Fancy Molasses Industry fund is given further on and then the Committee recommended that a Board of this nature should have a representative not only of all of the employers but also a representative of the workers because it is something that is going to affect workers very closely. It has been agreed that there should be a fund from the Savings Fund of this molasses to ease the shock of workers from this displacement of labour and for that reason, you will see in the Bill the establishment of a fund to be administered by this Board. This is one of the features of this Bill. I feel, Sir, that we cannot place too much emphasis on it. There is a backward tendency in this island by people whom you believe should think otherwise, instead of asking the industry to pay for some of these things, they have the peculiar habit of saying that the Government should pay for it. I am one of those people who subscribe to the view that an entity or a

corporate body should be called upon to pay employees for any reduction or any loss of employment. I feel that this bulk shipment of fancy molasses is going to affect vitally the workers concerned; therefore the industry should be made to pay for some of these things.

Before I sit down, I will tell honourable members that it is my intention to answer any question that may be put forward. I want to say that the Government is open for all the criticism that can be made, but I hope that all honourable members will be willing to accept the replies that the Government intends to make.

The last point I will make is to answer criticisms by one or two people and a certain section of the Press that this island was discriminating against Canada by bulk shipping fancy molasses to the United States, and so far as the shipping of fancy molasses in cans is concerned. With regard to the latter, I will say that the Barbados Canning Company went into voluntary liquidation after the people concerned in that company visited Canadian importers and got the information that the canning of fancy molasses in Barbados would have an adverse effect against the distribution of what they would be buying in bulk. The Canadian importers agreed that canning the fancy molasses in Barbados ensured that the buyer in Canada was getting a pure product, but as a compromise they agreed not to dilute the fancy molasses coming from Barbados in bulk. It was also agreed that there should be a single selling organisation for the export of this molasses from Barbados. I want to say that even before I was a member of the Government that I am one of those people who believe that even if forty people are engaged in a particular industry, they cannot create competition, because if the market for their product is not available that competition, will be inimical to the interest of all concerned. What quantity of fancy molasses that would be exported from here can easily be sold by the one selling organisation because it does not militate against the interest of the people who are in the industry. They all will become members of the same selling organization. Because of that, this recommendation has been accepted.

I must remind honourable members that we are not dealing with an industry that is prosperous. What we are doing is to more or less preserve an industry that is faced with very serious competition—may be possible extinction. Why the single selling organisation has been accepted in principle is because it is felt that it would help the people in the trade better. All those undesirable practices which are conducted in the trade would probably cease; it would also mean that importers in Canada who were buying more or less at various prices from exporters here would be getting it at a uniform price.

With respect to bulk shipment, in the report honourable members will see that the Committee recommended the sale of molasses to the United States. As a matter of fact, you either sell it to the Americans in bulk or you keep it. I would however like the House to know that from the report of the Committee, the Canadian importers were aware that Barbados would ship in bulk to the United States should the opportunity offer itself. The Committee felt that it was desirable to sell molasses to the United States of America and not a single objection was made to that statement for the last three years. When it comes to the question of discrimination on this matter, this Government or any other Government in Barbados would be the last to discriminate against the Canadians. This Government would not allow the Americans something which will hamper

the Canadians. When we remember how the Canadians aided us during the last war and all these territories in the West we cannot think of discriminating against Canada. However, you will see from the Committee's report that most of the importers in Canada were not in a position in 1950 to accept fancy molasses in bulk because they were not ready to make the distribution from that source. The Canadian importers knew that the Americans were ready to receive bulk shipment. A single organisation—the Dominion Molasses Company—has written me a letter voicing their disapproval to the shipping in bulk of fancy molasses to the United States. I have made that letter a matter for the Government because I do not go in for private correspondence on public business. I do not trust the integrity of people in business because so many things can be done in business which one may say is not integrity but which is known in business as business acumen. I cannot boast of having business acumen nor do I have any ambition to be a business baron. However, it does seem as if this single organisation, the Dominion Molasses Company, is making a row by saying that Barbados is discriminating against Canada in the shipment of fancy molasses. I want to make it clear that that is not true because Government has no intention of making any barter with the United States against the Dominion of Canada. These Canadian importers seem to be reasonable business people. They told us not to make any bulk shipments in 1953 because they were not ready to receive it. Moreover, the amount of fancy molasses that was made this year was only the quantity which the exporters received orders that could be sold. Molasses is not like sand on the beach. You can take sand up off the beach any time, but you cannot take up molasses in that way. You cannot manufacture more molasses than you can be sure would be sold; therefore you only make as much as the orders which you receive.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered all the points in this Bill. I will tell honourable members that it is necessary that we pass this Bill. I am glad that honourable members had the Committee's report for a long time because by that means they would be able to study the Bill as well as to make enquiries on the matter. I now beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took his seat while Mr. WALCOTT was speaking.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion for the second reading of this Bill. In doing so I would say that the honourable member has fully dealt with all the phases of it and there is hardly anything left for me to say. However, I do want to convince the House that the Government did not lightly decide to ship fancy molasses in bulk. We were faced with either shipping it in bulk through competition or seeing the extinction of the trade altogether if we acted otherwise. I think it is well known that the Barbados exporters of fancy molasses have rivals in Cuba who are willing at all costs to undersell our exporters in the market in Canada. Faced with that threat, it meant either shipping in bulk or die.

Sir, we know the repercussions that this shipping in bulk will have on the workers in the industry, especially the coopers, but I want to say now that provision will be made in the cess for coopers. Honourable members will remember that, first of all, the Government sent to Canada a Committee which comprised of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, Sir John Saint and Mr. J. D. Chandler. After this Committee made its investigations there, it was followed by other persons who were interested. I think those persons were

producers and shippers. The Government then finally referred the matter to the West Indian Trade Commissioner in Canada and knowing what was happening in Canada, he advised this Government that it would have to ship in bulk.

As I have said, there is no point that the honourable Junior Member for St. Peter has omitted. He mentioned about our bulk shipping to America. I can assure honourable members that there was no discrimination by our doing so. Further, we have accepted an undertaking from the buyers in the United States that they would not re-ship to Canada and I think we are in a safe position to say that the undertaking is being observed. Again I will say that the Government exhaustively investigated this syrup question before coming to this decision and I want honourable members to believe that the Government did all that it possibly could in the interests of the trade and in the interests of Barbados and the workers. Again, I beg to second this motion.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Sir, I think honourable members will agree that the fancy molasses industry is not in a healthy position at the present, rather it is in a position where it is controlled by the competitive forces in world market. You have to face facts. It might be all well and good if you want to get back in the House to fool some people and by so doing catch a few votes, but the true facts are that the industry is in a bad way and it is necessary if your price must be competitive you must ship your fancy molasses in bulk.

The Commission which went to Canada to study the economic problem reported in a sort of half way house. They arrived at the idea of shipping in bulk partly and in shipping in wooden containers partly. That was more or less because of the circumstances existing in Canada at the time when they made their investigations. For quite a long time I was wondering whether the Government was jibing itself into the idea that because of the coöperation industry and the vested interests by those people who hold hard currency stocks for the running of coöperages, that they would never have to ship in bulk.

It is correct to say that between 1928 and 1937 were extremely prosperous years for the industry. According to the report of the Committee the export trade reached a record figure around that time and in 1937 because of the position which had arisen in the industry, there being a lot of middlemen coming into the picture, the industry had to be controlled. The Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act was drawn up and put on the Statute Book and the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board was formed to look into the industry. I agree with the honourable introducer of the Bill that at that time there were probably too many middlemen in the industry. Besides that the Cuban and Puerto Rican manufacturers were already challenging the superstructure of our sugar industry. It is also correct to say Mr. Speaker, that another general position which made it difficult for the industry has been caused by the world price for sugar and the fact that the Commonwealth price is much higher than the world price. That has also caused disaster to the fancy molasses industry. Don't let anybody fool themselves. Those gentlemen concerned with the industry are as much disturbed over the fate of the industry as this Socialist Government. It is true to say that those gentlemen have asked that the price we have to levy should not be fixed.

Sir, the position would have greatly worsened had it not that this step to bulk ship this product had been agreed to by Government. But this is not all. You must at least give some sort of power to those in the industry to plan or at least to take the initiative.

As we know the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board was constituted in 1937 and its function was limited to fixing the price for molasses, to saying what should be the amount for production in the particular year, and the allocation of amounts between the various producers on the one hand and the various exporters on the other. I think it is correct to say that the Board was constituted within that framework and was well represented. At one time, the late Mr. S. A. Walcott and the then Dr. Saint were members of that Board. More recently, the honourable Junior Member for St. George. There were also on that Board Mr. C. Reece and Mr. S. Greenidge. It can truly be said that that Board was well represented through all its years.

There are one or two reasons why you really must have a new Board. One of the reasons is that before the importers can be given a firm price a lot of delay will take place owing to the several meetings which must be held between the various producers coupled with the fact that the question is also linked with what will be the sugar price in England. It is on these facts that one agrees with the general requirements which have been made in the objects and reasons of this Bill.

There is however one thing which I do not agree with and without much ado I will state it. I do not agree that with this fancy molasses industry which concerns the whole welfare of this island, all the powers of the Board should be in the hands of a monopoly of members appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I personally feel that the appointment of two of its members should still be elected from the floor of this House. I am accusing no one of dishonesty but this is my feeling. I know some honourable member in reply will tell me that you do not trust us, but it is a fact that I do not trust any human being. Whether it is a good thing for these producers and exporters to take the industry which I feel concerns this island and make a sort of monopolistic Board to run it because they feel that they are the people most directly concerned and then are asking the Executive Committee to appoint them to the Board does not seem to me to be right. I feel it is carrying things too far. I will say here and now that I am a member of the Fancy Molasses Board. There was a joint meeting of the Fancy Molasses Producers Association and the Exporters Association at which this question was aired. If I were present at that meeting I would have voiced this objection which I am voicing now. In my short experience on the Board, I have seen some people come on that Board and express all that nice love-of-the-island stuff, but when it comes to the business of the Board, they were there to push their own interest. Some of them did not even have the decency to bring along their broker; they were the very agents for themselves. As I have said, I agree with almost everything which the honourable introducer of the Bill has said with the exception of the way in which the appointments to the Board will be made. As I have explained already, we are faced with bulk shipment. We should have been in the fortunate circumstances where we should have started to bulk ship already. When you are in a monopoly position you can always cook the other fellow, but if you are not in a monopoly position you cannot cook him, you have to play ball with him.

I will again say that I agree with all the points that the honourable introducer of the Bill stated save for the way in which the appointments should be made to the Board. I still ask myself whether a Socialist Government such as this Government should put all the appointments of an industry of this nature into the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Com-

mittee. As I have said, if I were present at the joint meeting when this question was discussed, I would have objected to it; because I was not present, I am objecting to-day. As regards to the question of some sort of discrimination against the Canadians, it is not true to say that it exists. I am sure that the Exporters Association can give a report to show that there was none. The Canadians made it clear that they could not handle bulk shipment this year. With regard to the closing down of syrup plants, that is largely a matter of technical production. I know that this question is dear to the heart of the honourable Senior Member for St. John. I would only say in this question that when you are in the industry, your duty should always be to produce at the cheapest cost. There is nothing more that I can add. I have expressed all that I wanted to say and as I have said, I agree with all the points which were raised by the honourable introducer of the Bill save that of the manner in which the appointments to the Board should be made.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I think in considering how vital and important is this Bill, what is most important is not so much what the honourable introducer has said in support of the Government's decision to make the changes which have been proposed as what he has omitted to say. I will begin by saying that this Bill proposes to constitute in an entirely different manner the Board to regulate the production and export of Fancy Molasses. I regard this as the important point of the Bill but the House has not been told by the honourable introducer the reasons why the Government has decided as it is in this Bill to change the constitution of that Board. Previously, the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board was nominated by the House of Assembly, the Other Place and the Governor. The House of Assembly appointed four members, the Other Place two and the Governor one. This Government has now taken the appointments of that Board entirely out of the hands of the House and the Governor-in-Executive Committee is now to appoint the entire Board. I want to stress that this House should view very carefully any further attempts to demolish its powers—I may say to liquidate it, so to speak—and to impose a sort of dictatorship on almost every aspect of life of the colony. If I may give an illustration, we have seen that with education, we have had the most disastrous results by the giving up of our powers. With matters concerning the Department of Highways and Transport, we have done the same thing and honourable members are aware how often this House resents decisions made by the Advisory Board of the General Hospital. Now, for no justifiable reasons at all, it is proposed to put the entire control of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board into the hands of a small monopoly appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee without any say whatsoever in the appointments of those members by the House of Assembly. It is not to say that the Governor-in-Executive Committee never had any control over that Board. If you refer to the Act under which that Board was appointed you will see that the Governor-in-Executive Committee was given certain powers under the Act. As a matter of fact, the Governor-in-Executive Committee was empowered to make all the regulations which enabled the Board to carry out its duties effectively. The Governor-in-Executive Committee directed the tax which was levied on the industry and there was a further amendment on the original Act sometime in 1940 which compelled the Board to submit monthly returns to the Governor-in-Executive Committee; so to speak.

to tighten up all the operations of the Board. One section of the Act said that the Committee on the advice of the Board and with the approval of the Legislature should make regulations to authorise the quantity of fancy molasses to be exported and held in stock for human consumption and for the general supervision of the operations of the Board itself. It can therefore be seen that this Board was not autonomous. In the beginning and the end of the industry the Governor-in-Executive Committee had the final say in all the aspects and deliberations of the Board which directed this industry; but now, as a bolt out of the clear blue sky, the elected members of the House of Assembly must have no say in the manner in which that Board should be constituted. They must have no say in the election of the personnel to that Board, but the Governor-in-Executive Committee must be the people to do it.

Sir, I will tell honourable members that they will be doing this colony the greatest disservice if they agree to that aspect of the Bill. I expect to hear later that on constitutional grounds, that was the correct step; because we are attaining ministerial status where the Cabinet must formulate the policy and a minister will be responsible for the actual carrying out of the policy of the Board. I will say that if that is to be the case, we have not got ministerial status yet; and we have already paid too dearly for taking this step. Even if we do get some sort of ministerial status, nobody can envisage whether we will get full responsibility; we may only get a half-way house; therefore this House should retain as much power as it has now until such time as we get full ministerial responsibility; until such time as members of the Other Place and officials would have no say in any matters, when only the elected representatives of the people would formulate and carry out such policy. Until such time, all these attempts to remove power from the Legislature and put it in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee should be in abeyance. It is nothing more than power for dictatorship. We have seen within the last two years that every single thing—Government Departments, the General Hospital, the Borough Councils, the Municipality of Bridgetown—is to be controlled by this omnipotent totalitarian Executive Committee. Now, we are also giving the Governor-in-Executive Committee the power to appoint the members to this Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board which has very important duties to carry out. Sir, I am saying that it would be a backward step—a step which has nothing at all to recommend it and one which we confidently hope this House will not agree to take.

Reference has been made to the Report of the Committee which was appointed to enquire into all aspects of this Fancy Molasses Industry. It will be remembered that this Committee left here for Canada sometime in 1950. However, it seems to me that the honourable introducer of this Bill has only read this report but has not digested it. Perhaps, he has read it so long ago that he has forgotten much of what he read in it or perhaps, he has not read certain parts of it at all because it is difficult to understand why many of the statements he has made could have been made if he had fully followed what appears in this report. I also thought that the honourable introducer should have given this House some information as to why Government thought fit this year to resort to the Wartime Powers Act in order to control Fancy Molasses when we had the Fancy Molasses Board still in existence and still responsible for the industry.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That Act was never rescinded.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, early this year, some of the molasses shippers were having difficulties with regard to the export of the product in view of the coming about of certain complications in the industry and this Government overstepped this Fancy Molasses Board by exercising the powers given under the Wartime Emergency Act, so as to legislate for the export of molasses.

(A VOICE): Government never overstepped its powers, that Act was always there; it is still there now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, this Government exercised its powers under that Act to legislate for the export of molasses, over-riding the Fancy Molasses Board despite the fact that this Board is constituted properly, it having four members appointed by this House, two by the Other Place and one by the Governor. Invariably, this House appoints two planters or people who know something of the industry along with two representatives of the people from this Chamber. On the 27th March under the Export and Restriction Act, 1939, which is a wartime measure, this Government made an order prohibiting the export of molasses from the island in bulk or in containers other than in the wooden containers, without the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and that step was taken purely because Government knew that the new Fancy Molasses Board as it was then constituted would never agree to the Barbados Canning Company shipping molasses in cans. Sir, imagine the honourable Junior Member for St. Peter in his remarks saying that the Barbados Canning Company went into voluntary liquidation.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT. Deny that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable introducer of this Bill also said that certain Canadian importers felt that the shipping in cans would operate against them. Because Government utilised these wartime powers to prohibit the export of molasses in cans without the approval of the Fancy Molasses Board, this Canning Company could not get permission from the Steering Committee to ship fancy molasses from this colony in cans.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that what the honourable member said is untrue.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Anybody who investigated the workings of this canning factory would see that the owners did not close it down voluntarily. They did not go into voluntary liquidation; they did not suddenly decide to throw away money. By the wartime powers to control importers and exporters, this Canning Company could not get the necessary permission to export fancy molasses in tins and as a result, the company went into liquidation. The honourable Junior Member for St. Peter also used the remark that the Canadian importers opposed the exporting of the molasses in these cans because it operated against them. We now hear of that, but even if that be so, are we here to think how the Canadian importers would feel about it, or are we here to think what would be good for this island? I would like this House to realise the value of having fancy molasses in cans in Canada. When fancy molasses is shipped in big containers, there is always the possibility of its being diluted by blending with molasses which has not our peculiar flavour from other countries; therefore, it is important to have on the Canadian market a small shipment of our fancy molasses in cans so that Canadian users can have an honest-to-goodness taste of what is Barbados molasses. Sir,

molasses go to Canada from Cuba, Puerto Rico, from some states of South America and from Barbados, but there has always been a demand for our molasses because of its peculiar flavour; therefore, it is vitally important if you are going to ship your entire crop in bulk to have separate and distinct some part of this molasses going from the colony shipped in such a manner as to preserve its identity and its quality thus enabling Barbados molasses to maintain its grip on the users.

The honourable introducer of this Bill also said that the Canadian importers were not ready for bulk shipment.

