

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th June, 1958.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); His Honour Mr. L.E. SMITH, J.P.; (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER; Mr. C. E. TALMA; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M. B. E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Mr. L. St.A. THORNE and Mr. T. W. MILLER;

Prayers were read.

Mr. Straughn entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

MR. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor, Papers were laid as follows:-

HON. DR. H.G.H. CUMMINS: Message No.16/1958 regarding an Agreement for a programme of technical co-operation for Barbados, the Windward Islands and the Leeward Islands.

HON. DR. H.G.H. CUMMINS: The Date of Publication of the Registers of Electors and Registers of Local Government Electors, Order, 1958.

HON. R.G. MAPP: Report and audited Statement of the Transport Board for the year ended 30th September, 1957.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

HON. DR. H.G.H. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled 'The Date of Publication of the Registers of Electors and Registers of Local Government Electors, Order, 1958.' In connection with this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I beg to say that it is urgent. Copies of the Resolution have been circulated and I intend to ask for leave to proceed with it later in the day. The reason for it is that in point of law these Registers should be ready by 30th June; it is not so long before that date and it is impossible to get the publication of these Registers through by then. This

Resolution is therefore to make provision for extending the date of publication until the 31st July.

QUESTIONS

MR. L.E. SMITH: To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Is the Government aware that the Residents of Malvern Tenantry under Hackleton's Cliff in the parish of St. Joseph are suffering badly for lack of a road and water?

2. Will the Government take immediate steps to acquire a parcel of land from Malvern Plantation for the purpose of re-siting the homes of these tenants as was done in the recent case of the residents of Parris Village in the same parish?

Messrs. Bryan and Goddard entered the House and took their seats.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

HON. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

HON. D.D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59, No. 4

ADVICE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

LOCAL GOVERNMENT RE-ORGANISATION

HON. DR. H.G.H. CUMMINS: The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$33,407 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimate 1958-59, Part 1. Current, as shown in the Supplement Estimates 1958-59, No.4 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

This Resolution has for its object the making of provision for the employment of certain officers to advise on the establishment of Local Government. The Government is doing all it possibly can to have Local Government instituted very early next year, and probably there will be the holding of elections towards the end of the year; it is therefore necessary to have the machinery for the institution of Local Government set up as quickly as possible.

Hon. members will remember that a Local Government adviser, Mr. Lightburn, was here; he has gone back to England, because of ill health, and there is a member of the Civil Service who has been attached to Mr. Lightburn's office ever since he came out here and started to work, and, in addition to that, this gentleman has been given a course abroad.
3.25 p.m.

This gentleman, Sir, will be employed as the Local Government Commissioner, and it is necessary for him to set up his office as soon as possible in order to select certain personnel and train them in the administration of Local Government.

There is also another officer by the name of Local Government Officer whom we want immediately, but it is not quite clear yet whether he will be a permanent or temporary officer until this machinery gets going.

Now provision is made under Section 50 of the Local Government Act, 1954 as amended by the Local Government Act, 1956, and in the Current Estimates for a Local Government Adviser, and this gentleman will be paid from that vote, which also provides for the personnel, furniture, and typists who will work in that office when it starts.

In the same Resolution under a new Head (which we call Local Government Re-organisation) there are certain other personnel such as Clerks and Treasurers for the City area, Northern area and Southern area, whose salaries and travel will come under this new Head.

I think, Sir, that this sets out in detail just what we envisage at present: that is, the Local Government Commissioner, the Local Government Officer, Stenographer and furniture which will come under the existing vote in the Current Estimates. Under the new Head "Local Government Re-organisation" will come the staff which will be paid from this vote.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

HON. D.D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

MR. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, from this we can see some form of progress towards Local Government coming into being. As I said quite recently, the longer this is delayed, so much more will the parishes suffer as they are suffering from want of proper administration; and when I say that, I am not decrying the present Vestries, but the existing amendment of the Vestries Act whereby capital cannot be raised as in former years. It is no use coming to this House for money to be raised by loan when a number of things are being neglected, the greatest of all being sanitation and the scavenging of the parishes, and the erection of additional standpipes and baths. Whenever in the past the Vestries wanted to do these things, they came to the House for permission to raise a loan and to have capital for repairs to their Church property. All these things are done directly for the taxpayers and in many cases provision could not be made, and the neglect continued. For that reason I am glad that something is happening.

We have been told that the existing Maude Bill will have to have a number of amendments. Now the Premier made no mention at all of that, and I would like him to tell us whether they have been drafted and are in preparation to come to this House. It is pointless going ahead with these things as this Bill might be far in advance of what we expect in the Maude Bill when it comes into being. He has given us no intimation except to say it could be expected towards the end of the year. Of course, we have heard that for so long that we do not know how soon the implementation of the Maude Bill will be. I, for one, would like to see it as soon as soon as it is completed. I know a lot of work, more than Government anticipated, had to be done in the joining together of parishes and the cutting off of some and adding to others, and the whole assessment had to be brought up to date. That has taken a lot of time and work; but I do hope that if it is near at hand, the Premier can tell us the day in more exact term when the public can expect elections to take place, or whether the existing Vestries will have to

lay rates again next year, as has been said in certain quarters.

Now I know these appointments will have to be filled, because they are key positions. The clerks and Treasurers will have to be capable and well qualified men because a lot will depend on them, and I should like the Premier or someone from the Government side to say why this Commissioner should remain after the Councils have been functioning. Is it that you anticipate that the elections will throw up the type of person that will not be capable of running these Councils? What would be his functions? Is he to direct or advise them? If proper appointments are made in the Town Clerks and Treasurers, it would not be necessary to have Lawyers because they are very capable laymen who can do the job.
3.35 p.m.

I would like to know why this Commissioner will remain in office. It is true, we do not know for how long; but it is my feeling that as soon as you have these councils set up and they are armed with the law and they know their duties, the public will expect that they will function on their own.

I would like the Hon. Premier to bear in mind what I have asked him. How far advanced is the Government with the amendments of the Maude Bill? I ask that because I understand the amendments are so numerous that you may as well rewrite them. Again, I say I am pleased to know that some progress is made and we will not continue to run Local Government under the existing manner. It is not that I have any fault to find of them, but it is so because of the handicaps under which they are running that they cannot do a proper job.

MR. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, it is extremely satisfying to me to see that a Commissioner is going to be appointed. Now, Sir, I am not quite sure if this Commissioner is going to be a local man, but the point which strikes me most is that we are asked to provide money for advice on Local Government and its re-organisation, and the advice which I have got is that the Maude Bill has got to be returned and, as far as I can understand, completely renewed. Up to now I am led to believe that the wicked system of local taxation which obtains today will be perpetuated under the new Bill. I have never been able to see - and I will have to go much further than the hon. junior member for Christ Church - how it can be expected that all the parishes outside of the metropolitan area should provide from local taxation the amenities which are necessary for today's modern standard of living.

HON. DR. H.G.H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member, first of all, is reflecting on the amendments and then on a vote. He is reflecting on a question which was settled in 1954 and I would just like to draw that to your attention.

MR. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I think that it is the knowledge of all of us that this Bill is full of amendments. I am not casting any reflection on any vote of the House whatsoever; I am suggesting that advice should be obtained from a local person now that we have had the advice of an expert from outside of the island. I have said before, and I will say again, that an expert is an ordinary man a long way from home, and if we are paying out money to get further advice we should pay out money to get advice locally on the system adhering locally. I feel that the time is ripe when this advice should be noted and should be considered because, as I have said, for the other parishes outside the metropolitan area to obtain the necessary taxation under the present condition, I rather view it somewhat like the federation where we can compare St. Michael to Jamaica and Trinidad and the other parishes, perhaps barring Christ Church, - and I hope I am not stepping on any hon. member's toes - rather like the small islands. I am not suggesting that any of the hon. members of this House is a small islander, although in these days of federation we all should be quite willing to be termed as West Indians.

I do feel that is the point to which this adviser should pay particular attention; and while the comparative rate of

growth of industry, etcetera, in St. Michael is bound to be much greater than in the other parishes, I am wondering whether this adviser cannot advise the Government as to how to effect an equalisation of taxation. After all, St. Michael could never be what it is without these things. I am sorry that his Lordship the Right Honourable Lord Mayor is not in here at the moment, for perhaps he could give us some advice as well. (A VOICE: Who is the Lord Mayor?) You know. I do feel that it would be appreciated in this House and by any local person with local knowledge that the amenities which St. Michael is capable of offering must of necessity be of much more than the amenities which the other parishes can offer due to the system of taxation. Sir, I hope my words will be taken into consideration and that we will have a system obtaining in the island where one particular area does not get the benefit of the fruits of all the persons who work in this island.

Mr. F. G. SMITH and Mr. T. W. MILLER rose to speak.

MR. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say—

MR. CHAIRMAN: I saw the hon. junior member for the city first.

MR. T. W. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I really was not thinking of entering into this debate, but after hearing the hon. junior member for Christ Church who is a member of the Vestry of that parish and also of the Vestry of St. Michael, I rise to say that his speech today seems somewhat to me to be blowing hot and cold at the same time. On the one hand, he is happy to think that after the past three or four years we are now getting somewhere with Local Government, but on the other hand, he went on further to state that he was wondering what the adviser would have to advise on, and (2) he was wondering if the Government thinks or feels that the Local Government elections would throw up people who are capable of administering the affairs of councillors. Mr. Chairman, I will not sit here and allow him to get away with that. It is an insult to the electorate of any ward to suggest that the people would elect people who are incapable of administering the affairs.

MR. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. It was not my fear. I questioned whether it was not the fear of the Government. I was not afraid of that.

MR. T. W. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I was not saying that you have to abide, or you should abide, by the decision of any electorate. They have the right to choose. While I am on my feet, I hope as and when the time comes that the electorate of this island would get rid of all the members of the various Vestries constituted as they now are. Now, for the first time in the history of Barbados people unemployed and having attained the age of 21 years, through Adult Suffrage will have the right to vote and choose

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. This Resolution has nothing to do with people voting, twenty-one years of age or else. This Resolution deals with the authority to take on certain staff. 3.45 p.m.

MR. T. W. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the Premier. Where you find a backbencher of the Government in a most invidious position as to what to say, when to say it and how to say it ———

MR. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with this Resolution. The point as to whether a backbencher is in an invidious position as to know what to say, when to say it and how to say it, is nothing to do with this Resolution. This Resolution deals with the appointment of staff.

MR. T. W. MILLER: As I have already said, I never intended entering any debate on this matter, but I could not allow the remarks of the hon. junior member for Christ Church to go unnoticed, because there was an insult to the Electorate and I want them to understand that it is the first time that they will have the opportunity of voting and voting for the people who look like themselves, people who have passed through the hornpipe, people who know their troubles. People like the hon. junior member for Christ Church — — —

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has already made that point which I have allowed him to make. I am asking

him now to get back to the Resolution.

MR. T. W. MILLER: Very well, Sir. (Laughter).

MR. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I should like to say that I welcome any Resolution which is likely to put an end to what I consider the chaotic conditions existing in the Local Government of this Island. For a long time now, as you will see from this Resolution, we have been toying with the idea of the establishment of these various areas, and it is refreshing to find the Hon. Premier at this stage considering this matter of great importance and urgency. For too long it has been hanging fire, with the result that nobody knew where he stood and nobody knew if and when this new set-up would be brought into force. Perhaps, before I am finished, it may well be thought that I am urging the case of members of the legal profession, but I should like to make two points.