(A VOICE): Read the report of the Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have in my hand a copy of the same report which I presume the honourable introducer has also read. The honourable member also said that Canada was opposed to the consignment of the product to individual importers. I wonder if he thinks that when this island starts shipping fancy molasses in bulk that all the present importers would continue to get it. There are about 167 such importers in Canada now and I opine that only about six would continue to get our molasses. Among other things, the report stated that the majority of Canadian dealers was opposed to the importation of molasses in bulk owing to the cost of the outlay for storage facilities and the small wholesalers were opposed to it because it would mean putting the industry into the hands of a small monopoly in Canada; it would mean putting the industry into the hands of only those who are already equipped to receive it in bulk. I hope honourable members will not accept the view that the 167 Canadian importers of Barbados fancy molasses are going to put down facilities for receiving our molasses in bulk. The majority of them cannot afford to do it. As soon as you ship molasses in bulk, you are going to put it into the hands of a small monopoly; therefore it is important that every year, a certain quantity of the industry should be shipped in containers other than that in bulk so that Canadian users would always have a knowledge of what is Barbados molasses.

Sir, the reason for using this wartime powers was simply that the Executive could appoint a favourite Board to control and export fancy molasses for 1953. It was done because this special hand-picked body would be there to do what the "big boys" wanted: I wonder if the honourable introducer of the resolution knows half of what he said. He spoke in such a way as to give the impression that the reason why we did not have bulk shipment here a year or two before was because of the interests of the workers in the industry. That is pure tommy rot. The reason why we did not have it before is nothing of the kind. I am not going to say for a moment that the Government did not lose sight of the fact that if we shipped in bulk certain people—the coopers particularly—would be unemployed as a result, but that was not the reason why we did not ship in bulk before. If it were concerned with the interests of the workers alone, we would never have closed down the Canning Factory because that factory employed more than a hundred people. More than that, most of the syrup factories in Christ Church have closed down because that canning factory is no longer in operation. If this be the case, do not tell me that you were really interested in protecting the workers, because you would also be trying to protect the workers at this canning factory and the syrup factories that have closed down as a result.

Mrs. BOURNE and Mr. BARROW entered the House and took their seats while Mr. CRAWFORD was speaking.

One factory in St. John when they stopped reported that they stopped purely because they did not make molasses this year for the canning factory. I made it my business to find out what workers were employed by the canning factory and how many people lost their work as a result of the factories closing down earlier. I discovered that the canning factory used to pay about \$5,000 a year in wages. I had no means of estimating what the syrup factories would have paid out if they had prolonged their operations providing additional molasses for the canning factory. What is important is the fact that the committee which went to Canada to investigate the whole position said this in its report:—

We were informed that there is a limited market for fancy molasses packed in Canada in cans, the five gallon and gallon cans being preferred in the country areas and the smaller cans in and near the city. It was agreed generally that the consumer who secured his fancy molasses requirements in small ready packed containers would use a suitable can in preference to waxed paper containers, provided the packages were equally priced. In fact, the price of a can of molasses is higher than the comparative price for fancy molasses in waxed paper containers, and seems likely to remain so owing to the high cost of the can.

(A MEMBER: Read paragraph 73) An honourable member would like me to read paragraph 73. It says:—

Dealers confirmed the fact that the canned molasses packaged in Barbados had not been well received by the consumer. It was stated that in 1948 when the Barbados Produce Exporters Association Inc began to ship canned molasses, each member of the Association marketed his proportionate share of the production through his own broker. Soon afterwards this arrangement was discontinued and one broker was appointed in each area to market Barbados canned molasses on behalf of the Association as a whole. Those brokers who by virtue of this arrangement ceased to handle the product expressed the opinion that the change was detrimental to sales since they were no longer interested in pushing the product. On the other hand, we were told that there were still too many brokers dealing with this canned molasses.

That is the crux of the whole thing. In other words, the Canadian importers do not want the consumers in Canada to get these small packages because they are mixing up our molasses with Cuban and Puerto Rican molasses. The consumer does not know the difference. If honourable members help the Canadian importer to go on diluting our molasses the time will come when there will be no Barbadian molasses in Canada at all. Mind you, we cannot hope to compete all the time with production costs which obtain in Cuba and Puerto Rico who have guaranteed markets for a large portion of its produce in the U.S.A. The only salvation that Barbados has is the special flavour of its molasses. Take away that special flavour and we will not sell a gallon. To make it possible for the importer to go on diluting our molasses with that of Cuba and Puerto Rico is to kill our trade.

I mention all this because there is a small group in Bridgetown which wants to get the control of the industry in its hands, and it is forcing the Government to do what it wants done. There was a part of the industry in 1950 which wanted bulk shipment. They approached Government over the matter, and they talked it over with the union that represented the workers. We know that an agreement was made to bulk ship. The union felt that they had taken certain steps to protect the workers, and the Government felt that since bulk shipment might soon be coming

anyhow, they could make a trial shipment in bulk. This firm got the green light to go ahead and make arrangements for bulk shipment. It was stopped, not because workers would be thrown out of work, although that is the impression that was given and is still being given. It stopped because the firms which shipped molasses in puncheons had large sums of money invested in wooden puncheons, and if you had allowed bulk shipment by certain enterprising firms in 1950 those who shipped in puncheons would not have been able to compete with the price of molasses landed in Canada. The cost of these puncheons constitute a large part of the price of the molasses. I am told that a puncheon costs \$34.00 and do not forget that the firms who own cooperages were also making money out of these puncheons. They were not making the puncheons for love. So as I was saying certain firms opposed bulk shipment in 1950 because they had large sums invested in puncheon material which they did not want to lose.

It is their power, their influence, which has brought the molasses industry to the plight in which it is and which will ruin it if we take steps proposed in this Bill, and give them full power to do as they like and bamboozle the Executive Committee. There will be no resort to the Legislature, and the whole thing will be a dictatorship. The Legislature has on more than one occasion refused to agree to proposals by the Fancy Molasses Board. But the fact was that the decisions of that Board were subject to the approval of the Legislature. I cannot for the life of me understand why the Government should feel that the interests of this colony would be best served by changing the manner in which the Control Board for the Fancy Molasses Industry was constituted. As long as the elected representatives of the people have some control, some interest, some say in the operations of these public bodies you can rest assured that the public interest will be better protected.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER takes the Chair.

It is all well and good, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to say as the Objects and Reasons say that the present method of appointing members to the Board is open to criticism, and that the members should be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. But every type of interest was represented on the Board as it was appointed hitherto—the molasses interest, the sugar interest, Government interest; and the representatives of the workers were there by virtue of our power to put people on the Board. The same thing need not follow when the Board is constituted as proposed in this Bill. With the Executive Committee having the power to appoint representatives of the exporters and of the workers, and there is a shift at any time in the political set-up of the island and a Conservative Government comes into power what will happen as far as representation of the workers is concerned? The Legislature will have no say in the matter. There is far more possibility of the workers being represented on the Board if the House has some say in it than if it is left entirely in the hands of the Executive Committee which may or may not be of the wrong political complexion, depending on how you look at it.

The mere fact that already this year the big interests of the industry by-passed the Board, ignored it, to pursue a special policy they had in mind is indicative of the entire policy in this matter. They do not want to know that this Chamber has any control over their actions. They want autocratic power so that they can do as they like without regard to the Legislature. Members of this House who have sat on the Board will tell you that they have

had to fight most strongly to protect the interests of the small molasses producers against the big ones. If this Board had not been so constituted in the past the small producers would have been out of the business a long time ago. But you put someone from the House on the Board so as to protect the interests of the small fellows and twice in my time representatives from this House on the Board have refused to sanction what the big interests of the industry wanted to do, and we have protected them in upholding the interests of the small producers. And now this authority and power is to be taken out of our hands.

At this stage, Sir, I move that the House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. VAUGHAN seconded.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that this House do now adjourn for half an hour. Honourable members in favour will please say aye, and those against will please say no. I think the ayes have it.

On a division being called for the question was resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. TALMA, HOLDER, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. COX, HAYNES, CRAWFORD, J. C. MOTTLEY and Mr. VAUGHAN—(8).

Noes: Mr. F. L. WALCOTT—(1).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I now declare the “ayes” have it. This House now stands adjourned.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:—

Dr. CUMMINS for Mr. ADAMS laid the reply to Question No. 17 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for the City (Mr. LEWIS).

LEAVE TO DISCUSS DAMAGED HOUSES IN ST. PHILIP

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes to discuss a matter of importance.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has already given me notice.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—May I suggest that the honourable member be allowed to say what he wants to discuss so that honourable members may be able to vote properly.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I want to inform the House of the damage done to people's houses by high winds in St. Philip last Sunday.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave. He has already given me notice of his intention, and if there is no objection leave will be granted the honourable member.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I object to leave being granted to discuss a matter of this sort. It should be brought by the proper authority—the Vestry—if they need the help of the Government. This matter results from an act of God in a particular parish. It is not of universal proportions nor a matter of urgency such as an epidemic. After the honourable member has said all that he will say all of us will agree, and then what will be the position? No petition to the Government. No resolution to come to the rescue of the vestry. No petition has come from the Vestry saying that this is a matter affecting our parish; we do not have enough funds at our disposal; will the Government help us. How does it help the position for the honourable member merely to get up here and spend half an hour discussing this matter?

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I sent some of the people who have suffered to the Churchwarden. He says it is our business as representatives of the parish in the House of Assembly.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I have on previous occasions heard the question of damage by high winds and rains discussed in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not before the House. The question before the House is for leave to be granted.

Mr. LEWIS: I am going to speak on the question of leave being granted. My contention is that the honourable member should be granted leave because it is not the first time that this House has assisted victims of an act of God in a particular parish. I should like to be made aware of the fact that it is the duty of the Vestry to assist these people. I do not know that that was the position taken up on previous occasions, and that is why I feel that leave should be granted the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that leave be granted the honourable junior member for St. Philip to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes to discuss a matter of public importance. Honourable members in favour will please say “aye”, and those against will please say “no.” I think the ayes have it.

On a division being called for the question was resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, MILLER, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. MAPP, LEWIS, BARROW, TALMA, HOLDER, BRYAN, BRANCKER, WILLIAMS, CRAWFORD, J. C. MOTTLEY, VAUGHAN, ALLDER and HAYNES. (16).

Noes: Mr. ADAMS, Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. COX. (3).

Mr. SPEAKER: I now declare the “ayes” have it.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I am sorry to see the attitude adopted by Government Members on a matter of this sort, and a matter of this importance. I think, sir, that the Government would be failing in its duty if it did not come to the assistance of these poor, unfortunate people: because these houses that have been damaged belong to the type of people who are unable to keep them in repair. The wind, therefore, prevailed against these houses. You know, Mr. Speaker, that there is an old saying that, “high wind knows where old house is.”

I do not want to be tedious, sir, but as far as the attitude of Government members is concerned it shows the lack of interest on their part in the welfare of the men and women who sent us here. (A MEMBER: The people of St. Philip sent you and Crawford). Yes, they sent myself and Crawford, and the workers in other parishes sent the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and his supporters.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am addressing the honourable junior member for St. Philip. There is a rule of this House which says that no member should be referred to by name in debate. The honourable member therefore must not say “myself and Crawford”, but “myself and my senior colleague” or something like that.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I am sorry if I made a mistake in quoting the honourable Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has not spoken. I think the honourable member would better be guided by me and withdraw the offending remarks.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I withdraw the remarks. As I was saying, sir, it is the duty of those of us who represent the poor to go out of our way to come

to their assistance in cases like the present one, and I feel that any honourable member who attempts to prevent a matter like this from being discussed in this honourable Chamber would be failing in his duty to the people.

I do not have at my finger-tips how many houses were damaged. At least four were blown down and many had their roofs and other parts of them damaged. I hope that the Government will make an investigation and see whether it is in their power to help. I sent some of these people to Mr. Garner, the Churchwarden of St. Philip and he said it was not his business; but the business of the two representatives of the parish in the House of Assembly.

I beg to move that the House do now adjourn for five minutes to discuss this matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to second the motion. There is no need for a prolonged debate on this matter. But it really surprised me that a professed opponent of vestrydom should suggest that a matter affecting the welfare of the poor classes should be left to vestrymen to see after. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph knows well that left in the hands of the vestry these people would remain until next year uncared for and unassisted.

We have had an occasion of flood damage not so long ago, and the honourable member himself censured the parochial authorities for their indifference in not reporting accurately the amount of damage that had taken place. He knows, and I know and we all know that this is not a matter for which the vestry is responsible. We are also aware that we who represent the people in this Chamber have to initiate action if we want anything to be done expeditiously. We can all remember the fight that the honourable senior member for St. John had to put up in this House to get assistance for the owner of a house that was damaged in St. John—a fight over the bodies of the vestry. Anyone who knows what the Vestry of St. Philip stands for, and still suggests that we should leave the fate of these people in their hands must be absolutely indifferent to the needs of the people.

If the vestrymen are so interested in the people why get rid of them? Why bring the Maude Bill? if they are to protect the people in every aspect of life let them go on functioning. We have the Maude Bill before us because of the indifference of the Vestry.

The police authorities have made a survey of the damage done and they have in detail what has taken place; so that if the Government is as interested in the people as it professes to be, it can get a report from the police; and if the vestry is slow in acting I suggest that the Government should prod them into immediate activity on behalf of these poor, unfortunate people.

These are poor people who, as my colleague said, are unable to help themselves. As one of them told me yesterday, during the crop money would be a little more available to effect repairs. But it is during the dry time when there is very little work. It does not cost two cents to repair a house or put back on a roof. But since money can be so easily found to be squandered in other directions we can find a few dollars to assist these people—not next year but immediately—so that they will not have to live in a house with the roof off and exposed to the elements. They need immediate attention, and I hope that the Government will prod the vestry into action, and if necessary make money available to them. Cut out the red tape and get these places repaired.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,—Where a matter of this sort is concerned and the Vestry even had three million pounds at their disposal they could not spend

one cent. They do not have the authority. If they spent a cent on a matter of this sort the taxpayers could call back for their money. The vestries are only there to administer poor relief and things of that sort. Their hands are tied. Mr. Speaker, if the honourable junior member for St. Peter wants to speak I will sit and let him speak. It is a very sad state of affairs for people to have the roofs of their houses blown off. As a matter of fact, whether a man is rich or poor, a house without a roof is not a house at all.

I think that the honourable junior member for St. Philip did a good thing when he raised this question on the floor of the House. (Cheers.) Government will know that there are houses in St. Philip which have been blown down and damaged, and they should, as early as tomorrow, send to the Vestry of St. Philip and ask them to make a survey of the damage and let them bring a Resolution here at least by next Tuesday. To wait until the vestry help these people, the people will have to look for somewhere else to live. It is a matter of importance, and should be handled with all the speed possible.

The vestries do not even have money to spend on Poor Relief. Some vestries are paying a pauper 2/- per fortnight. Can that keep any person at all? Some pay 60 cents.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will stick to the matter that is before the House.

Mr. SMITH: I only want honourable members to know that the vestries' hands are tied. It is the Government's business. I think that we should be proud of the honourable junior member for St. Philip. If a similar thing had happened in St. Joseph I would have come here with it as fast as possible. A person cannot sleep in the open air. I feel that this is a case of urgency and I sincerely hope that the Government will take this matter into their hands, send to the Vestry of St. Philip tomorrow and ask them to make a survey and find out how much it will cost to put back these houses.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—There are two important considerations which must be borne in mind. The first is that St. Philip is after all a part of Barbados, and it would be heartening to the people of that parish to know that the House is with them in their hour of sorrow; and they will be greatly comforted by the fact that their troubles are being aired and sympathy is being expressed to them by the elected representatives of the people of this colony.

When we consider the question of relief it is surely a matter for the Central Government, since it has been fully apprised of what has taken place, to initiate the expenditure. We must bear in mind that the vestry is a statutory body. There are only four things that they are entitled to do with the money which they collect: the repair and maintenance of the churches in their respective parishes; salaries of the necessary church officers; maintenance and education of the poor, and such other necessary parochial charges as are usually borne by the parishioners and allowed by law. I do not know if the Vestry of St. Philip is in the habit of usually bearing such a parochial charge as repairing out of vestry funds the houses of parishioners damaged by wind or rain. If they have been in the habit of bearing such a charge then this may be regarded as a usual charge allowed by law. But, Mr. Speaker, we have to consider this: Even if the Vestry had the power to do it, the question remains where would they find the money? At this time the vestries have no money. People have only just begun—if they have begun at all—to pay their parochial taxes. What little has been paid in is to keep the parochial institutions in order and to enable salaries to be paid.

I feel, Sir, that this debate this afternoon should be very beneficial. It should be a tonic to the suffering people of St. Philip. It should be a source of encouragement to the poor people of the rest of the island to know that the House will rise up in sympathy and give them charitable support. It will also serve the purpose of informing the Government of what has happened in the parish so that they can send their proper officers to investigate and meet us with a Resolution next Tuesday. Indeed sir, if necessary, Your Honour has the power to summon a special meeting in case of emergency. If that is not necessary we can pass a Resolution next Tuesday—assuming that the damage has taken place—and there can be no doubt of that. These people are obviously not insured. I feel that a useful purpose has been served by airing this matter, and the Government should move as quickly as possible. They should move as quickly as the honourable junior member for St. Philip has moved.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Before any other honourable member speaks I would like to say that a man is not a man unless he has the courage to say something which may not be popular. I am going to say something unpopular now. The speeches that we have heard on this matter can be described as mere rhetoric and vote catching and nothing else. As far as the honourable junior member for St. Joseph and the honourable senior member for St. Lucy are concerned their speeches were nothing else. To give the impression to the poor people of this island that we as a government do not care for them or sympathise with them in any calamity that befalls them, and that we will turn a deaf ear to them is unworthy of a man and especially of a politician who purports to give support to the Government.

When the Churchwarden of St. Philip said that the matter was one for the two representatives of the parish he spoke the plain truth. Do honourable members forget that a similar thing happened in St. Joseph a few years ago? Did the House of Assembly hear anything about it from me? In a case like this the two representatives of the parish, the vicar and the curates should go around with a hat. Only when it assumes epidemic proportions does the Government step in. To give the impression that every time there is a high wind in this island the Government can go to the Treasury and repair damaged houses is unfair. Does the Government every time that a fishing boat sinks step in and replace it? But when 70 were blown to St. Vincent the Government brought them back. That is the Government's duty.