The first one is that for a long time the Government knew that the time would come when we would have to introduce this system, and it would have been a good thing, as has happened in the African colonies of Nigeria and Gold Coast, if the Government had handpicked four or five or even six or eight people and arranged for them to be attached to County Councils or Borough Councils in England with a view to their appointment to the Executive posts of Clerks and Treasurers. As a matter of fact, I may be wrong, but it is not within my knowledge that there is any Barbadian, or anybody in the local service who possesses that knowledge of the intimate running of the Borough Councils or County Councils by his personal contact with these Councils in England, or from his being attached there for any period of time. That is one criticism of this Resolution which I shall make, that we often wait until it is too late to train our staff for positions such as Clerks and Treasurers with the result, as has happened in the local and federal services, that other countries have passed us by. It is not the Premier's fault, because at that particular time, he was not the Premier; but I should like to ask the Government to assume the responsibility of having persons trained when they intend to introduce some new system which calls for specialised knowledge in that particular field. Therefore, I would have been much happier if I knew that the Clerks and Treasurers who have been appointed were men who had come back from the United Kingdom after a period of being attached to Councils and Boroughs in that country.

As you will appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the introduction of this new system is likely to encounter for a long time not only legal and technical difficulties, but transforming the local Government system from its present status to the new status which we hope to give it, is going to cause considerable headaches. In England, I know that the Clerks and/or Treasurers of Councils are legally-trained men. That is why I prefaced my remarks by saying that these persons should not necessarily be Barristers, but men who invariably have had some legal training, because it will be their duty in due course to advise the Local Government as to what their powers are, how far they are encroaching on the right of the Central Government and whether they can do this or that. It is interesting to see the Clerk of the House watching me, because a Treasurer, if he is legally trained, is likely to get more money than what the Clerk is getting now. I do welcome this Resolution, because it is high time that the parochial employees and the persons connected with the present Vestry system which has produced a bunch of incompetents and dictators — it is high time for that system to be swept away and the new order replace the old. I hope that the staff contemplated in this Resolution will be adequate and I hope that the Premier has considered the matter thoroughly, because it is unnecessary to come to this House every now and again with a new Establishment Order asking for additional staff, for so many additional Stenotypists or Clerks as the case may be. I do not see any reference in this Resolution to any Long Grade Clerks; I see that reference is made to a Local Government Commissioner, a Local Government Officer, a Stenographer and you have Office Equipment and travelling. It is quite clear that you will need a certain number of Clerks — unless the Premier will tell me that some of the present officers of the Local Government will be transferred to the various Councils in this position. 3.55 p.m.

I do hope that when the Blessing of this House is given to this Resolution, the Premier will consider the matter as urgent, and let us have these elections this year in order to give some sense of security to the present employees, and in order to create a situation in which you will get it said, as it is often said now, that we cannot do this or that because we do not know when the Bill is coming into being. I welcome this Resolution but I should warn the Premier that in the establishment of this office and these officers, he should see to it that no hardship or injustice is done in the transition period to any employees who have given faithful service to this antiquated system which this new system replaces. It is going to cause a great deal of headaches, inconvenience, hardship, and in some cases, heartburn; but it will be his job as the Minister in charge of this Resolution to see to it that this new system is introduced as smoothly and as harmoniously as is humanly possible. It is long overdue, and I give it my support.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I agree with quite a lot of what the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has said, but I am afraid that it is shutting the stable door after the horse has got out; and I want to make it clear that that is not reference to any officer of this House.

The hon. member has made a very valuable suggestion which perhaps even at this late stage can be taken cognisance of by the members on the other side who comprise the Government. What I envisage will happen is that shortly after the Local Government Bill is implemented by the institution of the three Councils and the election of the Councillors, one or more of the officers of these Councils will be sent away to the United Kingdom on courses in order to familiarise themselves with the duties which they have to perform.

Now, since under Section 50 of the 1956 Local Government Amendment Act the power to appoint the first officers of the Council is vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee, there is absolutely no excuse for the delay in the selection and appointment of these officers, so that they may avail themselves of an opportunity to get some further training in Local Government affairs. That is why I heartily commend the hon. junior member for St. Andrew on the suggestion which he has made in so far as suggesting that it can still be done. I can see a great disruption of the smooth working of the local Councils if we attempt to send away the newly appointed officers after the Councillors and Aldermen have been elected to their offices. Since 1956, this Government has had the power, as it has now, to select these first officers. If they had to wait until the Councillors were selected then the Local Government authority to appoint the first officers, there would have been some justification for the delay which has occurred in the interval of time.

But there is another aspect of this Resolution which is causing the Official Opposition a great deal of concern, and it is the part in the Addendum, paragraph 2 which says: "the former Local Government Adviser having relinquished his duties for reasons of health, a Local Government Commissioner has been appointed on secondment from the Local Civil Service."

Now we had Mr. Lightburn as Local Government Adviser, and most of his time was taken up in rehashing the Local Government Bill of 1954, and trying, as far as I can see, to persuade the Executive to accept the suggestions made on the floor of this House as early as 1953. As a result of his labours, the 1956-55 Amending Act has been placed before this Chamber, has been passed, and is now on the Statue Book, and it has certainly gone a long way towards wiping out some of the anomalies; but the fantastic thing about the whole situation, Mr. Chairman, is that the Amending Act is nearly as long as the original Act itself. I have before me the Laws of Barbados for 1956, and here you can see the amendments to the Local Government Act, 1954. I want hon. members to notice how Government stationery is wasted and why there is so much confusion in the interpretation of the Law. There is nothing at all to prevent the Legislature from repealing an Act which they find to be unworkable, especially if they have not attempted to work it, and to redraft a complete new Bill and place it before this House. The hon. senior member

for Christ Church and myself sat on the opposite side of this Chamber along with the then hon. junior member for the City, and pointed out Section after Section of the Local Government Bill in 1953 which we felt was unworkable.

HON. DR. H.G.H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Allow me to point out again that this has nothing to do with the Resolution before us. The Resolution deals with the appointment and salary of certain staff.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it is for you to tell me whether or not I am in order. I definitely deprecate the hon. member for St. Thomas, the hon. Premier, telling me what I should stick to. I am dealing with the functions and duties of the Commissioner, and I am now at the first phase of my argument where I am dealing with the displaced or relinquished Commissioner, Mr. Lightburn, and I intend to deal adequately with the Commissioner whom they want to foist upon the Local Government Councils of this island. It is not for him to suggest that I cannot point out that Mr. Lightburn spent all his time in Barbados doing that kind of thing when they had the opportunity on the floor of this House to accept the amendments and suggestions which were made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When you made reference to the amendment to the Act, I took it that you were dealing with the right which the Government had to appoint these men at the time.

MR. BARROW: I am dealing with the amendment to the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already made the point that Government had the right to appoint these officers. 4.05 p.m.

MR. BARROW: Do you mean to say that I can only make one point?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am saying that you have made that point and I am not prepared to allow you to deal with the Act.

MR. BARROW: Do you mean to say that I can make only one point and sit down? Do you mean to say that I cannot mention Section 50 of the Act?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not prepared to allow you to deal with the Act.

MR. BARROW: I cannot hear you, and when I hear you I do not understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You made reference to the Act to prove that the Government had the authority to appoint this man. I have allowed that, but I am saying that I am not going to allow you to deal with the Act itself.

MR. BARROW: I am not dealing with the Act; I am dealing with the question of the appointment of the Commissioner and the function of the Commissioner. That is the point I am trying to make. We are now asked to vote money for a Commissioner who has been seconded to a new office or to that office in a new disguise, because Mr. Lightburn who was the holder of that post has relinquished it for reasons best known to himself. I was saying that Mr. Lightburn for all the time he was here was occupied in drafting amendments to the Local Government Act which he would not have had to do if the Government had accepted the amendments which were made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church and myself in 1954.

Now, Sir, I am asking: what is this new man going to do? What qualifications has he got and what is his name? Let me take the last question first. The new Commissioner is directly related to a prominent member of the party on the other side. That is point number one. Point number two is this: what qualifications has he got for this job? I challenge the Hon. Premier to get up and say that this man has any qualifications apart from the fact that he is the son of a Local Government employer under the old Vestry system. What work is he going to do? As I have said, Mr. Lightburn spent his time redrafting the Local

Government Act and sending it down via the Executive Committee to the House in the form of an amending Act which was very voluminous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. junior member for St. John will read the Addendum to the Resolution, you would see what his job is.

MR. BARROW: I have read it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is here set out. It says: "he will be engaged in training the first Clerks and Treasurers of the Councils and will advise and assist the councils during the transition period."

MR. BARROW: I say it is not necessary. It is necessary to find out what his job is going to be. If they say that he will be engaged in training the first Clerks and Treasurers of the Councils and will advise and assist the councils during the transition period, I want to say that he has not got any kind of knowledge of Local Government affairs at all. He has not got any academic training or any practical experience. A Clerk of the Council is no boy in the yard; he is no yard fowl; he is something of the eminence of the Clerk of this House. You are going to take a man who has not got a School Certificate - I can say that because you have not quoted his name - and take him to advise the Clerks of the Councils. You are going to put him over qualified accountants who have spent years in their jobs. That is the point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, and it sort of stinks of nepotism and patronage. You are taking a third grade Civil Servant to do that job. A Clerk of the Council has a very serious job to do. He is not a shorthand writer. He is a man who has to advise the new Aldermen and Councillors and tell them when they are acting legally or illegally. He guides the Council just as the hon. Clerk of this House. Do you see how fantastic it is to suggest that you are going to take a man out of the Civil Service who has never worked in a Vestry or under the old antiquated Vestry system and, without any former training at all, ask us to vote money to put him to instruct the new Clerks and Treasurers of the Councils along the lines of their duties? We know what Mr. Lightburn did. He was a qualified legal draughtsman because of the amendments which he made to the old Local Government Act. That is all that Mr. Lightburn had to do.

Mr. Chairman, what worries me as a taxpayer and as a potential voter in the Local General Elections and as a representative of this Honourable House is that Mr. Lightburn spent all his time doing something which could have been avoided if our suggestions were accepted. His time was frittered away and he was a man who knew his job. You just brought him down here to redraft the Local Government Act.

If you had brought in Sir John Imrie from Trinidad and informed us that he was going to take over the training of the officers and the junior clerical officers, I am sure that hon. members would consider him to be a worthy successor to Mr. Lightburn. There is not one single Civil Servant, not one individual, in the employment of Her Majesty's Service of this colony, nor not a single one of them who is in Local Government, who has the experience or any Local Government qualifications.

They have already said that this man has been appointed and the hon. senior member for the City knows who it is. He is a person who is directly related to a prominent member of the Government Party. It is no secret because he has been appointed. I have nothing against him as a man, but you are going into a new venture and you should have a trained man. If you are going to train fellows to be able to take up their new offices, then to take somebody who has no training and no interest, apart from the financial interest of drawing his salary, is not a satisfactory state of affairs and I cannot support it.

Mr. Chairman, I would only suggest that in future when they anticipate taking a step of this kind, they consider their position carefully and at least have the decency to inform hon. members and the general public when a certain individual is to be appointed to a post, to come to the

House first and let us discuss, debate and suggest the functions which we think such an officer should perform. They have done not only a great injustice to themselves, but they have also almost committed a crime against the individual who unfortunately would be burdened with the duties set out in this Addendum to the Resolution. 4.15 p.m.

MR. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, after the numerous attempts which have been made to establish these County Councils, and the numerous mishaps which have befallen the Bill in relation to the establishment of these Councils, it is very encouraging to see that we have reached the stage where a Resolution has been brought down to establish these offices.

However, I would suggest that it would have been better if the Hon. Premier, at this stage instead of attempting to recapitulate what has happened up to now with regard to the implementation of the "Maude" Bill, had, by means of a prepared statement to the House, set out categorically all that has happened up to now. There have been so many mishaps connected with the introduction of this new Local Government Bill and the establishment of District Councils generally, there have been so many amendments and changes made in the last few years, that it would have been a proper thing if a prepared statement had been made and read and circulated to hon. members so as to inform us as to what the present position is. When you read the Addendum to this Resolution, you will see that the object of it is to provide money for the setting up of these various posts. Clause 2 of the Addendum says this:

"The former Local Government Adviser having relinquished his duties for reasons of health, a Local Government Commissioner has been on secondment from the local Civil Service"

As far as I remember, Mr. Lightburn was a fully qualified Solicitor, an experienced Solicitor and Town Clerk attached to one of the prominent Councils, a Clerk of many years' experience. Mr. Lightburn has not completed his work, as has been set out here in the Addendum to this Resolution, and therefore, you will need a man of the calibre of Mr. Lightburn to complete the work which he had set out to do. The Addendum to the Resolution says that Mr. Lightburn retired for reasons of health. He has done a portion of his work, and as far as the training of Clerks for the various offices which are set out here is concerned, the personnel cannot be trained by any local person who is not au fait with the running of the City Councils, Town Councils and Borough Councils as in England.