It seems that the honourable senior member for St. Lucy cannot help saying, in a seemingly serious way, things that are ridiculous. "Send down a Resolution tomorrow, or before tomorrow." It looks well in the *Advocate* or in some other part of the Press. It is not worthy of a man to make a speech like that and to give the impression that the Government does not care anything for the poor people. When I was telling the honourable junior member for St. Philip not to worry I knew that every person sitting around this table would be sympathetic towards the people of St. Philip; but what course must we adopt after expressing our sympathy? When I mentioned the Vestry the smallest school child knows that the vestries have no money to repair houses. I meant that the honourable member should go to his local authority who would have to say that they did not have the money and ask for help. Then, of course, the Government will ask what has the clergy done in the matter, and the Social Welfare authorities. Is it something that the parishioners cannot help with? Is it so large that you must come to the Government? Those are the questions that the Government will ask. But to sug-

gest that every time there is a high wind Government has a duty to replace damaged or blown down houses is pure and unadulterated nonsense. No treasury is illimitable.

Floods killed hundreds of thousands of sheep and cattle in Great Britain a few years ago, and of course the British Treasury shed out millions of pounds. But every time that there is a flood in an area and a farmer's sheep get drowned does the farmer run to the British Treasury, or the American Treasury or to a government treasury in any part of the world? It is the duty of representatives of a constituency to make their points; but it is not doing their duty for members, especially members of the Government Party, to give the impression that the Government cares nothing for the people. You can train a parrot to say "I am on the poor man's side. These hard hearted fellows on the Government do not even want to discuss the matter." It is easy to raise sympathy by speeches of that sort. It is easy to stir up prejudice against the Government. I say let us do our duty as men and not as election canvassers.

I was brought to my feet, Mr. Speaker, not because I am unsympathetic to these people or to any other people. None of us would be human beings if we were unsympathetic to these people who have lost their homes or have had them damaged. It must be a terrible thing to have even a few shingles off your roof when the rain is falling, far more the whole roof. But I say again that the proper procedure is for the two representatives of the parish, and the clergy to go around with a brief and get these people's houses repaired. If it is on a big scale of course the Government will help. We had to help in the case of the 1949 floods because that was on a big scale. Why did the Government not help when the rock rolled over on someone's house in St. Thomas although we got cursed for it? It was not the duty of the Government to come to the rescue of that family. By what stretch of the imagination can you say that a disaster to one family demands that the Government step in. If it was an epidemic, or a raging fire or something on a big scale it would be a different matter. But every time that a house gets burned down must the Government look for money to replace it?

I hope that honourable members who in the ebullition of their speeches may have said things that were not fair will see now that if they come to members of the Government with a brief that we will help. But if they ask us to take money out of the Treasury we cannot do it unless a correct case is made out.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—The tactlessness of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph on occasions like this certainly does give the impression that he has tyrannical propensities or is uncharitably inclined. If the honourable member was of the right frame of mind he would have complimented the honourable junior member for St. Philip for bringing that matter to the attention of this Chamber. But when I listened to the furore which went on it reminded me of my similar position when I tried to bring to the notice of the House a disastrous occurrence in my parish some years ago.

I am sure, Sir, that most of the members of this House are sympathetic towards the people of St. Philip in their present calamity. But things are not done, Mr. Speaker, as easily as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is suggesting. Of course the honourable member is too far removed from the backward areas of this country. He only knows about hardship when he sees it on paper, and he is always reluctant to hear about it at first hand from those

who know about it by association. Therefore you could not expect more from him. But it is our duty as representatives of the people, when these cases occur and we have the power within our hands to ameliorate the condition to do so.

The honourable member knows that the rectors and vicars in the various parishes do not care particularly about cases like this. You have to be a pillar of the church or a very serviceable individual before the rector or vicar pays you any attention. What is more, the rector is going to head the list with a dollar, and then the unfortunate person is going to have to wait for weeks or months before he gets enough to purchase one bundle of shingles. What is more the Government has the facilities at its disposal for finding out as early as tomorrow how much it would cost to have these houses replaced. The honourable member if he was truly sympathetic would have promised that he would telephone the Department which gives out money from the Labour Welfare Fund and suggest to the Manager that he immediately investigate these cases, make an estimate of the cost and get these people back under cover. I do not want him to do anything that will need a lot of red tape. He has it in his control to deal with the situation immediately. How does the honourable member think it feels to be in a house such as those occupied by many of these people, where even when the top is not off it is often difficult in the rainy season to find a dry spot to rest one's weary body? But the honourable member does not know about these things and he does not care to know.

Some of these appeals which seem to be appeals to charity are not truly that, Mr. Speaker. They are appeals to justice. Some members may feel that if we come to the help of these people it would be out of charity. But that is not so. It is a question that the strong must help protect the weak. You must take from him according to his ability and give to him according to his needs. That should be the decision of a government headed by the honourable member who is so socialistic in campaigning.

The honourable junior member for St. Philip has brought this case here. Not every member would be in a position to know what has happened in St. Philip. It is the duty of the representatives of a parish to bring to the notice of the House any sudden calamity that occurs in the parish which they represent. It is very unkind, Mr. Speaker, that every time an honourable member attempts to carry out that duty his speech is sarcastically described as "rhetoric and vote catching." The honourable member for St. Joseph has passed the stage when he has to do those things; but I do not think that there is anyone who has done them more capably than he. If he feels desirous of forgetting all the kindnesses showed upon him by the same people on whose behalf we are speaking it is a matter for him. But surely, Sir, you should do justice to those who did justice to you.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,—I think that this is an opportune time to refresh the memories of the Government that an address was passed unanimously by this House asking Government to arrange for a comprehensive scheme of insurance to cover such houses against such damage as we heard has occurred. It is the straw which shows which way the wind is blowing. Four houses were blown down in St. Philip on Sunday; but by tomorrow night 40,000 may be gone from all over the island. And no provision has been made for that.

I said at the time when I brought that Address that this matter was a serious one; but apparently it has been forgotten like many other important things that are brought to this House. We should

take warning from the case of Jamaica where six or seven years after their last hurricane people are still living under rocks. The same thing can happen in Barbados. No one knows what is behind the clouds. One has to protect oneself from the elements. I think that this is an opportune time for the Government to reconsider this matter and to see if by chance something cannot be done about it. If it had been done before these people in St. Philip would only need go to some insurance organisation, have the damages assessed and in a couple of days the matter would be settled. What has happened to these houses may happen to forty thousand. I hope that the Government will see the seriousness of it and re-open the question of insurance.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I am sorry to see the atmosphere in which this matter has been discussed. Instead of our listening sympathetically and pointing out to anyone who may have made a mistake the better way of handling the matter, it would appear that our sympathy to the people who have suffered has been subordinated to other considerations. I would first of all like to say that I am sympathetic towards the people of St. Philip who have suffered as a result of this act of God, and I sympathise with the honourable junior member for St. Philip for the difficulty which he has had in getting his views before the House.

It must be remembered, Sir, that we have in this colony a fund for calamities, and a calamity, if it occurs in the parish of St. Philip and in no other parish is still a calamity. Even if it is confined to a few, a few can suffer the same privation as the many. Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like to say that I deplore the attitude of the Honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph. He said that he was brought to his feet through what was said; but it appears to me that he was brought to his feet through his own attitude to this matter being discussed today. He had to answer himself and correct himself. He is the Leader of the House and a legally trained man and he deliberately told the House that this was a matter for the Vestry. Then he had to say that it is not a matter for the Vestry. Where are we? How can the honourable member say that he was not dishonest when he tried to mislead the House that we should not discuss this matter because it was one for the Vestry? I feel, sir, that we should discuss our business in a much better way.

I would like to counsel the honourable members for St. Philip that before they attempt to bring a matter of this nature before the House they should have some details to give. The honourable senior member said that a survey had been made by the Police; but evidently he knows nothing about it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am the person who told the House that a Police survey had been made. I was in contact with the Police sergeant today and yesterday. I know the damage in detail.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member knows the damage in detail.

Mr. LEWIS: How are we to know that he knows it? It is his duty to make out a case on the facts as he knows them. One of the honourable members said that four houses had been blown down and the roofs had been blown off others. That is not detail. That is not the way for honourable members to act who take their duties in this House seriously.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I must object to the honourable member's remarks. He is insinuating that my colleague and I have not taken our duties seriously where this matter is concerned.

Mr. LEWIS I am saying that the honourable members for St. Philip have not brought this matter in the manner of honourable members who take their duties seriously.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Philip is out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am rising to a point of order, sir.

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

Mr. LEWIS: If they had been able to say that the entire roofs of three houses had been blown off etc. that would have shown that they were taking interest in making out the case. The speeches made by them could have been made by anyone else. It was not the best thing to talk about the government squandering money etc.

As far as the Address by the honourable junior member for St. Andrew is concerned, the Government now has an interest in having these houses insured because they are lending people money, from the Labour Welfare Fund. It is true that it is the people's money, but anyone who lends you money will see that he has some sort of protection. This Government is afraid to undertake the things that socialism means. It is afraid of socialism. The honourable senior member could not have been serious when he talked of carrying around a brief. That would be the action of vestries of long ago. That was a form of patronage used to get people under your thumb and make them vote for you. We want to get away from all that.

I think that in a matter like this we should deal with a principle. We should have some fund. We should find out if any of the sufferers are insured and assist those who are not. If we are not willing to help these people by insurance, when calamity comes we will have to spend money on them. I feel much sympathy for these people, sir. Only a few Sundays ago all the churches of the island held a day of prayer for protection against these calamities. I do not know if the people in St. Philip did not pray hard enough, or if they do not go to church. I notice that one of the representatives of the parish lives in Christ Church and the bad weather seems to have passed down that way too.

Those are my views, sir. The honourable junior member for St. Joseph is a vestryman and he told us what could happen. If there is any help to be given it would have to come from outside the vestry, he said. I want to repeat that I am in sympathy with the people of St. Philip and I would be willing to support a Resolution sent to this House to assist them.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker,—I too regret that this debate has taken the course it has taken. It caused an honourable member to make the mistake of making statements which cannot be supported by law and subsequently statements which on reflection might turn out to be politically inadvisable. Be that as it may, the situation cannot be retrieved now, and we are confronted with the position that members of this House have been made aware of the calamity which has befallen some of our brethren in a parish of this small island. We have also been made aware that the vestries are not the statutory authorities for dealing with the matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges which we claim at the opening of every session of the Legislature is that the best construction should be placed on all our speeches by the other branch of the Legislature, and I would say that that should apply equally between member and member in this

Chamber. I do not think, therefore, that it is quite fair for members of the House to be accused of electioneering and dishonesty because they voice an opinion which is entirely in sympathy with the sufferings of the people of this island. I do not think that that privilege which we claim would have any *de facto* validity if we disregard it in debate and do not place the best construction on the speeches of honourable members who are asking for the sympathy of other honourable members in a matter of this kind.

I would like to say quite categorically that I do not consider either the Vestry of St. Philip or the Rector, the first on the grounds of legality and the second on the grounds of ways and means, would be the fit and proper parties to investigate this matter and to do something about it. I understand from what the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph has said that he really considers that this matter is within the province of the elected members of the House of Assembly, not as legislators, but as individuals to do something about it and he finally enjoined other members to follow the example of the members for St. Joseph when they were confronted with a similar predicament in the past. I have been able to check up on this and I have been reliably informed that no representative of this House represented that unfortunate parish of St. Joseph when there was a high wind a few years ago. I understood that both honourable members for that parish had the athletic experience of going about the parish with a brief headed by the Rector or some other such person. As a matter of fact, one honourable member informed me that he knew of an occasion in which a parishioner begged his colleague for some assistance in some matter and to show what unanimity existed between them, they each despatched the parishioner to the other member of the parish. I certainly hope that nothing like this will occur in the parish I have the honour to represent because I would not have the time, the energy or the inclination to walk about that parish with a brief. I think it is degrading. We as Socialists should not countenance poor people if visited by some visitation where they might find themselves deprived of their house or a roof over their heads to be walking around the parish with briefs for aid. We are trying to move away this remnant of the old poor law and any vestige of charity and patronage which has all along imbued the political atmosphere of this island. When the honourable member who said that it was the duty of the Vestry to investigate the matter and do something about it, on rising again and saying something differently, he put himself in exactly the same position as Cicero was placed in relation to Mark Anthony. It will be remembered that when Cicero rose up against Mark Anthony and was in a position to prove his case, for a long time, he did not have the courage to tell it. He lost his head to Mark Anthony before he delivered his philippic against Mark Anthony,—a philippic which would have been the end of that gentleman. It was said of Cicero that he would have been able to ward off the sword of Mark Anthony if at the time he should, he had stated all the things he had known of Mark Anthony. I would not put it in the classical way. This is just my observation on the debate.

Sir, as a Socialist, I am entirely in sympathy with the motion made by the honourable Junior Member for St. Philip, and because of that I would like to remind honourable members that charity begins at home. When there is a disaster as that mentioned by the honourable member, the damage is

much more colossal than that envisaged. In visitations like this, this Government has even given assistance to other colonies. If I may mention an instance, when Castries, of St. Lucia was burnt down, this Government sent aid. This is a case where the parishioners of St. Philip have suffered and for the most part, there are agricultural labourers. I would suggest that they can be given some assistance even by giving them priority of having their houses repaired out of the Labour Welfare Fund. This is a fund which already exists and when we give them assistance out of that fund, we would be within the bounds of the law. Instructions should be given to the officer in charge of that department of Government to give those people priority in getting their houses repaired as quickly as possible. I know definitely that the Vestry of that parish would be acting *ultra vires* if it spent the taxpayers money on matters of this kind; therefore this House should be put in the picture and should be apprised of the extent of the damage and then consider the case on its own merits. As a socialist, it is rather surprising for me to hear that if anything happens of a natural catastrophe which affects the well-being of any citizen of the island, that it is not the duty of the House to do something about it unless the House considers that it is expedient. I think that is a most irresponsible statement. We have been told in our childhood days that when one sparrow falls, the Almighty is concerned about it. We should be concerned with circumstances such as these. I feel it would have been far better if we had agreed to the motion for the adjournment which was moved by the honourable member and had expressed our sympathy and promised our support, but when this House with all due seriousness can express condolence to the people of Russia on the occasion of the death of one of the greatest despots that the world has ever known, and is not concerned with what happens in St. Philip, then I say that we who call ourselves Socialists are in danger of losing the respect of the people who put us here.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the last honourable member who has spoken made a most important point before his last statement and I think it is one which will have a reflection on the voting of this House. I would however like to tell the honourable member that we have despots in here and may be, somebody may call him one. Now, Mr. Speaker, what we were telling the honourable Junior Member for St. Philip was to the effect that if tomorrow there came a high wind which blows down a house in St. Peter and we realised it, we as representatives of that parish would have to put our hands in our pockets and go to the party and assist them. Now, we do not know how many houses were damaged by this high wind in St. Philip; we do not know what is the extent of the damage. The honourable Junior Member for St. Philip comes in here and just makes a bald statement that the roofs of three houses in St. Philip were blown off by high winds last Sunday afternoon. He does not know the extent of the damage. You will never get me to vote for something which I am not fully apprised about. Is the honourable member really serious when he is asking this House to vote money because three roofs have been blown off houses in his parish by the high winds last Sunday? If there were three fires, instead, would he ask this Government to give assistance? If it were something of a major catastrophe, of course, it would be the duty of this House to give assistance. If it were a whole area or a district that was wiped out, of course it would be the duty of this Government to grant some aid. Sir,

this is a place where you get practical politics. If you want to aid anybody, that may be quite in order, but it may not be quite in order for Government to aid them. I would resign from Government before I vote for something of which I am not sure about. The honourable Junior Member for St. Philip has not done the elementary thing that you would expect a representative to do, that is to make on-the-spot investigations before coming to the House. He should come here knowing all the facts. He should come here knowing how many houses have been damaged; what is the extent of the damage; and a rough estimate of the total damage. Instead of that, he comes here with a bald statement and presents the case in such a manner as to cause honourable members to make speeches as if a national disaster had taken place. Just like a bonfire where everybody gathers around, he wants everybody to come to the assistance of these people. When you do that, you want to reduce this Government to a farce. Because people of our calibre are running the Government, you bring in any pork-knocking scheme. When this Government does not support it, you say it is not a Socialist Government, but you are the socialist.

The suggestion by the honourable Senior Member for St. George that those people whose house roofs have been blown off in the high wind should be given priority in the Labour Welfare Scheme in securing loans is a very reasonable one, and one for which he should be given praise. I am always willing to give praise where praise is due. Whether or not it was a national disaster, so far as giving these people priority for getting loans in the Labour Welfare Scheme is a very reasonable suggestion, but it is a different thing when you come in here and ask Government to put back on the roofs of those houses or to go into the Treasury and get money for this purpose. You cannot come in here and ask the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph to send down a resolution for money for this purpose without knowing the extent of the damage and all the other relevant facts. When you come in and ask that these people be given priority for assistance out of the Labour Welfare Fund in a manner which has already been approved by Government, that is a reasonable suggestion and something directive. I will never support any resolution which Government brings to the House to vote for money in circumstances as this unless the damage is of a sufficient worth as can warrant its being called a national disaster.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The honourable member talked of national disaster; well I am sorry that this House should be afflicted with such a national disaster. Sir, it is a calamity that this Legislative Chamber should be subjected to this inexplicable display of rage because the honourable junior member for St. Philip in his representative duty to his constituency brought to the notice of the Government that a few families of St. Philip had been rendered homeless by the high winds of Sunday afternoon last. I can even understand the attitude of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph. He is just back from Buckingham Palace, Westminster Abbey and other places in the big cities of Europe and naturally, he cannot imagine that flimsy shackles or small houses like these should be his concern or the concern of a Government. He can only think at the present of those more important structures from which he has just come in those well fortified cities. As I have said, I can somewhat appreciate his apparent lack of the local situation. Sir, it is all very well to say that honourable members are vote-catching but this is a political chamber and I submit that any subject worthy of the cause it represents would be vote-catching. This is a political chamber, not a dinner party saloon and any time

an honourable member makes any speech on anything that is worthy of mention, it would be a vote-catching speech. When the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph earlier moved that sympathy resolution, that was a vote-catching speech to certain sections of the community. Therefore, it is very undesirable to say of honourable members when they bring to the notice of the House any calamity which the people are suffering from or anything of that sort to say that it is vote catching.

Sir, the Vestries are not housing authorities, but the Government certainly is the housing authority for the island. Government has now taken upon itself the island-wide responsibility as a housing authority. What better agency than this Government which is the housing authority for the island could the honourable member have for bringing this question? The Vestries have no power. These vestries cannot legally take our funds and repair houses and the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph knows that very well; so too the honourable Junior Member for St. Peter. This debate would never have taken up all this time if the actions of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph towards it were different, but the moment he said to carry it to the notice of the Vestry, it showed a lack of understanding and utter lack of appreciation for the people who are suffering as a result of the calamity.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am sorry to see the attitude adopted by the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph in this matter which caused it to take up so much valuable time of the House. I only asked for an adjournment of five minutes, but I am sure that we have been debating this question for over two hours. When I asked for leave, I was sure that it was the business of this House to discuss this matter. The honourable Junior Member for St. Peter attempted to justify the action taken by the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph, but really and truly, he made himself more ridiculous than he usually is. I do not want to prolong this debate any longer; I will leave the attitude which members of the Government assumed in this matter into the hands of the gods because I know that in due time the attitude they assumed will be viewed in its true light and dealt with accordingly.

Sir, with these remarks I withdraw the motion for the adjournment of this House, but before doing so, I take this opportunity to thank those honourable members who so ably supported this motion with their expressions which were sympathetic to the cause and I hope that those people of St. Philip who have suffered adversity as a result of the high winds will get some relief even through this prolonged discussion in this House. I now ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Junior Member for St. Peter is asking leave to withdraw the motion for the adjournment of the House for five minutes. If there be no objection, leave is granted the honourable member.

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

DEBATE RESUMED ON BILL TO AMEND FANCY MOLASSES PRODUCTION AND EXPORT ACT, 1937.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment of this House, the honourable Senior Member for St. Philip was addressing this House on a motion for the second reading of a Bill intitled an Act to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, we now return to this issue on fancy molasses. The honourable member who introduced this Bill made some reference to the question of bulk shipment and referred to the fact that a section of the local press had accused the Government of discriminating in this matter by permitting shipment in bulk to America and not to Canada. The honourable member said that this was not the case and he further said that the only Canadian gentleman who protested was from the firm of the Dominion Molasses Company. That firm had written some letter to him which he ignored. In other words, the honourable introducer was saying that Canada is apparently quite satisfied over the position with respect to the shipment of fancy molasses in bulk going to America and in so far as Canada is concerned, with the exception of the single Canadian firm which protested, there was no dissatisfaction. Does the honourable member expect this House to take that statement of his seriously? Sir, it is not true to say that there is just one gentleman from Canada protesting against this apparent discrimination. On that point, I want to read a short quotation from the Report of the Fancy Molasses Committee. Paragraph 90 states: "Almost all of the Barbados Fancy Molasses sold in the United States market is purchased by two large companies working in close collaboration. These companies are equipped to handle fancy molasses in bulk and have indeed secured molasses in this manner from sources other than Barbados—viz., Cuba and Puerto Rico." The subsequent paragraph says: "The Canadian dealers feared that if fancy molasses was shipped in bulk to the American market this molasses could be transported into Canada and undersell molasses sent to Canada in wooden packages. This matter was discussed with the principals of the two firms handling fancy molasses in the United States who stated that this was not possible but, in any case, they would be prepared to sign a guarantee not to send any such molasses to Canada." In other words, it has been all along noted by the Canadian importers that if you ship in bulk to America, you may be threatening their trade; therefore, the Canadian importers could not agree to bulk shipment to America.

(A VOICE): Read paragraph 103.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That paragraph has nothing to do with my point. If I may read paragraph 103, it says: "Market conditions in the United States are somewhat different from those in Canada, and we came to the conclusion that we could increase our shipments of fancy molasses to the U.S.A., if bulk shipments were made. This additional business would not affect the amount of labour which is at present employed in the industry." This is beside the point. This does not answer the point that there was no general protest and only one firm protested. Sir, three Canadian firms came to Barbados early this year and interviewed shipping interests with regard to bulk shipment. No Canadian businessman is so short-sighted to his own interest not to see that if molasses is sent from Barbados to America in bulk that the American importers would be able to ship it to Canada and undersell the Canadian importers. Not only did these three representatives from three Canadian firms come here to see about that cause for dissatisfaction but the Canadian Government has also taken the matter up. That Government has asked Barbados why it has allowed this discrimination. It was the Canadian Trade Commissioner who came here on expressed orders to take the matter up with the Barbados Government; therefore, it is not true to say that the

Dominion Molasses Company is the only firm that protested against this discrimination.

Sir, no bulk shipment was made to Canada this year because, here again, the "special boys" in this island were protecting their own interests. I am suggesting to the House not to be fooled by the apparent antics of these "big boys." We could have satisfied the Canadian merchants and the Canadian Government; we cannot afford to make such powerful enemies as we have made this year on bulk shipment. It would have been far better if we had agreed to compensate the shippers in Bridgetown in respect of any loss they may have sustained than by allowing the special few to exercise these emergency powers to protect themselves and as a result put the industry in this position. Do not let anybody fool themselves that they have heard the last of this matter in so far as Canadian importers and the Canadian Government are concerned. We have lost almost half of the export trade already as a result of these special few protecting their small body of exporters. The shipment this year has gone down to 24,000 puncheons as against 40,000 last year. (A VOICE: WHY?) The honourable Junior Member for St. Peter told us something half-heartedly about world prices of sugar affecting the price of fancy molasses, but what has caused this remarkable drop in the export trade is the fact that in June last year, Cuba sent the first bulk shipment of molasses to Canada. I will tell you that the honourable introducer of this resolution is under a misapprehension if he feels that with the increase of sales which one would derive from sugar it would tend to guarantee a good market for fancy molasses. Naturally, if the world price of sugar comes down, the price of molasses must also come down, but that has nothing directly to do with this matter of the reducing exports of fancy molasses from Barbados to Canada. What would perhaps have saved the situation would have been if in 1950 we had taken the step which we are now willing to take in 1953. If this island had allowed that trial shipment of fancy molasses in bulk to go to Canada, that might have saved the present situation. At that time we could have protected the workers as has been proposed to do now, so that you cannot claim with any degree of justification that the protection of workers prevented bulk shipment arrangements. Last year when Cuba made her first trial shipment in bulk, it caused the whole bottom of the Barbados market to drop out because there you were faced with people of Canada importing molasses from Cuba at this cheaper rate. The only thing which could have saved this island was if we had found a market for almost all our production in some tin containers because there was that same demand in Canada for our canned shipment. This island could have still competed with inferior molasses even at a cheaper price, but here we are in the position in which emergency powers have been used even to block canned molasses shipment because the majority of the shippers who would have fancy molasses in bulk does not want any competition by molasses in Barbados which may be of better quality than theirs. Sir, this House should seriously consider again its actions with Canada by making bulk shipments of fancy molasses to America, because our interests with Canada are too vital to allow any special interested group to jeopardize them. With the Canadian Government taking steps over the matter with this Barbados Government we must come to the understanding that this matter is of far-reaching importance and is superficial. Earlier today there was an attempt during the course of my remarks to belittle the amount of fancy molasses which the Barbados Canning Company turned out. I understand that last year out of the 27,000 puncheons of fancy

molasses shipped to Canada, 1,300 puncheons were shipped in cans, but regardless of what percentage it represents, the Fancy Molasses Board should know that the presence of the canned shipment in Canada guarantees that country would always have a correct sample of Barbados fancy molasses but by our shipping of fancy molasses in bulk, it cannot always be guaranteed to be the real Barbados fancy molasses.

I will now make another point. Under section 5 of the Bill it is proposed to use any savings which may result from the shipping in bulk for the creation of a special fund which may be used for certain purposes. These purposes are: (1) to provide alternative employment for labour displaced by bulk shipment; (2) to pay interest and depreciation on capital involved in providing bulk storage in Barbados and Canada; (3) to permit the fixing of the price of fancy molasses early in the year and subsequent equalisation when the price of sugar is arranged; and (4) to prevent violent fluctuations in the price of fancy molasses owing to short crops. The first purpose gives the answer to the whole argument. You are setting up a savings fund on the shipping of molasses in bulk so as to provide a fund for an alternative purpose. This purpose was recommended as far back as 1950; so that you can see that this talk of protecting workers is mere tommy rot because from that time you anticipated doing that. Instead of protecting the workers, you are now protecting the special few to the prejudice of the whole island; you are doing this when you give them the Board as proposed in this Bill. That fund is also to be used to pay interest and depreciation on capital involved in providing bulk storage in Barbados and Canada. I have never in all my life heard such a thing. If you are going to start to provide for bulk storage in Barbados and Canada, you will never have a single cent for labour displacement nor for stabilising the molasses price, nor for the doing of anything else. Sir, what do you think it would cost to provide bulk storage facilities for bulk shipments of fancy molasses in Canada and Barbados? As a matter of fact, there are many importers in Canada who are not equipped or well equipped to receive molasses in bulk. If we are going to start to erect containers for bulk shipment of molasses in Canada, are we sure that they will be used for Barbados molasses alone? If I may give you an idea of the sort of equipment that we will have to provide, I will refer you to the report of the Committee which was comprised of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph, the Hon. J. D. Chandler, and Sir John Saint. These persons actually went to one of the places which was equipped for such a purpose and reporting they stated that on the ground floor of the building there were two storage tanks with a capacity of approximately 367,000 gallons each; one tank with a capacity of about 750,000 gallons and a fourth tank with a capacity of about 520,000 gallons. A tunnel connected the plant with the waterfront alongside which ships could berth, and through that tunnel ran a pipe-line to the storage tanks. On the upper floor of the building canning equipment was installed. There was a railway siding outside the building which could accommodate three tank cars at a time. They were informed that a tank car had a capacity of about 7,000 gallons. About 4,000 square feet of floor space was available in the building for carrying packages. Therefore when you state that you will be utilising any savings to provide storage facilities in Barbados and Canada, it will take all and more than that.

(A VOICE): Not in Canada.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If that is not so, what do you mean by paying interest and depreciation on

capital involved in providing bulk storage in Barbados and Canada. When you begin to do that, you are going to use up every single cent out of the industry and if you do not look sharp, you will dry the Treasury too. Sir, by this Bill we will be putting important legislation on the Statute Book to remain there for a long time and which will be interpreted and operated by others who may come after us. We have to be very careful in what we are doing. Sir, by this legislation, we want to stabilise the price of the industry, and utilise the funds to provide alternate employment for displaced persons and what not. Furthermore, we are increasing the powers of the Board to permit the Board to create and operate such a fund with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The old Board had a lot of power and we are increasing that to this new Board which will be able to operate without any recommendation from this House. Not only is that so, but this new Board's sole intention is to protect the interest of the big exporters first; the interest of the island will become secondary and anybody else last. The whole idea behind the formation of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board was regulating the production, the allocating of quotas to the fancy molasses producers, to see about the exports and the fixing of a minimum price, and it must be remembered that in every year there is always this ding dong tussle between the big producers and the small fellows. Mr. Reece at Society, the late Mr. Walcott of Apes Hill and Water Hall and more often a representative of this House were always in some big fight with them and almost every time the resolution for the fixing of the price came in here, you would get members agreeing with the actions of the Board.

Sir, the big sugar factories can manufacture vacuum pan molasses and it is the intention of the big sugar industry fellow to squeeze out completely all the small fellows and with this new Board consisting of hand-picked men of these big fellows, they will be able to run the industry as they please. The honourable Junior Member for St. Peter has inserted something so as to get representation for the workers on the Board, but he is fooling himself and the House that by that insertion these workers will have some say in the matter. Why should not this House retain its power so as to have some say in the control of the industry? All the argument that has been advanced shows that this new Board is not representative enough. Look at the personnel of any of the old Boards over the last ten years since it was created and you will see that you always had representatives of the industry, representatives of the Legislature and the Governor's nominee on the Board. The constitution of this Board will now be changed owing to its being dealt with in the private confines of the Executive Committee. It will pass on to these big fellows and added to that, there will be no discussion in public, no discussion on the floor of this House, owing to the Board being able to put things only to the Executive, whom they can always fool. I must point out again, Sir, that we are opening ourselves to the most vicious affairs if we pass this Bill giving these fellows all this power, not only to equalise the price but this Board will also have additional power by its having to deal with the accumulation of the savings from bulk shipment and which it will also disburse. We are telling this Board that it has this fund to play with and if it goes to (let us say) half million dollars it will have to provide bulk storage facilities. We are doing that when we have no idea what the construction of the elaborate facilities for storing bulk shipment will cost. Sir, if the molasses interest has to ship in bulk why should not they

provide their own storage facilities? They provide them now for shipping in wooden containers and these people were making money in the old days in all phases of the trade. Now they are shipping in bulk they wish to fool somebody that this will protect the industry and save it, but from this savings fund they must pay the interest on the investments and the depreciation on the capital expenditure. Could anything be more fantastic? As soon as that happens those in the sugar industry would come along and say "Well you have given the molasses people storage facilities; give us storage facilities for our sugar." This will be the result of all that we are doing.

I think the honourable Junior Member for St. Peter is fully aware of the fact that sugar too may be bulked shipped in the near future. As a matter of fact, certain parts of the world are at present bulk shipping sugar; therefore, we will soon have to provide for the bulk shipment of sugar. Do not let anybody tell you differently that all along if there was not this Board constituted as it was, you would have had these small producers completely wiped off the map of Barbados long ago; therefore, it was almost a criminal thing to bypass the Board and resort to wartime emergency powers to pass legislation to give a small group complete control of the industry this year. As I have said, it was a most vicious thing to do and there was absolutely no justification for it. As far as I remember, this House had occasion to hold a secret meeting over this affair already. I think it occurred when I was a very young member of this Chamber and I remember well that all members of the public as well as the reporters were excluded from the meeting. The reason was because the big fellows did a most vicious thing that year. I do not want to repeat it because it was discussed *in camera*. However, the price for fancy molasses was good that year and everybody was trying to get some of the money. Now we are reverting to the same position as it was then; for with our sanction, we are going to cut our own throats and that of the small fellows and we are going to let the big fellows do as they like.

Sir, it has been openly said in well-informed circles that the Canadian importers are opposed to canned molasses coming from Barbados because they can get bulk shipment. Why do you think they do not want any standard from Barbados when they can get it in bulk? The obvious reason is that the Cuba molasses which they get along with other brands of fancy molasses would be blended with it. I opine that in five years you will have no trade at all. Sir, read through this report and you will see almost on every page the stress being made that the identity of Barbados fancy molasses must be preserved. When you ship in bulk as you will be forced to do through economic reasons, and you destroy your canning plant, and you let this small monopoly control it from this end and another small monopoly at the Canadian end, I opine that in five years your whole fancy molasses industry will be extinguished.

I want to suggest to honourable members that there are two things which can be done by this Chamber. First, we should not interfere with the manner in which the Board was appointed previously. Those who fear that Board, let them go on fearing it. Secondly, if we have to ship in bulk, let us ship a small proportion—I do not care how little it may be; it could be two per cent—in small containers which cannot be diluted at the Canadian end. There is market for it. The figures every year for the export of canned molasses showed that it was increasing in sales. The year 1948 was the first which we started out shipping in cans and the amount has been going up ever since then. In 1950, six hundred gallons were

shipped in tins and in 1952, it rose to thirteen hundred gallons. We have also had enquiries from the other islands for canned molasses and some of it was also sold that way. Many of us also buy a can or two to send to friends away. The point I am stressing though is that I do not care what quantity may be shipped in bulk, let there be always in Canada a small quantity to show the standard of the Barbados fancy molasses. If you ship all in bulk, it will lose its identity and you are bound to damage the future of the industry.

With regard to the canning, I shall quote from the report of the Committee. I shall do so because honourable members seemed to have forgotten that the Committee itself stressed the desirability of having canned molasses in Canada. I will read paragraph 75 which says: "A matter of major consideration, however, and one that strongly supported the Barbados effort to market Barbados canned fancy molasses, was that the contents of the can could be guaranteed to be genuine Barbados fancy molasses." I said earlier on this point that it was pointed out in the report that canned molasses had been unpopular through the tin and also through the flavour. This was because at the beginning, the manufacturers here were canning new molasses and the people in Canada were in the habit of getting old flavoured molasses, so that the new flavoured molasses which was given them in cans would be unpopular. What the manufacturers would have to do is to can old flavoured molasses. They also can make the tins more attractive. What I want to impress on hon. members is that canning is important to the preservation of the industry and the Committee also viewed it in that manner. The change in the label and the size of the tin as well as canning old flavour molasses instead of new flavour are all recommendations which can easily be carried out. With all these proposed changes in the production and export and control of the industry, the fact remains that members of the Legislature should have more say in the proceedings of the Board and unless far more important reasons can be given by the Executive for the proposed changes in this Bill, they should not be supported in this House tonight.

(At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.)

Sir, I think I have covered all the points on which I wished to speak. At this stage, I sincerely hope that honourable members are viewing the matter in the same light as I and that they will be prepared to view the position as it now exists and not to the fancy of some people.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I want to say that I appreciate all that this Government is trying to do in this matter but I fail to see why this Government has brought down a bill of this nature when they know that this House will not agree with it. Perusing the Bill, you will find that it cuts out sections of the old bill and puts in here and there, sections which suit the particular outlook of the big people in the industry at the moment. I feel that is detrimental to the best interests of the people of this colony.

Section 3, paragraph 2, has been amended to read as follows: "The Board shall consist of the Director of Agriculture and seven other members appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee." Sir, the original framers of this Fancy Molasses Bill saw the necessity of vesting all the rights for the control and marketing of this product into the hands of the elected representatives of the people. I feel that we of to-day stand more in need of vesting these powers in our hands than delegating

them to the Executive Committee. Just think of it. All of our rights and privileges to be ruthlessly taken from us who are the mouthpiece of the people of this island and given to some Board appointed by the Executive Committee. Why should this be, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I would like to know the reason for this radical change in the setting up of this new Board. If you look through this Bill, clause by clause, you must be convinced that something is radically wrong with the framing of it. I would like to know why a Bill of this nature has been sent to this House and why Government does not want the people's representatives to have any voice in this matter for five long years.

Sir, it has been intimated to me that honourable members would like a short adjournment now. I therefore beg to move that this House be adjourned for three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, and Mr. VAUGHAN.—4.

Noes: Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. F. WALCOTT, Mr. ADAMS and Mr. COX.—7.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in relation to this Bill . . .

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member having seconded the motion for the adjournment which has been decided in the negative, he is not entitled to continue the debate.