Therefore, I think it is the duty of the Government to acquaint this House as to the calibre of the man whom they have appointed to succeed Mr. Lightburn in the training of the personnel for these District Councils. It may be that the money has run out and they have to find money to pay this Local Government Commissioner and the Local Government Clerks, and they have already seconded the Local Government Commissioner. It may be that they want to find money to pay the Local Government Commissioner who has already been appointed. The power of making these appointments is vested in the Cabinet, and therefore this Resolution is merely a means of finding money to pay people for another year or two. The hon. junior member for Christ Church appears to be very happy, although the setting up of these Councils will not be of any assistance to him. He appears to be very happy at what is being done, but I would like to warn the hon. member that the bringing down of this Resolution to pay these officers does not mean that this set-up will take place either this year or next year. For the last three years we have had the Local Government Bill which is to be implemented; the money has run out and more money is needed now. They have their special friends to whom they want to give these jobs; the money has run out and they want this \$33,407 to pay these people. If hon. members are going to agree to pay this money, the matter is in their hands; the Cabinet wants this \$33,000 odd to pay their favourite people, and in this case, it may be one person or two persons at least. The Local Government Commissioner may be the person who has worked with

Mr. Lightburn, but whether he is that person or not, the fact remains that now that a part of the work has been done, very few people would have the aptitude to impart what they knew to another in order that he can perform the duties of the Local Government Commissioner. The Government say that they want this \$33,000 to pay for the training of the staff. I think that the Maude Bill and the establishment of these District Councils have been very badly handled, and an explanation is due to this House. A statement should be given us setting out categorically the various stages which have been made towards the setting up of these Councils. The Premier has been the appropriate Minister and he should be in a position to give details as to the various stages and the progress which have been made so far.

I think that they have got as far as the appointment of Valuation and Assessment Officers; well, let us hear something about them. I hope the Premier will see the necessity for making a statement about them.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think I am among those who quite welcome this set up even sooner than the end of the year, even although just before I came into the House it was said that all the old men will be scrapped. Well, I think the hon. member who said so was making fun, because if you want to scrap me, you will have to scrap the whole Island. (Laughter) I am taking a different line from hon. members in this matter. I should like to say that very rarely you will find me paying tribute to people who have been brought down here to go into matters. Sometimes, I find that they have been brought down for a joy ride and they have no more experience than I have. I doubt whether they will find anybody with more ability and who can discuss with greater ease the amendments to the Local Government Bill than Mr. Lightburn. As a Vestryman, I have found that it was rather refreshing and enlightening to sit with Mr. Lightburn and discuss matters with him and I, for one, can say that I have learnt a tremendous lot from him. I have spent more time with him than possibly any other Vestryman in this Island.

4.25 p.m.

I doubt whether you could have found anybody to have given you with greater ease an idea of the running of Local Government than Mr. Lightburn. I am one of those people who feel that if you had someone as understudy to Mr. Lightburn while he was here - and if members remember rightly somebody had been sent by Government to England to take a course - then that person should be appointed as Local Government Commissioner. For the benefit of members, especially the legally trained men who would have me believe that I must go and read the English statutes and those of British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica to know about this, I would like to tell them that this is a hybrid. This is the only Bill of its kind in the area. Mr. Lightburn has gone and I think I can say that it is not necessary to have a Solicitor as Clerk. I am not ridiculing professionally trained men, but I must say that I heard legally trained men attempting to say that laymen of no kind can stand up to legally trained men on this. I would ask them to look around and see that I am still here. There are some people with experience and ability that can stand up and advise on these things as good as anybody else.

This Resolution is for a Local Government Commissioner. I see nothing wrong in having a Local Government Commissioner in the first instance, not necessarily a legally trained man. But looking through the Resolution and seeing the salary which you are offering, I say there is nothing wrong in getting a trained solicitor to assist in advising. There is the question of the general overall policy, and for the interpretation of the Sections you do want a legally trained man. As to whether the Civil Service Commission should appoint these persons, I would be the first to ask why you spent money to send someone to England to be trained and then appoint somebody else, unless you are appointing a legally trained man. Let me say that legally trained men just called to the Bar are just as ignorant of this as I am of flying an aeroplane.

MR. F.G. SMITH: On a point of order, my suggestion was to appoint a Solicitor of a number of years' training. Nobody is suggesting that you should appoint a Solicitor because he is a member of the legal profession.

MR. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is really earning the living of three Barristers, as I have observed from the way he is going around nowadays. These jobs will attract young men, but as far as I am concerned, I would be the first, if you sent a man from here to be trained and he was attached to the Commissioner's office, to criticise this Government. On the other hand, your Local Government Officer can be a legally trained man, and I am wondering whether the Premier would be able to tell us whether it would be necessary to have an all time man in this office as adviser; it could be a retired man with experience who could work for two or three years until it starts rolling properly. It is not for us to tell Government whom to appoint, but I am definitely in favour of the under-study to Mr. Lightburn. I cannot agree that because a man is legally trained he would be more suitable than a person who is not legally trained.

I should like to draw to the attention of hon. members that in other countries in this area the Local Government has to do with water, education, harbours, police and several other things - and I know the hon. member for St. Andrew will readily appreciate this - but in Barbados you change the name of Local Government, and say they must continue to look after the poor, sanitation and street lighting. Persue the Bill and show me anything else. Do you want an Oxford man or a Middle Temple man to tell you how to look after the poor, sanitation and street lighting? You amended all the Acts long before the Central Road Board came into being. Because the system is a very old one and because you cannot measure the conditions in other parishes by what exists in St. Michael, Christ Church or even St. Philip, I think we all readily agree that it is necessary to bring in an amendment to bring this up-to-date and to have a modern means of administering the Local Government.