Mr. HAYNES: I do not feel my views on this matter will be of any avail, but I must express them. I am not taking the side of the producers or that of the exporters; I am taking the middle course. When I consider the history of this Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board at that time, the late Mr. Laurie Yearwood, who was a member of this House, brought in this Bill for the control of fancy molasses. Conditions were very much different to what they are now. You were working on a rising market, but to-day we are dealing with a falling market. It is rather pitiable when we consider what is the situation to-day. Formerly we used to export to America and Canada fancy molasses in the neighbourhood of 81,000 puncheons every year. This year, that number has been reduced to about 27,000 puncheons. I consider this a sure sign that without some nourishment on the part of private enterprise this industry is going to fade out of the picture. It is obvious when you consider that the industry is less than one-third of what it used to be a few years ago. Sugar manufacturers of Barbados a few years ago used to look for about \$300 as a subsidy towards sugar out of the molasses industry; to-day they cannot get one cent out of that industry.

Sir, I look at the fancy molasses industry to-day as a very delicate child and the only way you can get a delicate child to recover from its troubles is to allow it to do as it likes until it regains its health. This is the principle which we should adopt towards this fancy molasses industry and on which we should consider this Bill. Because of that, I feel that this Bill is too premature. It should be postponed until the industry is a little stronger; then you can bring it again under control. The honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph knows the slender condition under which this industry is surviving. If private enterprise steps in or is given a free hand, we can probably sell molasses in a particular year a little cheaper than sugar and by that means we could probably rebuild the industry. My suggestion to-night is that we should postpone this Bill until the industry

gets a little stronger. I have heard certain honourable members blaming Boards, but you might blame a Board as much as possible and the people on it, you cannot have power over the consumers and retailers in Canada. They are going to take what molasses they can get at the cheapest market. I believe if this commodity is allowed a little free intercourse, it would come back to its normal life. We are told that the Canadians like the flavour of the Barbados fancy molasses and if they can get it reasonable, they would probably buy it in preference to that from Cuba or any other country. I feel sure they would do it. As long as it is under this control it will gradually suffer more and more setbacks until nothing is left of it.

If we look at the position of the island, we would see that we are faced with 5,217 tons of sugar to sell on the free world market. We have to take what we can get for it. What we are going to get for it will amount to between six and seven shillings per ton to the sugar manufacturers of this island. If we had (say an 80,000-puncheon molasses crop) the idea of free sugar would never have occurred. We would be able to get our Commonwealth Agreement of 131 thousand odd tons of sugar and we would have this syrup which we could sell to Canada and America. As a result of our fallen fancy molasses industry, free sugar has arisen. I am therefore counselling Government to postpone this Bill and leave it dormant until the market recovers itself; perhaps, within a year or two we may regain control over the market.

Just another point. I have seen an omission from this Bill of a clause to call for a report on the crops by the various producers. Years ago, crops in Barbados started in March and producers had until January to tell importers how much syrup their factory could produce. To-day, most of the factories start grinding in January. I was therefore looking for a clause in this Bill calling on the various producers of crops to report in the month of November so that the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board would know in ample time how to allocate what they expected to receive and if the Board wanted any more they would have time to ask for it. With regard to the clause which cuts out that you must make syrup on the open process, I see no harm in that. I have often heard exporters remark from time to time that syrup made in a vacuum is a better quality syrup than the one made in the open process. I think that is proof. Still for all that, with the troubles within the industry, with the controls what they are at the present moment, to my mind if the Bill goes through, the exporters and producers will find out that it will only cripple the industry more and not only that but it will also cripple the sugar industry. I repeat that the more of the industry that we can sell in liquid, the less we would have of dark crystals. If there is no control, there are certain parts of this island where the juice obtained suits making into fancy molasses. These parts get a better yield, something in the vicinity of five or six gallons more per ton of cane. In other parts of the island this is not so. If those places can be allowed to make this syrup without control, probably, they will make this syrup and sell it cheaper and as a result, they might be able to revive this delicate child. I am sure that the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph who went to Canada will tell this House the conditions prevailing there. I, personally, had not the opportunity of visiting there, but I have been able to gather what are the conditions from the various exporters, though I am not supporting them, because a lot of the trouble emanated from them. I will say that the local exporters have caused a lot of this trouble, but I will also say that if there were

not any control, I am sure that in about two years or around that time the industry would revive.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—The speech made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip has been so informative and so extensive that I feel it must have influenced the minds of all free members of this chamber, and even the minds of those who are supposed to support government policy. Surely the disclosures which he has made have shown that he has been able to acquire the necessary information which he has imparted to the House quite capably. If I were a member of the Executive further more an ordinary member of the Government Party, and after hearing the points raised in the speech of the honourable member, even if my mind had already been influenced by Executive Committee decisions, I would certainly have to give his speech some respect. I say that because I take it that as a member of the Executive I would put the interest of the community first and all other interests after.

Sir, on receiving this Bill I intended to approach it from one angle and that is to oppose the taking away of power from this honourable chamber. But after listening to the honourable member it has intensified my feelings on the matter. I notice, Sir, that we have reached a stage in this chamber when we no longer think of the merits or demerits of the principle involved in any particular matter, but purely and solely of our political affiliations. If honourable members were really interested in the welfare of this community, after reading the Objects and Reasons of this Bill and listening to the speech of the honourable senior member for St. Philip they would of necessity rebel against the passing of the Bill.

I wonder what next is going to happen in this small community of ours when responsible members continue to be less than men. Now I will approach this Bill from the angle that I have mentioned—the taking away of power from this chamber. As you know, Sir, every session the senior members of this chamber meet privately and appoint members of advisory boards.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What does the honourable member mean by "meet privately"?

Mr. ALLDER: I mean not as members of the House. They meet in Select Committee. I have always understood that that was meeting privately. However, Sir, they meet and appoint members of various advisory boards to advise the Administration on various matters. The members of this Chamber appointed to these Boards were the members appointed to safeguard the interests of the community generally. This Bill now proposes to take away that power and vest it in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. It is true that the various members who have been appointed to advisory boards have not always met with the approval of a large section of the community because the institutions they advise are run badly. Take for instance the Hospital. I believe that the policy adopted there is such because of the outlook towards social matters of the members who have seats on that advisory committee. Then there is the Mental Hospital; the Public Works Department; the Department of Highways and Transport; the Hurricane Relief Committee of the various parishes and even the Playing Fields Committees. None of them meets with the approval of all and sundry in the community. That is what causes fear in my mind as regards the further taking away of power from the members of the House in appointing members to this Fancy Molasses Board.

The Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board is considered an important body and should be utterly representative of all branches of the in-

dustry. The Objects and Reasons of the Bill state that the present method of appointing members to this Board does not meet with satisfaction; but I have not heard any reasonable explanation of that view by the honourable member who is handling the Bill nor is it explained in the Objects and Reasons. I take it that if you feel that the present method of appointment is wrong you would consider it your duty to explain what causes you to feel it is wrong. As a member who has sat on this Board I was of the opinion that the other members who sat there were very generous in this respect: Not only did they appoint members from this Chamber to sit on the Board but they went outside and also appointed members whom they thought were capable of making useful suggestions. If the Appointment Committee were as generous as that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot see how the Government has reached the decision that the method of appointment to this Board is not satisfactory enough.

What is more, Sir,—and it has worried my mind in recent months when we have been confronted with certain Bills or Regulations—is that they do not provide for representation by members of this House, but permit representation on such Boards of what I would consider a private organisation, namely the Barbados Workers' Union. Regardless of the purpose of the Workers' Union or any other bargaining organisation, the House or the Legislature of any country should have a predominating voice on any administrative or advisory board having something to do with government. That is how I look at it. But this Bill says that not even this honourable chamber can have the privilege of appointing a member or members to this Advisory Board. I have no prejudice against the Workers' Union, but I cannot think it is right to reduce the power of the Legislature and vest it in a private organisation such as the Workers' Union. Perhaps some honourable members would clap themselves on the shoulder and think that I am grudgeful because they have succeeded in getting representation on this Board by the Union over which they rule. That, however, would just be a show of might. The greatest authority in any country is the Government and the legislature which makes laws. What is more the legislature of a country, if it is democratically run, must control the government however strong the latter may be, or feel that it is.

It does seem to me, Sir, that the Legislature of Barbados have reached a stage where we have no influence. We have reached the stage of being just a debating society, and our opinions are not even respected in quarters where they should always be respected. We are being used merely as rubber stamps. As I have said some time ago we have been reduced to a kind of finance committee to give our blessing to Government's proposals for expenditure, and if we do not look sharp even that little power will be taken out of our hands. Already an attempt has been made to side step us by means of the block vote. Gradually we are being surrounded and taken advantage of. The situation looks so hopeless that you have to have courage to continue unless you are just here to fill one of the chairs.

We have reached a stage where we cannot shoulder our responsibility and set up a solid foundation for those who are to follow after. (Mr. SPEAKER resumes the Chair). Now, Mr. Speaker, when this honourable Chamber was dominated by members who looked like my honourable friends on my left, these controlling powers were vested in members of the House, and they were able to get their policy carried out in the administration of the various institutions of this colony which had dealings with the public. The chaotic condition which exists at present at the

General Hospital was prevented by the fact that the members of the House then had some influence where that Committee was concerned through having representation there and on other committees and boards throughout the island. Today, Sir, innumerable complaints come to honourable members of this House when they walk the streets or are at their offices or homes and they are helpless as far as giving suggestions is concerned to those who can investigate the causes of the complaints because of the lack of influence on the part of the House as far as the running of these institutions is concerned. But that does not prevent honourable members from carrying the blame for the bad running of these institutions under the control of the Government, and if we are not to lose the last vestige of our influence we must be prepared to deal with this Bill in a manner that will preserve that last vestige of influence.

It is alright for the honourable senior member for the Government to bring this Bill. In my opinion, if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph who is the Leader of the Government had any respect for other honourable members who must keep him in power by their support and allegiance he would have reflected that when he first came to the House and the Conservatives who ran this place dominated these Boards no attempt was made to remove them from the Boards. He would then say that in gratitude to the members who support him he would allow them to have the privilege of appointing members to these boards, if for no other reason than for the gaining of administrative experience. But the honourable member seems not to be willing to encourage his supporters to become efficient administrators as long as the position remains that all important decisions must be brought to him. What is more sir, our status in this Chamber has been so reduced that not even Civil Servants care to give you—not the servile obeisance which was exacted by some members of the past—but ordinary respect. They disrespect you as a member of this House. I am talking about a personal experience, and it goes to show how the dignity of this Chamber is being reduced. If you make a statement on Education with which everyone might not agree, is it permissible for a teacher to confront you in public and say, "well this is another point for you to raise in the House. Say that a teacher was knocking around town while school was in session." It is only because these gentlemen of the Service and others feel that as long as they can deal with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, and sometimes with the honourable junior member for St. Thomas—scarcely ever with the honourable senior members for St. Peter and St. Michael—they do not have to pay anyone else any respect. The House of Assembly is no House of Assembly today. All that you have to do is to please the chief, and once you do that you can tell the other members to "bag their heads."

All these things mean that the colony's Legislature is being reduced in power and respect through shortsightedness and seeking for patronage and the furthering of self interest by members who have been sent here by the people. I mince no matters, sir. It is time that someone spoke out. It is regrettable that so few have the boldness to approach with courage and selflessness the broad matters which we discuss in this House. What is the sense, Mr. Speaker, of the electors having changed the political complexion of this Chamber by sending here persons different from those of the past, if these same persons do worse than those who were considered to be reactionary? But you will see, sir, that all capitalist interests are represented on every advisory board, whether it be the Fancy Molasses Board or the Hurricane Relief Committee. They are represented at all times. I must

say, sir, and I regret to have to do so, that I cannot find myself admiring the principle of giving to the Executive the power of appointing members of this board. I regret that I have to feel that way and to express it; but it is so. It is my humble opinion.

I am given the impression, sir, that the members of the Executive would agree to behead all Barbadians once you allow them to have representation for the Union on a Board. Why? Because these things are not approached with sufficient impartiality and selflessness. This Bill seeks to exclude members of the House from representation on this Board, and a short while ago we discussed another Bill which also excluded representation directly from members of this House although representation was given to the Union. It is a big anomaly, sir. You find members of the Executive representing Government's policy on the Board; you exclude members of the House and permit the trade union to have representation; and you find honourable members acting on these boards in a dual capacity and with conflicting interests. How can justice be done? An honourable member sits as a member representing the Government and he also uses his influence as a trade union official; but the House must be reduced to a negative state. It is things like these which cause wars, Mr. Speaker. The taking away of power from its rightful owners has in the past caused a lot of trouble. But today only a small number of voices are heard defending the rights and privileges which should be defended by every member around this table.

Now, sir, the speech of the honourable senior member for St. Philip has given us more ideas about this matter than we have been given by the Government Bench. That is regrettable because there are many things of an intricate nature in connection with the Molasses Industry which one would like to know. For instance, we see this in the Objects and Reasons: "It was also recommended that if and when it became necessary to ship fancy molasses in bulk any savings resulting therefrom should be paid into a special Fund which may be used for such purposes as (a) to provide alternative employment for labour displaced by bulk shipment....."

Now, sir, if the honourable member handling this Bill wanted this House to be influenced by the benefits of the Bill he would have explained how it benefits the colony. This Bill proposes to put a lot of power in the hands of people who are going to use it we do not know how; and many things should be explained before we can give this Bill our blessing. Another point is how are you going to disburse the savings gained by bulk shipment among the various heads set out here. As regards sub-clause (a) which I have quoted above, how are you going to disburse it among displaced workers in the industry? How will the Fund be built up? Who will administer it? At how much per individual are the funds going to be allocated? There are all those points to be considered and none of them has been explained by the honourable senior member for St. Peter. (Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Do you want someone to read it for you? I do not expect the honourable member to be so charitably inclined as to read something for me. I do not think that he reads for himself as fully as he should matters like these which would help him to do justice to his office. He was so casual and rambling in introducing an important Bill like this that one just sat and listened without being able to follow his arguments. That is how the honourable member would have helped me. Of course he does not seem to be armed with the necessary information himself.

As I was saying, Sir, I expected to hear some explanation of how this Fund would benefit displaced persons. The only alternative employment to these workers that I can envisage is some project or

projects handled by the Government. I must ask for an explanation inasmuch as you are appointing a private board with statutory powers. Is the honourable member ashamed to explain that the Administration has not yet decided on the policy of finding alternative employment for these workers who may be displaced? Surely in an important matter like this we are entitled to some explanation. Of course, some time ago I heard that the Molasses and Sugar Exporters intend to contribute to the fund and to the Trade Union part of the savings gained by bulk shipment. I would like to know if that intention is still to be carried out. That information came from a source which can be expected to know the policy in this matter. In short I heard members of the Union and of the Executive saying that the exporters plan to contribute some of the savings from bulk shipment to the funds of the Union. I am wondering if that goes for the betrayal of the privilege and powers of this honourable and ancient Chamber. I heard that rumour and a lot of members around this table have heard it too. I have been a member too. Yes a member of the Labour Party—regrettably so. As I have said, as long as you offer the Trade Union some concession it seems as if they would throw everything overboard, disregarding the future consequences of their present actions. Only help them as individuals, and they do not care how the others in the colony manage.

Now we come to another point raised by the Honourable Senior Member for St. Philip. Here I quote sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 5 of the Objects and Reasons. It says: "To pay interest and depreciation on capital involved in providing bulk storage in Barbados and Canada." That is another of the uses to which this Fund will be put. Now, Sir, we import a lot of foodstuffs from Canada. Take the Salt Fish Industry in Canada. We import a lot of salt fish. Can you imagine the Canadians deciding to set up a board of management for that industry, and saying that funds are to be accumulated and a part of those funds used to pay interest and depreciation on capital involved in providing bulk storage or other storage for salt fish? I would be more in sympathy if the suggestion was to assist bulk storage at the point of export; but not the cause of bulk storage and depreciation at the receiving end. How unbusinesslike that sounds to anyone who is looking at the matter impartially!

The honourable senior member for St. Philip made a very important point; because I have always heard and read about the importance of Barbados Fancy Molasses and syrup. I have always been told that the Canadians like it in preference to molasses produced elsewhere. I have also heard that our molasses must be assisted to maintain its identity. I have all reasons to believe that attempts were made successfully to help our local produce maintain its identity. But suddenly we are told that someone from the Canadian end will see after the maintenance of the quality of our local molasses and that he or they will preserve or see after the safeguarding of its quality.

The honourable member knows very well that there are certain methods of commercial manipulation so that with the best of intentions a man has to do something that would be a lesser evil than going out of existence commercially.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how this Government could agree to such a thing. I must support the suggestion of the honourable senior member for St. Philip that even if you have to ship in bulk, a couple thousand gallons should still be canned to

packaged, so that in case bulk shipment permits tampering with our quality of molasses we will still have exported a portion of our molasses in a pure and undiluted state. No better suggestion than that could have been made. Whatever might have been the previous decisions of members of the Government, that suggestion should be given some consideration.

Not only will the canning of local molasses benefit us from the point of view of our trade in Canada. I remember well last year that every day my family had to use the local molasses as a beverage, and I know that other householders also made use of it. The canning of our molasses should still be carried on. I started to see it on the shelves of our drug stores and groceries in the city and country areas. Suddenly we heard that the canning factory was closing down.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip must have known where he got his information from. I am impressed that he got it at first hand, and that there are certain persons in the Industry whose sole purpose is to monopolise it, and Government was influenced by some means or other to bring into force certain regulations which eventually caused the local canning factory to close down. Such things are bad. We have reached a stage where we cannot have confidence in anyone. After individuals get power they suddenly change. What is more, sir, sometime ago all the small syrup plants were appealing to members of the House and to others to save them from the hands of the big monopolists. The practice of centralisation of sugar factories is rampant today. Shares are sold in some big factory and every year more and more small factories close and the owners buy shares in one big factory. What happens is that the small syrup manufacturers who cannot get shares in the existing factories are at a disadvantage. So is the ordinary peasant. The latter has no alternative but to accept the price arbitrarily offered by the few existing factories which means that if the peasant does not sell to them he can sell to no one else. So the big fellows are monopolising the producing end and they want to monopolise the exporting end too.

As the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said, this Bill will limit the sale of our molasses in Canada and America to those who have facilities for bulk storage, and they in turn, after you have eliminated other potential buyers will dictate the price of the molasses. I agree that by this Bill you are sounding the death knell of the industry. You have got it killed by the policy of local monopolies, and now you are burying it altogether by allowing a policy of monopoly on the part of the importers. Then you will find yourself in a position where you cannot repair the damage which you have accidentally or intentionally caused to the colony.