The Addendum states that "it is expected that it will be possible to hold Local Government elections before the end of 1958, and that consequently the City and District Councils as provided for in the Local Government Act, 1954 (1954-51) will be established early in 1959. It is accordingly proposed to appoint as soon as possible the first Clerks and Treasurers of the Councils under section 50 of the Local Government Act, 1954, as amended by the Local Government (Amendment) Act, 1956." I think it is but fair, having said here that the Commissioner has been appointed, to say who has been appointed. I look forward to hearing Government boldly say that the person who was sent for training and who was an understudy to Mr. Lightburn has been appointed. I was not here at the beginning, but I did not expect to hear anyone enquire from the Premier who the person is. The name should be announced, seeing that you have elected someone. Although the legal luminaries will agree that you should have a Local Government system in which you are taking in Police, harbour, education, housing and other things, I think they will have to look beyond the average person who could absorb what was told to him by Mr. Lightburn.

4.35. p.m.

The difficulty which is confronting hon. members is in fact that when you take the salaries of these posts and compare them side by side with salaries paid to magistrates and professional executives, you are going to find out that you are going to create some dissatisfaction. If you are going to pay your Local Government Commissioner \$7,680 per annum, naturally, you will get someone in your service saying: "Here I am, qualified as a magistrate or a judge, or Assistant to the Attorney General or Deputy Registrar, or even the Registrar, and I am not in this category at all." It presents that difficulty and somebody will say that the House or the Government has hand-picked their friends.

I am satisfied beyond any doubt that if you send out a man for training and that man was an understudy to Mr. Lightburn, that that man should be appointed and I agree whole-heartedly with that. It does not matter if that man was my greatest enemy. I should not attempt to say what I have been told by people employed by the Government and I know how they feel about it. They know why it was done this way. However, Sir, I do not intend to stray on that part. I feel that the Hon. Premier having said that the former Local Government Adviser having relinquished his duties for

reason of health and that a Local Government Commissioner has been appointed on secondment from the Local Civil Service, should not have given any member of the Opposition, who asked who is the person appointed, the opportunity to ask that question; you should have said who he is. When you do that, you only give them opportunity to criticise and say that you are acting with favouritism and that you are taking somebody out of your ranks. If the man whom you have appointed was occupying that position and has had training and he is the right man, he is the right man. The Hon. Premier has not mentioned that Mr. Ramsay or anybody has been appointed; you have not mentioned any names; you only say that he is appointed.

Now, you know I want to be kind. Mr. Lightburn was a very experienced man in his job and you know he was a very able man. He was a trained solicitor and he was so much considered that even when he retired he was called back as a Royal Commissioner to work on a boundary dispute. You can therefore very well see how much they thought of Mr. Lightburn. In paragraph 2, you say that this man, your Local Government Commissioner, will be engaged in training the first Clerks and Treasurers of the Councils and will advise and assist the Councils during the transition period. I think of Mr. Pearson Scott, Parochial Treasurer of St. Philip, and Mr. George Grannum, Parochial Treasurer of St. Michael. You may discuss something with them, but it is not very kind of your talking of training them. I have the view that if you have experienced men in this area, it will go a long way once you have the right type of Commissioner to solve this situation. I do think however that you have put it a bit harshly in this Addendum. You say that he will be engaged in training them. (A VOICE: If he has to train them, he has to train them.) Train whom? I do not agree that it is a matter of training them. You have an Act and it is there to guide you. Let me put it this way. There are other things which have to be done. You have to set up this office first. The Government must decide whether they are going to appoint Aldermen before the election; therefore, you must have a Commissioner. As a matter of fact, it was the opinion of Mr. Lightburn that you could not bring into being your Councils until your Aldermen were appointed. (A VOICE: He gave that opinion as a solicitor.) I think all of his ideas and his opinions must have been jotted down and in the possession of his understudy. I can well see that he is there to assist the Government and not so much to train these people. If you appoint a Clerk, he is a Clerk. What I think happened is this: the necessity for appointing this Commissioner before is for the purpose of advising the Government, because I can very well see that no member of the Government is going to worry himself about keeping himself au fait with the Local Government Act; therefore, this Commissioner is for the purpose of advising the Government.

Sir, I am voting for the Resolution; but I think before we vote for it that the Hon. Premier should without hesitation answer that criticism by the hon. junior member for St. John because if you bring a Resolution and say that somebody was appointed, you should not fail to say who was the person appointed. You must remember that that is our business. This is a thing which has already been done. It is part of the people's business to ask you who has been appointed. There should not be any secret to the appointment. It would appear by the way you have put it down as if the Government has appointed some nitwit. I am the first to let academicians know that you cannot assess them by their qualifications alone. Some people with the biggest qualifications are the biggest nitwits (A VOICE: Why have you sent your children to get academic qualifications and degrees?) I say what I say. I have no apologies to make. I am no Socialist; therefore none of them can ask me anything. I say what I have in mind to say on the floor of the House. I have said that I have seen academic idiots who could not work by their qualifications, but had to sell pumpkins and fowls to make a living. There are academic failures all over the world.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for the City. Address the Chair.

MR. MOTTLEY: I am not addressing anybody else. It is true that you have just taken the Chair but the hon.

senior member for St. Joseph when he was in the Chair never let it be thought that he paid attention to asides.

Mr. Chairman, while I think I should vote for the Resolution, I also think that the Hon. Premier is morally bound to this House to tell us who is the person appointed and so clear the atmosphere. If it is as I say, one whom the Government has trained and one who has been seconded to that Department, then actually nothing wrong is done if that man is appointed. However, if somebody is needed as Local Government Officer, I think I agree with the suggestion by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew that the Government should invite applications for that post and if possible ask that that person be a Solicitor because the salary is very inviting. Personally I think they should invite applications from legally trained men, preferably solicitors.

4.45 p.m.

MR. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, everyone of us in this Chamber is a representative of the taxpayers and, as a representative of the taxpayers, each one of us is called upon in this Resolution to vote the sum of \$33,407. It is therefore incumbent on us who are asked to vote this sum of money, to be given all the information which is available at the moment, and there is no reason why it should not be given to us. It is not a matter of War time secrecy which requires that it be concealed or kept secret from public information, especially when the Addendum to this Resolution states, as it does in paragraph 2, that a Local Government Commissioner has been appointed, and when it comes to paragraph 4, it is stated that it is proposed to pay these salaries from the 1st June, 1958. There is no reason why, the appointment of the Local Government Commissioner having already been made, we should not be given the information as to who has been appointed, because we are now called upon to vote money in respect of this appointment and in respect of the other proposed appointments. After all, we should be given not only the name, but the full qualifications of the person who has been appointed, and we should be told whether the vacancy had been advertised or whether the appointment was made without any advertisement calling for applications. Even if a suitable appointment has been made, in the absence of an advertisement, one does not know who has applied and how much more suitable other applicants there may have been, particularly having regard to the attractive salaries which are offered to these Local Government Officers. The appointment of the Local Government Commissioner is different from that of the Local Government Officer, because in the case of the Local Government Officer, it is said in the Addendum that it is proposed to create a temporary post of Local Government Officer, and the money will come out of this Resolution which we are now asked to support. If the Government has in mind a particular individual for this particular post, as the post itself has not yet been created, you do not expect them to give an inkling of whom they have in mind. It is the duty of the Government to inform us, and it is the right of the Opposition to be informed as to the person who has already been appointed and who, presumably, as from the 1st of this month, is entitled to draw this \$7,680 per annum.

There is another thing which some of us may have overlooked, and it is in respect of the salaries of the Clerks in the City, the Northern and the Southern areas. I do not know Sir, if you realise that the salary of the Clerk in each case is more than that of the Clerk of this House. He is a Solicitor of repute in this Island and we think that a salary of \$520 a month is reasonable for him and we do not contemplate giving him any more. Well, we are fortunate to get a man of this repute at this salary; we must be anticipating the appointment of some persons as Clerks of these areas who are more highly-qualified and with more experience than the Clerk of this House!

The hon. and learned junior member for St. Andrew - I nearly said the hon., learned and gallant junior member for St. Andrew (Mr. F. G. SMITH: Gallant too.) is quite right in suggesting that the appointment should be made of somebody who is well qualified, because we can have persons with modest qualifications to feel that they are entitled to draw, in this impoverished island, a salary of \$600 a month. This person must be an experienced person

and one who is highly-qualified to do this job. An advertisement should be made for this post and the money which is to be paid out - of course, we cannot contemplate voting this money to be paid out to a person who is the protege or friend of any political party or of any highly-placed person or relative of such person in this Chamber, in the other Chamber or in the Federal Chamber. The salary is too high for the job not to be given to the best possible person. Judged by comparable standards, the Clerk of this House is drawing less money than any of the Clerks of the three areas in respect of Local Government will draw. Without saying that our Clerk should not be paid any more, I am saying that you are going to pay these Clerks more than what you are paying the Clerk of this House, and therefore, in making any appointment, you must have in mind that the person must be a highly-qualified and experienced person to fill this office. I am not voting against this Resolution, but I am throwing out a note of warning to the Government that if and when the money is passed, we expect to hear some high-class appointments made to these very well-paid posts from the standpoint of the salaries paid to other people in this Island who have to be qualified and have a certain amount of experience. These Clerks are to be paid salaries which are even higher than that of a Police Magistrate, and no one is qualified for the post of a Police Magistrate who is not a Barrister and who does not also possess University degrees.

While I am not saying that there are not persons who are brilliant academically, but who lack commonsense and who fill some jobs extremely well, or not as well as some who have not got academic qualifications, yet, I am saying that you are paying to these Clerks, salaries which are higher than those of any Police Magistrate or the Clerk of this House, and you are really envisaging the appointment of some very efficient and competent person. You should advertise widely and make sure that you get the best applicants for this post at this salary. I would not be surprised if the Clerk of this House were to apply for this job of \$640 a month instead of \$520 a month which he is now enjoying. I would not be surprised if a Police Magistrate were to apply for the post of Clerk of one of these areas. We would have to consider whether we could get competent people to apply for the post of Clerk of this House or for a Police Magistracy in this Island. The responsibility is that of the Government to see that if this Resolution is passed the money is not wasted, but that it is expended on nothing but the very best, having regard to the handsome and lucrative salaries the payment of which this Resolution contemplates.

4.55 p.m.

MR. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering myself how this Resolution could have excited so much verbosity, and I am inclined to feel that it is just one of the regular opportunities of making as much talk and as much ado about nothing as is always possible. However, I think the thing that strikes me mostly is the attitude adopted by certain members in feeling that the Hon. Premier has refused to mention any names. As far as I can notice, he may have omitted to mention the name, but I do not think that he will refuse to mention the name of anybody if asked.

I would only like to contribute to this debate in this angle, Mr. Chairman; I would like to feel that Government continues to pay careful attention and provide people with courses in public administration or anything necessary for carrying on of the Government duties as they are becoming so immense. I believe that would be a much more valuable and constructive contribution than the talk about who a person is and whose relative he is. I should like to feel that a more constructive bit of criticism would be that there should be proper provision for courses in public administration which would be of some assistance in doing jobs like these.

MR. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should like to let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph know that he is the most junior member in this Chamber, and he has no right to pass judgment on anything anybody says. It is only because he is young that I would not jump into this debate and open it up again, but I want to warn him that when members on this side speak, they speak as representatives of the people, and neither the people nor the hon.

junior member for St. Joseph has any right to talk about verbosity by members in this Chamber. I spoke and therefore he refers to me, but the only reason I would not speak again is because I cannot make any more useful contribution. He has no right to talk about verbosity. Who gave him the right to do that? If he continues in that vein, he is going to run into trouble in this Chamber.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member who has just sat down. It is all right for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to get up and criticise, but I am wondering whether he thinks it is right to say that we get up and speak a lot of words that mean nothing. It would be infinitely better if the hon. member would sit down and be considered a fool in a matter like this than to get up and open his mouth and confirm it. The hon. member got up and pushed his hands in his pockets and talked about verbosity. I admire the hon. member for speaking; when I came in here I jumped into a debate from the first day, but you could not be more ignorant than to say that hon. members of the Opposition say a lot of words but mean nothing by them. He knows nothing more about this, but wants to let the Government know that he will support them. Take an example from the hon. junior member for St. James and you will do better.