Those are my views. I do not think that Barbados should be inflicted with a Bill of this sort. Of course if we are inflicted with the honourable senior member for St. Peter we can be inflicted with anything. I do not expect the honourable member's attitude to be different because he is incapable of seeing reason.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will stick to the Bill and speak on that; not on the attitude of the honourable senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. ALLDER: If the Government wanted to be sincere, or to appear to be sincere they would have been more co-operative as regards the debate on a Bill of the magnitude of the present one. We know that those outside the Government Party whose views differ from those of the Government are few, and

therefore they have an arduous task in trying to bring to the notice of the Government anything which strikes them as being an error in this Bill; and the Government refused to support a motion for adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must not reflect on a vote of the House.

Mr. ALLDER: An opportunity should be given for every shade of opinion to be expressed especially where a Bill of this sort is concerned. I am sure that while Government members may feel that they have a monopoly of all the brains, there are—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is certainly straying now.

Mr. ALLDER: I feel that this Bill calls for extensive discussion, and consideration of all the views that have been expressed.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir,—I had no intention of replying on this Bill. We have been discussing it since 3.30 and it is nearly 9.30. We have been discussing it all that time expect for a brief interval for tea and some time spent in discussing another matter. I feel, however that I should reply—to use a popular phrase—for the purpose of the record, and not for the purpose of the gallery or the newspaper press. The last honourable member who spoke has chosen to go outside at this stage. But I will reserve what I have chosen to say in reply to him for his return. He will not get away with challenging the integrity and honesty of members of the Government.

Now the honourable junior member for St. Lucy who is a member of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board denied the allegation that the Government sidestepped the Board and made regulations. The whole matter of shipping in bulk and even this Bill was submitted to that Board. To see how democratically the Government acted, this Bill and the report went before a joint meeting of that Board. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy said he was not at the meeting, and his objection is based on the composition of the Board. There was no question of sidestepping the Board. The Government did not pass regulations dealing with the canning of molasses or the exporting of molasses in cans.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip talked about factories having to close down because the canning factory went out of operation as if a single factory ever produced molasses on the basis of selling a considerable portion of it to the canning factory. The honourable member made one of his usual speeches. One could see that he did not understand the Bill at all. Although the report was laid 18 months ago you could see that the honourable member did not understand what he was talking about. As regards the point about the fund being used in part to provide alternative employment, the honourable senior member for St. John asked me to explain that. I would have to work on hypotheses. The question has not yet arisen. How can you decide on a future policy basing your decision on present circumstances?

Now in 1950 canned molasses was shipped out of this island. The same thing happened in 1951 and 1952. To hear the honourable senior member for St. Philip, one would think that from the time this order came into operation no canned molasses was exported. He is saying that the order caused them to close down the canning factory. There is not one iota of truth in that. For the three years 1950 to 1952 the total amount of molasses exported in cans was only an average of 2.6 per cent of the total amount exported. In 1950 we exported 5,720,332 gallons in barrels, and 85,498 gallons in cans, an equivalent of 1.5 of the amount. In 1951 we exported

6,230,260 gallons in barrels and 116,179 gallons in cans, a percentage of 1.8. Last year we exported 3,353,943 gallons in barrels and 95,480 gallons in cans, a percentage of 2.6. The only reason why the percentage went up last year is because there was a drop in the total amount manufactured.

When you come to the report you hear the honourable member saying as regards lower production costs that cost is nothing to do with it. Before the war when the world market prices were up and during the war you had an era of prosperity. After the war what was the situation? Appendix I will show you what was the situation. You will see that during the year 1948 we shipped 6,313,806 gallons, and in 1949 3,822,993. What was responsible for that? In 1950 after devaluation the Canadians were hesitant about buying; business people are that way. When the honourable member advocates control where is he living? In Utopia? Can he in his right senses, dealing with an industry such as this ever begin to think of any control in dealing with a fluctuating product in a fluctuating market?

Now, Mr. Speaker, any honourable member who is introducing a measure must do so with a certain amount of reserve. He must credit honourable members with a modicum of intelligence, and he does not expect that he will have to explain every little detail. Apart from that, this question that we are discussing is nothing novel. Honourable members must have read the Report and the Bill and made up their minds already.

Now as regards the House of Assembly maintaining control, that has nothing to do with the principle involved. But I want to explode the fallacy of the honourable senior member for St. Philip that the canning factory had to close down because the Government denied them the right to ship molasses in cans. When I said here that it was a voluntary liquidation I knew what I was talking about. In any part of the world you cannot deal with a trade matter and ignore the people involved in the trade. You hear talk about capitalist this and that. But I ask honourable members to do a little bit of introspection. This report was not made by the people in big business. The House voted money and appointed members of a commission to go to Canada to investigate this matter, and the terms of reference of that commission were as follows:—

“To enquire into all aspects of the fancy molasses industry of Barbados, with particular reference to production, price, marketing and methods of export and to make such recommendations as might be considered necessary to ensure the maintenance and development of that industry.”

It is not something that the House knew nothing of. As regards shipping in bulk and the competition from Cuba and the Dominican Republic this commission was assured that price was the main consideration. We had to see to it that the rights of workers were protected. We had to be cautious. Knowing that shipping in bulk would mean a sudden decrease in employment, and knowing of our problem of over-population and a high employment force, one had to be cautious before deciding to put ten or a hundred people out of work. After the report was made the Board met. We did not say no shipping in bulk; but we said we would have to prepare for it.

When you see how the trade has declined and you read the report, you realise that the main factor is the price. That is the real problem. In the final analysis that is what the Canadians are concerned with. They want the cheapest. After the commission went up to Canada, another one comprising Mr.

Niblock, Mr. Thomas and Mr. King, President of the Chamber of Commerce went up to Canada too. Three years after the first commission reported the second one found that it was necessary to ship in bulk. As regards the canning of molasses the people in Canada who are going to be responsible now for this molasses are going to distribute it to the people in the trade.

Honourable members heard the honourable senior members for St. Philip and St. John accuse the Government of by-passing the Board. The honourable Deputy Leader of the House was at the meeting which we had. One of the reasons why it has taken so long to reach this stage was because we had to be cautious. We found that they had gone to Canada and got the Canadians to agree to get molasses from them on the policy of distribution on a large scale. We can no longer deal with this industry on the old system. The honourable senior member for St. Philip trotted out the remark that everyone could not receive it in bulk. That is obvious. But this is what is going to happen: There will be an organisation and this organisation will do the distribution. The Canadian importer feels that if he is going to import molasses from us and if he is going to package our molasses we cannot get in Barbados and package and sell molasses in Canada too. It would be inimical to their business.

Honourable members have talked about a monopoly. Can you begin to talk about the Sugar Industry without talking about a monopoly? The Sugar Industry is organised on a monopoly basis because there is no over production in the Commonwealth. I maintain that overproduction of sugar is inimical to the interests of the sugar producing territories. The world cannot eat the amount of sugar produced. There are millions of people who do not eat sugar. Any business like this must be controlled. What is the International Sugar Council meeting about in London today? What has Hon'ble Mr. Cuke gone for? Let them put sugar on the world market tomorrow and you will see the colour their faces will turn. The tonnage of sugar that Barbados produces is less than .01 of the total produced in the world. We are talking about a monopoly. What monopoly can we control in a market like Canada whom we have to beg to buy our molasses from us? The dump price of Cuban molasses would make our molasses look like a mosquito on the hide of a rhinoceros. Do we have the power to tell the Canadians to do this or that? Must we can molasses here so that the family of the honourable senior member for St. John can get it to make a beverage?

The honourable senior member for St. John has accused officers of the Union of having agreed to this against the interests of the colony. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy is a member of the Board; he is not a member of the Union. There are other members of the Board who are not members of the Union, and they have agreed to see the situation as it really is. When the honourable member accused the Workers Union of making a deal with exporters of molasses so as to get funds out of them, that could only come from the mind of a person rooted and grounded in suspicion, and the mind of persons who have no confidence in their own integrity, and who therefore are suspicious of everyone else. But I leave the honourable member to his own deserts. I do not think that anyone will believe that the officers of the Union would make an agreement like this so as to get money. I am doing a job that I like, and I have no ambition to become a millionaire. The shipment of sugar ex wharf is nothing to do with this. This money — part of the Fund which the Bill seeks to

create — is on behalf of workers in the industry who normally would have worked for the money. But if they lose their work I think it is just and reasonable that they should be provided for.

Now let us go to the establishment of the Fund. I will excuse the honourable Senior Member for St. John because on this matter he is just like a little fellow going into a class for a first time. What he hears the others saying, he says too; if he hears anything wrong he still will repeat it because he does not know better. The honourable member heard the honourable senior member for St. Philip trot out something, which according to him, he calls finance. It will appear to him a mysterious statement that the honourable Senior Member for St. Philip was making of this finance, but what a simple matter it is. Look what he says is a monopolistic issue. He is saying this Government is a monopolistic Government to create and operate the funds which would come from bulk shipment. What would be the situation if the Government had no interest in his question? You agree to bulk shipment. What would be the position if you made no legislative provision for those whom you are going to put out of employment? There will be a saving from bulk shipment. Instead of allowing the exporters to use the savings in such a way as to put back all in their pockets, Government is saying how the savings which they will get from bulk shipment should be used. Government has stated the way in which the savings from bulk shipment should be used. The honourable Senior Member for St. Philip is giving the impression that the Government is taking the money out of the Treasury to finance the unemployed and other things which have been proposed to be done by this Fund. I would like the honourable member to realise that this change over which has been proposed will sooner or later have to be adopted. As this is a new venture—bulk shipment—it is going to be of high capital cost. Government, as I have said, is saying how part of the money will be distributed. We did not agree to advertising as was proposed. We told the exporters that they will have to pay for that out of their running expenses. Government members are also saying that if we give them off something for capitalising their business, they may say any figure. This is the kind of financial matters in which a businessman would go to the Board and state that he is going to capitalise his business. Let us say he owns an old bond house worth \$40,000 and wants to renovate it. The renovations will put up the cost of the old bond house to \$100,000. Do you think we should let him put the sum of \$100,000 as cost of the bond house without consideration of the \$40,000 which was the original worth of the bond? That is one of the things you put the Board there to look after. There are some honourable members of this House who think that because some of us are not fortunate enough to be born sons of merchants and are not sellers of cloth that we have not the slightest atom of business sense and because of that, they feel that when we sit around a table with businessmen they can push anything down our mouths. I say that to explode the myth that we have not the idea of how to use those funds. Sir, you are using these funds to help you out of your unemployment crisis that will arise by the shift over, but to say how the money can be used, you cannot say that. How can anyone here now say how in the next three years this money can be used? I think I have disposed of the argument of the honourable senior member for St. Philip about this business with the Fund.

Sir, I agree with the single selling organisation. I feel that there should be the single organisation.

My reason for saying so is because you want a proper organisation to deal with marketing. This single selling organisation will be able to make negotiations in Canada with respect to all sales for fancy molasses. With regard to the liquidation of the Canning Company, I may tell honourable members that one of the members of the same single selling organisation bought this canning plant and he now wants a part of the quota so as to operate it. Bear in mind, that this member of the single selling organisation wants part of the quota for the canning factory as a separate unit; so that he can sell molasses in some particular places of Canada—mostly in Newfoundland. The single selling organisation agreed with the other people not to ship any fancy molasses in tins; on the other hand, the exporters here got the assurance from the importers of Canada that they will sell the Barbados molasses undiluted. Sir, what kind of trade relationship would you have if people in the same single selling organisation want to set up their own business in it and detrimental to what has been agreed upon? Let me tell the honourable senior member for St. Philip that he made this falsehood when he said that the Government stopped these people from shipping fancy molasses in tins. In 1950 fancy molasses was shipped in cans; so too in 1951 and last year, therefore, when you say that with the wartime powers Act, this Government caused the canning factory to close down or go into voluntary liquidation that could not be so because in 1950, 1951 and last year that factory was still operating and that same order was in force.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I said that the Government resorted to the law in March this year,—the Emergency Powers Act—to give them power to regulate the export of molasses. The powers of that law caused the Canning factory to close down.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir, let us not misconstrue those powers. In 1949 until 1952 the Canning Factory exported molasses in tins. The Canning Factory went into voluntary liquidation not because of any action by Government, but because they agreed not to can molasses in Barbados according to the arrangements they made with the Canadian importers. I would like the honourable senior member for St. Philip to know that generally, whenever he is on the outside looking in to get his information, I am inside looking out, and have had the facts. I did not challenge his interest or integrity, but when he begins to challenge mine, I have no other alternative than to resist the challenge. Sir, the honourable senior member for St. Philip said that the Government caused the Canning Factory to be liquidated. That is far from being the truth and the honourable member knows that. The voluntary liquidation of that factory had nothing to do with any Government order. The honourable member is well aware that one of the members in the organisation bought this canning factory and after the agreement was made, he tried to operate this factory separately. You cannot belong to a trade organisation and go out and make separate negotiations with people and then come back and work with the same organisation. It was Mr. W. A. Grace from Messrs Munroe & Company who bought the Canning Factory and he is a member of the same single selling organisation. The organisation felt that this canning of molasses by this firm would be inimical to the trade or even if it were an outsider trying to run a business on the same line.

With respect to the point about the Governor-in-Executive Committee appointing members to the Fancy Molasses Board, I was surprised at the state-

has to do could not be done by the old Board. Government has not made out a case about that, Sir, it is not as the honourable junior member for St. Peter says that the main purpose of the Board will be dealing with money because the House of Assembly does not have much to do with that. As you know, fifty percent of our revenue is taken out of our hands. There is only one source of revenue which this House plays with now and that is income tax. We cannot increase the duty on one single item under the Tariff Act. As soon as you touch any item under that, you are dealing with things under International agreement.

Sir, I am giving the honourable junior member for St. Peter notice that when this Bill is dealt with in Committee, I am going to move an amendment to provide for one or two members of this House to be appointed to the Board in the same way as the provision made for the Director of Agriculture to be on it.

The honourable junior member for St. Peter has tried to explain that the savings from bulk shipment will be put in a special fund to provide alternative employment for labour displaced by bulk shipment. He has not given any instance of what will be done. Really and truly, to my mind, I do not feel that the Executive Committee members in this House know of any way in which alternative employment can be found for those workers who will be displaced. However, they must have in mind some idea of something. I do not think they are thinking of dishing out a dole because to do that has not arisen. They should not put this in here without any thought of something which should be done in the matter. I know that it is not an easy matter. The honourable member also tried to explain what is interest and depreciation on capital involved in providing bulk storage in Barbados and Canada.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I did not say Canada.

Mr. LEWIS: If Canada should not be included, it should not be worded as it is in the Objects and Reasons. It is worded Barbados and Canada and this is very misleading. In the Bill itself, it says Barbados and elsewhere.

Sir, I have heard reports by the shippers of molasses from this colony suggesting that the fancy molasses trade might not be able to contribute to the cess funds. These shippers are getting around and making every sort of suggestion. I have also heard it said that if the cess on molasses is to be put in the hands of the sugar dealers the molasses would bring in a higher price than sugar and if it failed, what is made on sugar would make up the difference. I do not know which suggestion I should believe. The matter is very complicated. One thing I would suggest to the Executive Committee and that is to let this House have some publication of the accounts of that fund as soon as it gets going. I know that if it is not an order, they will never tell you. You will never know what they are doing with it. I have the greatest difficulty now in getting accounts of funds which this House gave sanction with the understanding that half-yearly statements of accounts will be published. I say again, let this House have at least annual accounts of this Fund. Let a statement be laid on the table of this House. Let honourable members see the document in this House and get it printed in the *Official Gazette*. There should be some public exposure on it.

Sir, I think I have dealt with the points I intended to speak on. There are one or two things which I suggested but I am urging that if this House is to have some control over this industry somewhere in the Bill, just as you include the Director of Agriculture, you should include representation from this Chamber.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say much because the honourable member on my right is in charge of the Bill and doubtless, he can answer all points raised, but inasmuch as I was a member of the Committee which made investigations into the aspects of this industry.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I was saying, Sir, that inasmuch as I was a member of the Commission which made investigations into the aspects of this molasses industry I shall make a special appeal to the honourable junior member for St. Andrew. No doubt, it is difficult trying to persuade people who have already made up their minds, but I will yet make a special appeal to the honourable junior member for St. Andrew because he has referred to the knowledge which I acquired when I was on that Committee. What he said was perfectly right; the situation is very ticklish. On Wednesday last when I passed through Montreal, I discussed the fancy molasses situation with the Trade Commissioner and two other people closely connected with the industry and who were easy to get hold of. It is because the situation is delicate; it is because what we saw in 1950 that however much we may like or dislike it the time would come when more and more people would have tanks and that in the towns and districts where molasses is now being sold that more and more people would take self service packages of molasses off the shelves in the shops; it is because we saw this type of trade growing that we reported to the Government to this effect that although the evidence was not yet sufficiently strong for bulk shipping molasses, yet the trade would certainly go if you did not ship in bulk. They told me while in Canada, do not wait until it is too late, make the necessary preparations, and that is why this Bill is here. I will tell the honourable junior member for St. Joseph that the worst possible advice that he could have given was when he said to postpone this Bill. This is only a precautionary measure. I have even a more serious suggestion to put to him. One of the most prominent persons in this molasses business in Canada, one who is going in for the importation from Cuba by tanks, told me that he will find work for displaced coopers from here up in Canada. He told me; "We know your difficulty. I think I can place some of your displaced labour if you think it over and see if some would be willing to come up to Canada." Sir, that gentleman made the offer and to me he seemed to be very sincere. I did not ask him; what he told me came to me like a bolt from the blue. He is one who is actually using tanks. As I have said, this is a delicate situation. There are some places in Canada that still get their supplies by small ships and in puncheons. Here and there in the districts you see puncheons of molasses with the different names of the exporters. The people there still tell you that they know when it comes from Barbados it is still pure fancy molasses but you cannot lose sight of the fact that when you go in the towns you see the sophisticated girl whose oldest sister might be working on a farm, she wants her molasses in a package; therefore for some years to come, you are going to sell molasses in puncheons, but more and more you are going to have to send it up in tanks. We must face the situation and if we are to go along with the times, we must agree with bulk shipment. When I first talked the matter over with the Trade Commissioner, he told me he was disappointed as regards to the industry but on Wednesday when I saw him again, he thought that the outlook was brighter than it was a year or so ago. He thought it was such today that we need not to be disappointed. He told me: "We must be ready for the Canadians." "I think we are surprised that they

agreed to a single selling agency." The Canadians accepted it despite the fact that in 1950 they seemed to have wanted to continue with their own individual exporters.

Sir, this Bill is merely a protection on the part of Government in case bulk shipment comes along that you will have the money which the local people are saving. At one time when the honourable senior member for St. Philip was speaking, he said we are not paying with the Government's money. We are saying that the shippers have to expand with the growth of the trade; you are getting rid of the certain expenses and saving money through a particular way; therefore, Government is asking you instead of adding that in your profits, by your displacement of labour you ought to take some of that money and put it in a fund for the people you are displacing. As is known, Barbados is not a place where jobs are easy to get. I pointed out that case first, therefore, it is not by accident that to provide alternative employment for labour displaced by bulk shipment is set down 1 (a) in the Bill. Any savings that might accrue, this putting of coopers back in employment must come first out of it. We cannot tell exactly what form it will take to put them back in some employment. Some coopers might be house carpenters and may work in building schemes. There might be others who, although good coopers might find themselves without a job. We might also be able to send some up to Canada and this fund may be a means of providing the money to send them up. One must consider that possibility. How can we at this time before the situation is open fully to us say this is the way we should apply it? We, first of all, will have to enquire from every cooper who will be displaced, what would he like to do, if he would like to go away. All of those things will have to be dealt with first. Because of all this, I am personally appealing to the honourable junior member for St. Andrew to see that we are not introducing controls. I am asking him to read this Bill carefully and he will see that all Government is doing apart from the question of providing for this alternative employment for displaced labour is to provide against the evil day which will certainly come upon us. For many years to come there will not be a complete switch over, therefore, again I appeal to the honourable junior member for St. Andrew, who in all sincerity suggested that this matter should be postponed, to see that just the reverse is the answer. Honourable members ought to know my views well enough on the question of the necessity of tank shipment and the Deep Water Harbour. It is not because we are scared, but it must be remembered that we have waterfront workers and those other workers. When the day for a Deep Water Harbour begins to dawn, we will tell them so just as we told the coopers. If the time is coming when Barbados must have tank shipment, Barbados must have it. We therefore told the coopers straightforwardly that there was no other alternative but to have tank shipment.

With regard to the other point on the appointments to the Board to be made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, I am going to be as mild as I possibly can. I believe everybody fully knows that we are moving towards self-government more and more. I believe that some people are surprised not to have already seen ministerial status here. How can we possibly go on and on to do something that we have been doing three hundred years ago? I repeat that as soon as ministerial status starts, every single department of Government will be under the charge of Government—obviously, ministers will be the heads of everything. All the power invested in any director will go as soon as ministerial status takes

place. In this instance, as soon as there is ministerial status, no longer can the Director of Agriculture be chairman of this Board, therefore it is obvious that all these appointments have to be wiped out of the hands of the House of Assembly. No longer can the Director of Education be chairman of anything educationally, nor can the Director of Agriculture be Chairman of anything agriculturally. If that be so, can you take the administration out of the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and put it back into the hands of the House of Assembly? When it comes to matters of this sort, honourable members must agree in putting membership on Boards into the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Anything in the matter of appointments to Boards that comes to the House between now and the establishment of ministerial status, the Executive Committee will make the appointments. But this will mean that the Government in power can be turned out any Tuesday night if you feel that it has not the confidence of the public. If this Government goes back on its promises, we must resign; that has been made abundantly clear. Honourable members on that side of the table ought to rejoice at the fact that if anything goes wrong, they will know the one man who is responsible; therefore that man must be a member of the Executive Committee so as to be able to advise the Governor who to appoint to Boards. Honourable members should rejoice to see that responsibility is placed squarely on the shoulders of the honourable junior member for St. Peter as minister for agriculture when ministerial status takes place. This was one of the points which I wanted to make clear. I will however say that this matter of appointments to the Board was a recommendation which came from the Committee and to which the present Board agrees. It was no accident that the late Mr. Stephen Walcott of this House was made a member of that Board. As long as there are planters in this Chamber—we now have the honourable junior member for St. George and my distinguished colleague—we can always select one for commerce and a producer on that Board, but the Act does not say they must be members of this House. Mr. H. O. Emtage, Mr. Reece, and Mr. Evelyn who were not members of this House were all at some time or the other members of that Board. I may be wrong, but I do not remember any occasion in the old days when there was more than one member of this House appointed on that Board. I say all this because I want honourable members to see that it is not a question of giving up any special privileges but that we have reached a stage when we have to give up that privilege to the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

I will therefore appeal to honourable members when they go into Committee to let this necessary clause remain as it is in the Bill for these appointments. I may say that if honourable members insist that the Act remain as it is now, they will be insisting only for a couple of months because as soon as ministerial status comes in, the Governor-in-Executive Committee will be bound to appoint such a Board.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Dr. CUMMINS, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. MAPP, Mr. MILLER, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. ADAMS and Mr. COX.—11.

Noes: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES and Mr. GODDARD.—6.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Speaking on the motion to go into Committee on this Bill, I am opposing it.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable junior member for St. John cannot speak on the motion. It is just as well as to say that His Honour the Speaker should not leave the Chair when the House is going into Committee.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I beg to refer to Rule 141 of this House. It says: "A member who has already spoken to a question or has moved or seconded an amendment thereto, or a motion for the adjournment of the debate, may not rise again to move an amendment or the adjournment of the House, or of the debate, or any similar question, though he may speak to these new questions when proposed by other members." Mr. Deputy Speaker, according to the Rule no question is before the House.

Mr. ADAMS: How can that rule apply to this question?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question that this House go into Committee on the Bill is a new question and the Honourable member is entitled to speak on it. Rule 141 does not apply now. The honourable member is at liberty to debate on the question before the House.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: Your Honour, I am opposing the motion that the House go into Committee on this Bill. I will give my reasons for so doing. The most vicious part of this Bill is probably the change in appointments on the Board and that is why I object to this Bill going into Committee.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order, Your Honour. The honourable Junior Member for St. John was ruled out of order by Mr. Deputy Speaker when he wanted to speak on this Bill after he seconded a motion for the adjournment which was lost. The honourable member seems to be taking the opportunity now to speak on the second reading of this Bill and not on the motion before the House. The second reading of this Bill has been agreed to and the motion before the House is that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am opposing the motion that this House go into Committee on the second reading of this Bill.

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

Mr. SPEAKER then left the Chair and the House then went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called and reads as follows:—

"Section two of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act) is hereby amended by deleting the definition of the expression "Fancy Molasses" and substituting therefor the following definition—

"Fancy Molasses" means cane juice evaporated to the consistency of syrup but shall not apply to fancy molasses which is considered by the Board appointed under this Act to be below the recognised standard of "Barbados Fancy Molasses."

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This amendment has been made to the Act so that in case there be not sufficient small producers to continue making the required amount, production quotas can be allocated to

vacuum pan factories so that the production of fancy molasses will be facilitated.

I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Mr. ADAMS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clause 3 was called, and reads as follows:—

3. (1) Section three of the principal Act is hereby amended—

(a) by deleting subsection (2) thereof and substituting therefor the following—

"(2) The Board shall consist of the Director of Agriculture and seven other members appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

(b) by deleting subsection (3) thereof and substituting therefor the following—

"(3) The members of the Board appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall hold office for a period of five years from their appointments:

Provided that—

(a) a member may at any time by notice in writing to the Governor-in-Executive Committee resign his office;

(b) the Governor-in-Executive Committee may declare the office of any member vacant on the ground that he is from any just cause unfit to continue in office."

(c) by deleting subsections (10), (11), (12) and (13) thereof and substituting thereof the following—

"(10) Any vacancy caused by death, resignation or otherwise shall be filled by the Governor-in-Executive Committee but the member so appointed shall hold office so long as the member whose office is vacant would have held office.

"(11) If during any period any member of the Board is unable, owing to his absence from the Island, or to illness, or to any other cause, to perform his duties or discharge his functions as a member of the Board, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may appoint a temporary member for the period during which such member is so disabled."

(2) The members of the Board in being on the commencement of this Act shall continue to be members of the Board until the appointment of members of the Board in accordance with the provisions of subsection (2) of section three of the principal Act and shall then cease.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: So far as this amendment is concerned, honourable members are saying that this is taking away power from this Honourable House but it is not taking away any power from this House in this instance because members of the Executive Committee are drawn from this House. Unfortunately, the honourable Senior Member for St. John is not a member of the majority party; some day he may be such a member. I am still hopeful of his rejoining such a party. What I rose to make clear is that in the old days the Governor selected the people who were to be members of the Executive Committee. In those days there was no party system. Today, the House reserves the right to appoint the four important members of the Executive Committee when you agree with party system as part of your constitution. From the party in the majority comes the Leader of this House who selects the other members to form the Executive from this House. These members are elect-

ed by the people's vote; therefore honourable members should not feel in these days that in matters of this sort the powers of this Honourable House is taken away. I want to make it abundantly clear that if the four members from this House on the Executive say "No" to any suggestion the other five members of the Executive cannot say "yes," Honourable members therefore should not feel that the authority of this House is taken away and put in the Governor's hands.

Mr. LEWIS: I think the honourable member has missed the most critical point in my objection. I am not objecting to the Governor-in-Executive Committee appointing the members of the Board. What I said was that in the same way as you had something written in that the Director of Agriculture should be a member, that something should be written in to show that you should appoint say two members from this House. It does not matter to me, they can appoint two members from the members of this House on the Executive or from other honourable members. Again, the life of this House is three years and I see that the life of this Board is five years, therefore there cannot be a carry over of the membership of the House on that Board because the life of the House does not coincide with that of the Board. I may be told that does not matter much. The fact remains: would it alter the principle that the honourable junior member for St. Peter and the Leader of the House enunciated when this House gives the Executive power to appoint two of its members or two members from the House, whichever the Executive may think better? If that is a variance in principle I would accede. What is wrong with this House saying that we give you power to appoint the Director of Agriculture and we give you power to appoint two members from this House? I would like to hear the honourable junior member for St. Peter answer this point because I think it is so relevant.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is remarkable about this party system and appointments to Boards is that it only affects the appointments of this House to the particular Board but not the Head of the Department. The fallacy of this party system in which the majority party selects the members of the Executive makes it no longer necessary for members of this House to appoint members to these Boards because a member from the House who is on the Executive would be responsible for the policy of the particular department. But while this may be so, you are permitting the Director of Agriculture to remain on this Board by virtue of his office.

Mr. ADAMS: This is only because we have not yet got ministerial status. How can you change this before we get ministerial status?

Mr. CRAWFORD: You cannot change this before you get ministerial status but the power of this Honourable House must be taken away before you get ministerial status. When you get your ministers, the Director of Agriculture would no longer be *ex officio* on the Board; he would be no longer Chairman of the Board. The removal of the powers of that officer on the Board depends on the introduction of ministerial status. Why should not the removal of the powers of this Honourable House to appoint members of this House to such Boards await until ministerial status is introduced?

Clause 4 was called and agreed to.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT moved, seconded by Mr. ADAMS that the CHAIRMAN do now report the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I am going to move the recommitment of Clause 3 so as to ask the honourable senior member for St. Peter what is the idea of speaking about members of the board resigning

from "office". Then if he looks at sub-clause (2) he may find that the words "principal Act" need some explanation. I beg to move that the section be recommitment.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I accept the motion.

The clause was re-committed.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—It appears to me that the words "principal Act" at the end of clause 3 should be "this Act". I have heard that it is not necessary to have sub-clause 2 of clause 3 but I think it should be there because it is that sub-clause that deals with the appointment of the Board.

Mr. ADAMS: I would not say off hand that the fact that you have this Act read with the principal Act means that the principal Act is now what is here. Sub-clause 2 says: "The members of the Board in being on the commencement of this Act shall continue to be members of the Board until the appointment of members of the Board in accordance with the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 3 of the principal Act, and shall then cease." Therefore, no longer is the Board being appointed by the Legislature, but by the Executive only. There might be some confusion in the mind of the draughtsman that you are referring to the principal Act; therefore to save ambiguity I will move that after the words "provisions of" in the last line but one to the word "Act" in the last line be deleted and the words "of this Act" inserted in place thereof.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded.

Mr. LEWIS: I see the word office used in this section, referring to a seat on the Board. I have never seen the word office used relative to the appointment of this Board. I do not know if the members are going to get paid.

The motion was put and agreed to, and Clause 3 as amended was passed.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded by Mr. ADAMS Mr. Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in committee with an amendment, and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded by Mr. ADAMS in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title was called and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND INCOME TAX LAW

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to take Order No. 4 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member to move the second reading of the Bill intitled an Act to amend the law relating to Income Tax.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Looking at this Bill honourable members will see that this is the best we can do towards the introduction of a Pay as You Earn system of Income Tax. The Commissioner of Income Tax felt that it would be useful to most employees if income tax could be deducted monthly instead of being paid in two instalments as at present. A person would not miss five dollars a month as much as he would miss thirty dollars a half year. The late Income Tax Commissioner had several talks with members of the Chamber of Commerce, on whom would fall the burden of making the deductions provided for in this Bill. The majority of them were in favour of trying out this. For that reason we have agreed to come down with this Bill which seems the best way of doing it.

I have no doubt that when we go into committee honourable members will ask for a fuller explanation. I personally have been making some inquiries. Suppose a small company went bankrupt, what would happen to the money collected from the employees? Some countries insist on employers sending in the money frequently. When the regulations are made

it will be borne in mind that we must guard against a possibility of that sort.

I beg to move, sir, that the Bill be read a second time.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—While I appreciate what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, I am going to ask him as a special favour not to seek to get this Bill passed tonight. I am well aware that if its provisions are to apply to this year it must be got through as soon as possible. But this Bill has more in it than I believe the honourable member himself realises. It strikes a very severe blow at the fundamental principle of the liberty of the subject, and that is something that should be taken seriously. I feel very strongly about it, and I am very sorry that the Bill should come up in these circumstances. I know that there are other members of the House who would like to say something on it.

The method adopted in this Bill is a substitute for the Pay as You Earn system. It has originated in Barbados as a result of our not instituting the Pay as You Earn system. With the Pay as You Earn system a man would be paying his tax on pre assessment; so this should not be confused with the Pay as You Earn system. I want honourable members to follow what I am saying. At present there is an income year and an assessment year. What you work for in 1952 is returned at the end of that year and the tax on it is paid in 1953. With the Pay as You Earn system you have to work out that a man working for so much would be likely to pay so much per week or per month as income tax, and as they go along for 12 months. Wherever you introduce a Pay As You Earn system you have to give up the income tax due at that moment. And this year they will collect the same or more than they would collect if they made the assessment this year on last year's income, as if they collected as they went along.

The Pay as you Earn system means that you can tell the employer to stop out from the wage or salary of an employee only such an amount as is assessed on the salary or wage that the employee is getting from that employer. A man may be getting two hundred dollars a month from one source, and only one hundred dollars a month from his employer. He cannot by any transfer of calculation deduct on the total income of the employee. This Act says that the Income Tax Commissioner can tell the employer to deduct the whole tax or part of the tax; but that is not something that the Income Tax Commissioner should be able to decide. If the Commissioner decides that he wants to get the money out as soon as possible and he feels that there may be some delay if he depends on the person to pay part of the tax, he may tell the employer to deduct the whole thing. According to the Act persons employed in the Income Tax Office are sworn to secrecy. They cannot divulge the income of an individual. I understand that if they go into the Court the only way they can give evidence about your income is if you give sanction. They cannot just go there as witnesses called by the Crown and give details about your income.

That is why I say that this Bill is striking at the liberty of the individual. If it said definitely that the Commissioner could not ask an employer to deduct more than on what he is paying an employee I would have no hesitation in supporting it. There is another thing. When the employee is paying this he is accumulating income tax that he has to pay. The Objects and Reasons of the Bill start this way:

"It is considered that the present system whereby an individual has to meet his income tax liability in two instalments causes particular hardship in the case of salary and wage earners." What is the remedy for that? The remedy is to make it lawful to pay your tax in three, four or five instalments or as many as you can count. This Bill does not do that. This Bill does not say that if you find it difficult to pay your tax in two instalments it will be accepted in seven. It says I am going to tell your employer to give me the whole tax. If you are working for someone, Mr. Speaker, and you are getting income from another source it is none of your employer's business. Your employer when he comes to know that you are working for other income apart from what you draw from him may decide to cut down your salary.

This Bill, sir, is one which I think should be discussed with full membership of this House. We have had Bills before us earlier today not as urgent as this and it is no fault of honourable members if this has come up at this time. I am appealing to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to postpone this. I feel strongly on this matter. The honourable member has not been in the position of being an employee and therefore he might not be so keenly aware of the dangers that lie in this Bill. If there is one thing that some people like in the Vestry system it is the possibility of knowing your business. This Bill will cut the throat of the employees of this colony if it is passed as it stands. Even if the honourable member persists in trying to get it passed tonight I will ask him to accept an amendment. It will be an amendment to the effect that the Income Tax Commissioner be given no discretion in the matter; that he will be told definitely to tell the employer to collect only such taxation as is due on the wage or salary that he is paying to an employee.

I am not one of those people who believe that someone can come into this country and work miracles. I am not carried away by these things. The late Income Tax Commissioner might be a genius; but I do not think that he would be given this power anywhere else in the world. This Bill does not seek to get any additional taxation for the Government. It does not seek to catch anyone who may escape paying income tax. You have got to make your return and be assessed and then this Bill comes into operation. There is such a thing as linking the salary of a man and his wife. That will bring about another complication.

We have had income tax since 1921. I feel that we should postpone this measure until next year and probably improve on it. But do not pass it in a hurry because the Income Tax Office are waiting on it. I do not see that as regards this Bill employees will get the slightest consideration in the Other Place. The majority of members in the Other Place will welcome this Bill because one of these days, if not now, they will have an Income Tax Commissioner who will co-operate with the employer and the whole secrecy of the Income Tax Act is cut out by this Bill. The employer can deduct on the whole of a man's income and by simple calculation he can tell what that income is, and he will know what to tell you when you strike for more wages under the Workers' Union. Let it be a matter for the employee and his employer if necessary; but do not give the Commissioner this discretion. Do not let it be forced on the employee whether he wants it or not.

I am suspicious that these Bills should come before us worded in this way. They are coming with the greatest amount of privilege for the rich; and they are worded in such a way that you do not no-

tice it. The Bill we have just passed is one in point. We are supposed to be a Labour Party introducing measures of social justice. I do not know if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has been away from the island for such a long time that he has not been able to give this Bill the consideration it deserves. But in all my time in this House I have never seen a Bill that is as serious a matter as this one.

I was surprised that with the great genius we had in the Income Tax Office we could not design a Pay as Your Earn method. When I heard that this Bill was coming down I was hoping that it would be some method of Pay as You Earn. That you would say if you deduct ten dollars a month from a man who has been paid in the vicinity of \$150.00 a month for the past ten years it would help him. There is a system by which certain stores pay out Christmas Bonus. There are employees who have gone to the Income Tax Office and said, "well I owe so much. If I get three months' bonus this year I will clear up what I owe." I am not discussing whether the payment of bonus is a good thing or not; but all that is mixed up with it.

There is one significant fact that I will draw to the attention of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. The daily newspaper and a particular contributor to it when he contributes under his own name has been writing about income tax for some time. He is a member of the newly formed Income Tax Payers' Association. I took the opportunity to ask a prominent member of the newspaper if they had ever commented on this Bill; because I did not remember seeing any comment on it. He told me no. I am asking the honourable member if that is not food for thought. The honourable member on my right, sir, has just told me that the newspaper did comment on the Bill; but they opposed the inclusion of company directors! They would never draw to the attention of the Government the fact that this Bill might have a serious effect on employees. That is a newspaper that represents employers; so it would be silent where the effect of the Bill on employees is concerned.

Employees of the City and of the island generally are not aware that this Bill means what it does mean. I welcome it as an attempt, if you are not going to have the Pay as Your Earn system, to give some measure of assistance to employees by giving them an opportunity to pay their income tax in more than two instalments. I am well aware that if it is left to the employee he might draw his money every month and then find himself in difficulties with his income tax at the end of the period. Therefore I am willing for us to make it compulsory for him to have it deducted by his employer. But the discretion which we are leaving to the Commissioner of Income Tax is not a discretion that we, representing the people, should leave to any one man. No one man should have "in his power to say "I will get the whole of your tax collected." An Income Tax Commissioner does not have that in his power in any part of the world. A man may have two jobs in one of which he works at night. By this Bill you are making it possible for the man's employer to know his whole income. The secrecy of the Income Tax Act is being violated.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I know, as the honourable introducer of the Bill has said, that it is going to be prescribed by regulations when this money collected from employees is to be paid over to the Income Tax Commissioner. I know that the time in which to pay income tax now is prescribed by regulations. If you look at the Income Tax Act you will see that there

are certain regulations which have to come before the Legislature and certain other do not. I have a strong suspicion that the regulations made for the collection of income tax do not come before the Legislature, although there is a part of the Act that says so. If these regulations are not among those that have to come to the House I am in favour of putting a provision in this Bill as to when the money collected should be paid over. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has already made a point about the possibility of a firm going bankrupt after it has collected this money. In one part of the world firms not only collect income tax for the Government, but they also collect from employees social insurance. If it is collected on the last day of the month the firm would have to go bankrupt in the middle of the same night to pose any problem to the Government because they have to pay over the money the first thing next morning after it is collected. I would not like an employee to be not only in the position of having the whole of his income divulged to his employer but also that the latter should have his (the employee's) money to help run his own business. That is why I feel that the employees should have a scheme like this by voluntary agreement with the employers.

However, Sir, I want to impress on the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that I feel that this Bill is too serious a matter to be pressed at this time of the night. The Bill should be postponed. Even if employees are denied the benefit of it for a year I am sure they will thank the honourable member for making possible a fuller discussion of this matter. While the honourable member has been away we have had a Bill of the magnitude of the Maude Bill to contend with. That has taken up a great deal of the time of the House. Honourable members have not had the Bill long enough to be able to discuss it thoroughly. The daily newspaper has taken up the cudgels on behalf of company directors. They see no reason why their incomes should be disclosed. They do not want theirs disclosed because it is the paying clerk in the office who might get a look at what is collected. It is the ordinary cashier that pays out salaries. But they do not mind the employee's business being known to the cashier and reviewed by the directors themselves. That is all the more reason why a Bill of this nature needs more consideration. I am appealing to the honourable member who introduced it to postpone it because it affects the working man in so serious a manner.

Mr. ADAMS: At first I thought that the honourable member was making a point. I thought that he would see that if you take away the discretion from the Commissioner of Income Tax you would make it impossible for an employee to go to the Commissioner and say "let each of my employers deduct. Let neither know of the existence of the other." If you do not give him discretionary power one employer will know everything. If a man is really afraid of one employer knowing about his other source of income surely he can tell the Income Tax Commissioner. He can tell the Income Tax Commissioner that he is making a substantial sum apart from what he is getting from his employer and he does not want his employer to know. That is where the discretion comes in.

Under the Pay as You Earn system in the U.K., and Canada there is a method whereby all the taxes are taken out by one employer. The employer is told so much is tax free; so much is taxable; there is the total; deduct so much every week or month. I have been through all this with Mr. Finch. I have looked up the English Act. I have not looked up the Canadian Statute but I have before me a form setting out

the practice both in the U.K. and Canada, and showing to what extent we can follow those practices. It also shows if a man is getting \$25.00, \$30.00 \$40.00 a week etc. and he has a wife, how much is to be deducted and how the system is going to operate.

This Bill would be unnecessary, Sir, if there was not a huge clamour in all walks of life against having to pay income tax suddenly as at present. The clamour came largely from below where people with fixed salaries would be helped considerably if they could pay their income tax monthly or weekly instead of in two instalments. You must at least give the Government credit for doing something to help these people rather than to say that the Government is trying to hurt them by giving the Income Tax Commissioner a certain discretion.

As I have said, it is because of this discretion that the employee can tell the Commissioner that he does not want his employer to know how much he is getting from another source. He can ask that his employer be allowed to deduct on only what he gets from him, and he will pay the rest of his indebtedness. Under our proposed system the employer will be given a card and he will be told that a man's salary is so much; so much must be tax free because the man is married etc. If you do not give the Income Tax Commissioner the discretion that he is being given, human nature being what it is, I do not doubt that an employer might want to cut down the salary of an employee whom he knows is getting a substantial income apart from his job with that particular employer. If that is what is going to happen, starting with the fact that Government is making it easier for the employee by allowing him to pay his taxes in 12 instalments, will the Government do something to hurt that man?

There are draft regulations to be made. I do not think that the Executive Committee has agreed to all the regulations. However, I will bear in mind the point made by the honourable member, and in the regulations we can cover that point. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas has informed me that no final decision has been reached as regards the regulations; so the point can be seen after.

Some of the provisions of the English Pay as You Earn system are not here and the same is true of some of the things of the Canadian Pay as You Earn system. That is as clear as daylight. A man may be working for \$100.00 a month with an employer; he works somewhere at night and makes additional income. We can give the Commissioner the right to say to employer A collect so much, and to employer B collect so much. The man may be getting income from a kitchen garden. He can pay his taxes due from that source of income directly to the Income Tax Commissioner. But if we do not give the Commissioner that discretion the evil that the honourable member fears will really happen. We can make the regulations explicit on that point. We can say that the Commissioner should permit a taxpayer to have deductions made by more than one employer if he is employed by more than one. The Income Tax Commissioner's job is to see that the full tax comes to the Government.

I do assure the honourable member that the whole reason for this Bill is that the Government sees the hardships that accrue when a man has to pay his income tax suddenly and we have taken all that we could adopt from the U.K. and the Canadian systems and devised a method whereby those hardships can be alleviated. Sometimes the honourable member gets annoyed and thinks that I ignore what he says. I will take great care to bring his point before the Executive Committee and make it possible

in the regulations that the evil which he fears will not occur. If necessary we can put in a right of appeal. Figures need not be disclosed and you can appeal to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. We have brought down this Bill to alleviate hardships which the employees now bear. We would not try to get rid of one evil and subject them to another.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to know what would happen in case an employer refuses to deduct taxes from the wages or salary of employees?

Mr. ADAMS: He cannot refuse if the Bill is passed.

Mr. SMITH: Is there a penalty if he refuses? I feel that this is creating a hardship. If the Bill is passed it will mean that employers will have to keep additional books and probably employ another clerk to keep records of those particular books. If that is so I really cannot vote for it as it stands. I am saying that as long as there is a penalty attached if an employer refuses to collect this money I will not vote for it. Businessmen will have to take on additional clerks. Government should not impose this additional burden on employers.

Mr. ADAMS: The expense of paying an extra clerk is included in the expense of running a business which does not go into Income Tax.

Mr. SMITH: That is all well and good in the nice way that the honourable member has put it. When you hire an additional clerk it may be true that that is a part of the expense of running the business; but it lessens the profits. I do not see why an employer should be compelled to collect taxes from his employees. It is not fair to him. I think that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee.

Question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to without division.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into committee on the Bill.

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

Mr. LEWIS: As an amendment to that motion I am going to move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. As we have heard, Mr. Finch has left this island. Since 1921 the Government has been collecting taxation in the present manner. Although I agree that it would be a benefit to have your income tax paid in more than one instalment this Bill does not say how many. It is not going to be spread over a year. There are certain things that can be covered by regulations; and certain things that cannot be. If this Bill goes to a Select Committee I can bring evidence as to how the money is collected under the Pay As You Earn System.

There are other sources of income. That is another point that should be gone into. I hope that people will read this debate and will be able to assist honourable members in this matter. It is being done for the benefit of employees. I feel that the Bill should go to a select committee. It is entirely wrong for the honourable member to think that the point made by me can be covered by regulation. I do not think so. There is a fundamental principle involved. I am pleading with him because I know how he feels. He feels that once this has been drafted and brought down it should not be postponed or sent to a Select Committee, because sometimes the select committees do not meet.

I would like to draw to his attention that this Bill was given notice of on June 30. Since then we have gone through other legislation and this Bill was left over. The honourable member left the island. I am assuming that if the Bill was so urgent it would have been dealt with before tonight. I am

sure that there is no one with whom I have tried to discuss this within the last few days who knew anything in detail about it. The Commissioner will not take the money in weekly or monthly instalments because by the time you are finished you may collect two years' taxes in the same year.

I do not see why the Bill cannot be postponed and discussed more thoroughly later on. The honourable member does not like to change a Bill after it has been brought here. He has exhibited that attitude all along. He always feels that it can be changed in the Other Place. That attitude cannot be excused on this occasion because I know that there are people outside this House who will be very glad of the provisions of this Bill. In addition they may well get the co-operation of the Income Tax Commissioner who can say, "This is the law of the land. This Act vests this discretion in me. I am appointed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and as long as the Act vests this power in me I will exercise it." People have been put in court for Income Tax. I understand that there is a right of appeal to a higher Court. I see a lot of poor people have been put in court for income tax and others have been kept out. That is why I know that the poor employee whom we are trying to help is the one who stands to suffer.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—I am seconding the motion,—not that I agree with it. The same point that has been raised tonight I raised two Monday nights ago. This would have the effect of a person paying two years' assessment in one year. What I feel is that we should postpone this for a week before we go through all the clauses in committee. I feel that there are one or two clauses that are not tight enough. There may be a few snags hidden in these clauses. I would appeal to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph not to be hasty in passing this in committee tonight. If regulations have to come down they are not laid yet. There is no point in hurrying. A select committee may mean a long delay, and I do not think we can do that. But when we consider that the regulations have not been laid yet, I would appeal for an opportunity to give the Bill a little more detailed consideration.

Some of us draw salaries elsewhere and from this House. It would be very difficult for me and other honourable members if the Commissioner in his discretion makes our total tax payable to our employer outside this House; or he may collect more from one source than he should. There should be some right of appeal, it is agreed, so why not put it in the Bill? I am not as pessimistic as the honourable junior member for the City. I feel that in a Pay As You Earn system something must be divulged to an employer. But in a Bill of this sort where you give this discretion to the Commissioner there should be certain safeguards.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not know why the honourable junior member for the City seems to think every now and then that because some of the members of the Government have no business experience they cannot read and understand the Queen's English. No matter what I tell the House the honourable member still says "you do not understand." It is the duty of anyone who finds grounds for objection to anything in this Bill to say it now. We have draft regulations and the point that the honourable member made can be covered in the Regulations. There is no reason why we cannot insert something in the Regulations to cover the point. Any draughtsman can make mistakes. The honourable member must admit that in the Bill the question of taking all the taxes from one source is dealt with. The Bill says such tax or part thereof. It is not a question of Mr. Finch attempting to get power for himself.

We agree that there are employees who would not wish one employer to know how much they are working for from an outside source. So the Commissioner is given a certain discretion so that he can comply with the wishes of such an employee. The Bill says such tax or part thereof. In order to say how the Commissioner is to exercise his discretion as to what part the employer should deduct on we can make provisions in the regulations. It is not a question of absolute discretion. Let us, as the Executive Committee, try to settle these difficult points.

I am not saying that the honourable member has not made a good point. But I am saying that it can be dealt with in the regulations. As I have said, the regulations have not yet been fully considered in Executive. The honourable member has discovered something which makes it more imperative that we should insist in getting this Bill passed without delay. The Income Tax Department feels that there should be no more delay with this matter because it is messing up things in that office. It must be pretty awkward for them anyhow. I appeal to honourable members to see that the regulations will soon be ready. Pass the Bill tonight so that the Other Place can be asked to expedite it.

Question that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee was put and resolved in the negative on the declaration of Mr. Speaker that the "noes" have it.

Question that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House go into committee on the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and the House went into committee, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and agreed to.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

2. Section thirty-nine of the Income Tax Act, 1921, (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act) is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the full stop at the end of sub-section (1) thereof and adding thereto the following:—

"Provided that where any tax is deducted in accordance with the provisions of section 43A of this Act, the amount of tax so deducted shall be paid by such employer to the Commissioner within such time or times as may be prescribed by regulations made under this Act, notwithstanding that no assessment was made upon such employer in respect of such tax or part thereof."

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—Mr. Finch suggested that payments should be weekly or monthly. As regards the calculations, as I told the House earlier a table will be presented to employers, and that, it is hoped, will ease the work of the employer. It is not going to be such a laborious task. I move, Sir, that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I wonder if the honourable member realises what he has just said and what he said a moment ago. With the greatest respect I will have to tell him that he knows absolutely nothing about the Bill. He may rest assured that what he is saying the Bill is is exactly what it is not. I myself thought at first that it was so. The honourable member does not seem to realise that this is a matter of your making your return at the end of the year, and on that year's income, just as at the present time, the Income Tax Commissioner is going to make up your taxes on what you have returned. It is nothing to do with if you earn so much per week or per month.

I did not tell the honourable member anything about business training. But the honourable mem-

ber has really got a good deal to do. I told him I knew exactly what this Bill is going to do, because I made some enquiries. I try to do my work for the House of Assembly conscientiously. Your tax is going to be the same as it is worked out at now. It is based on the previous year's income. The tax is already calculated. It will be nine or ten months in 1953 when the Commissioner makes this up. Your salary might have been cut in half.

This Bill is merely a matter of convenience to the Government. If the Government feels that they need the money in three months they will collect it in three months, no matter what happens to the employee and his family.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and agreed to without division.

Clause 3 was called and agreed to.

Clause 4 was called. It reads as follows:—

4. The principal Act is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section forty-three thereof the following new section:—

“43A. (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of any law or usage to the contrary, any employer shall, on being so required by notice in writing from the Commissioner, deduct in accordance with such notice from the salary or wages of any employee of such employer, such tax as may under the provisions of this Act be collected from such employee or such part thereof as the Commissioner may in his discretion require.

(2) Any employee whose tax or part of whose tax is so deducted shall upon its being deducted be deemed to have paid the same and shall thereupon cease to be liable for the amount of tax so deducted.

(3) For the purposes of this section, any director of a company or a person engaged in the management of a company shall be deemed to be an employee.

(4) For the purposes of this section the expression ‘employee’ shall include any person in the service of the Crown in respect of the Government of this Island and the expression ‘employer’ shall have a corresponding meaning.”

Mr. ADAMS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: With respect to the discretion given here I would like to tell the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that where the Pay as You Earn system operates and an employee leaves one employer and goes to work for another the table is arranged so that the employee need not tell his second employer that he has been getting so and so at the first employer. The employee can direct that his taxes be collected including anything previously earned. I have talked to people who have lived in places where the Pay as You Earn system is operated, and I can tell the honourable member that that is how it works, and no provision is made for that in this Bill at all. The employee has no say. This Bill is supposed to help the employee and he is the only person who has no say. The right of the individual is gone completely. He runs the risk of being put in court. The Income Tax Commissioner says, “I am the person empowered to collect taxes on what you are working for.” The employee is given no option.

I have an amendment to suggest but I cannot put it in at the moment because I have not fully drafted it or read it over. It might be

just sheer nonsense to make the motion as I have it here. I can only say that it grieves me that a matter like this should have passed the notice of honourable members. I am convinced that they do not see the danger of allowing this clause to remain as it is.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sure the honourable member knows that provision has been made for those people who cease to be in the employ of one person or to be employed by some person else. That is being dealt with in the regulations.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I feel this way about it. It appears to me that you can make regulations as regulations are made without the guarantee of the Act. I cannot see how the Income Tax Commissioner can exercise his definition of the law and then say if he can. I think that when the honourable senior member for St. Joseph reads the regulations he will find that the Income Tax Commissioner cannot overrule the Government. The regulations are put there to assist and help the law; they cannot contradict the law. I have no hope that what I have said will appeal to members of the Opposition because the majority of them is of the employing class so they will see in their light; they will not see in the light of the employee.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, when we were first debating this question you heard that the poor employees have no choice but to pay their tax in the two instalments, now you are saying something different now that Government is doing something to make it easier for them to pay their tax, by allowing the Income Tax Commissioner to collect it in more instalments. That is all this Bill seeks to do. When the honourable member says that this is against the Act, it is not against the Act, because the Act says two or more instalments; and therefore the regulations can also be amended for this tax to be collected weekly or monthly according to the knowledge of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. As regards these regulations, it is provided that they come to the House for approval. That is part of the Act.

Mr. LEWIS: I will tell the honourable member that this does not say that it is to be collected in three weeks or three months. The employer may be paid weekly but it does not say what percentage will be collected in a week. I think if the instalments are made to spread over the 52 weeks of the year, it will create a greater hardship on the people.

Mr. TALMA: There is only one little point I want to make. It seems to me that those who formerly paid no tax at all will be caught.

The question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion 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.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, In moving the adjournment of the House for a week, I would like honourable members to know that the Government proposes to deal with the Public Health Bill next Tuesday. I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, the 28th instant at 3 o'clock p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.