MR. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I hope no hon. member in this Chamber would ever try to cow a new member who for the first time tries to add to the debates of this hon. House. I agree that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has perhaps gone a little too far in this connection, but the time has come when I think he should say what he wanted to say about members on this side. He should however, take my advice and mention whom he is talking about and not generalise. Frankly I am disgusted at the tenor of debates in this House. When you can sit here and hear a member, especially as no appointment has been made, make indicative insinuations or positive assertions, it is time that we look into our own minds and find out the reason why a Socialist M.P. can write a book called "Dwell together in Unity" in which he says that "Since the War. Politics has become little more than a lucrative personal racket". Public life therefore has been almost devoid of the spirit of service. I agree that the hon. member has gone a little bit too far, but his criticism is not a singular one.

MR. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as one who has had the privilege of handling the amendments to the Local Government Bill in 1956, I want to draw to the attention of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that what he has heard from this side of the Table is not all verbosity. I happen to know the numerous ramifications and the amendments of this Bill, and I doubt whether the Premier himself knows much about it up to now. Why not bring down a Statement setting out the progress made on this Bill up to now? It is all right to get up and talk about verbosity, but I happen to know that members on that side know little or nothing of this Bill. The hon. senior member for St. George said that nobody has been appointed, but it is stated here that somebody has been appointed. When the hon. senior member for St. George runs to the rescue of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, he has not read what is written here. This is to give some friend of theirs a job as has been done in other cases recently. The object of this Resolution is to provide money to pay a few people for one or two years; so you should not be misled that next month or in December you will have Local Government established. Another year or two will pass, because from 1953 to 1958 they have been playing around with this.

Mr. Lighthurn has gone back for reasons of health, but he was efficient and you want a man of the calibre of Mr. Lighthurn to establish this. Is this money to pay Clerks and certain officers, or is it to pay high-salaried men for not doing the work? It is all right for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph supported by the hon. senior member for St. George to boost the Government. I know that Government does not know what they are doing up to now. Imagine paying a District Local Commissioner who is not trained specially or has special qualifications more than a Judge of the Assistant Court of Appeal. That is what is happening here, because you are paying a man in this post more than a Magistrate or a Judge.

5.05 p.m.

Too far east is west. That is what is happening here today. Tell me how many posts there are in which the salaries are that of a Judge. What is the use of qualifying in certain legal professions when if you become a favoured person with the present Government set-up you can get a big job? That is the position obtaining here and I resent the hon. junior member for St. Joseph getting up and insulting people. He has just come in here to insult people who happen to know the inside of these things. Government is creating sinecures. This job is a sinecure because he is going to train people and he has not the necessary ability or education. He is going to train people who can probably train him. Yet he will get \$600 a month to do that job. You find that there are jobs right down the line for which persons are handpicked. They are handpicked by the Executive Committee. Members of that Committee have the opportunity of helping their friends.

Now, Let me see how many more of their friends they can help by this Resolution. The Local Government Commissioner has already been appointed by them. You also have to appoint a Clerk and a Treasurer for the City area. That means two more persons. You also have to appoint another Clerk and another Treasurer for the Northern area and two more for the Southern area. Then you have another Local Government Officer and a Stenographer. That means two more persons; therefore, the Government has the opportunity of helping eight more persons in new posts. You have helped one so far and if an hon. member can come in here and does not understand the game of politics, let him try and learn it. I predict that in another year or two this thing will not be set up but the salaries will have been voted and they will play the game for another year or two.

MR. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate. I am sorry if I have been a bit too inconclusive with the remarks I have made. I have heard one or two pretty good contributions made on that side of the House and if I had used the term verbosity - and I think the term applies to them - I am sorry if it hurts them. I heard the hon. senior member for the City say that he would vote for the Bill. I also heard the hon. members who claimed that they are the Official Opposition say that there was nothing good in this Resolution. I think that it is the duty of the Official Opposition, if they say that they are not going to support something, to say positively what they recommend. When I hear the Opposition say what they did and criticised the Resolution and then other people say that they would support it but the Opposition does not say what they recommend, I think it is time that the people become enlightened to these matters.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph takes his impertinence somewhere else. The Opposition is not here to take impertinence from him or from any hon. member on that side of the Chamber.

HON. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I think in "May's" the word "impertinence" used in reference to another hon. member is out of order.

MR. CRAWFORD: Do not bother over thinking; you ought to know. While the hon. member is thinking, I will go on.

HON. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The hon. member is out of order.

MR. CRAWFORD: You cannot say that I am out of order because you are thinking so. We are glad to hear that the hon. member can think but let him get his thoughts resolved before he tells us about them.

I say that the hon. member on that side who told us what to do is impertinent. There is nobody who can tell us what to do with regard to the Opposition. If the Opposition feels that they are not going to support a Bill and they feel like saying why, that is a matter for them, but they have not got to say so.

Hon. members who cast their minds back will see the length of time that this matter was hanging fire. I see in the Addendum to the Resolution that the Local Government Commissioner, Mr. Lightburn, has relinquished his duties for reasons of health. I know that Mr. Lightburn was absolutely fed up and disgusted with the unconscionable delay on the part of the Government in implementing his recommendations with regard to Local Government reform.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. In connection with the word "impertinent" used by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, in May's Sixteenth Edition, on page 474 it is stated that no member should refer to another member as impertinent.

MR. CRAWFORD: Let us hear exactly what it says.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A list of offensive words is given there and one of them is "impertinent".

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Philip that on page 474 of May's, you find certain expressions which a member cannot use of another and in those expressions, you find the word "impertinence".

MR. CRAWFORD: To what does it apply? A remark or a member?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is set out.

MR. CRAWFORD: What is set out? We have to be sure what we are doing. In other words, is it unparliamentary to say that a remark is impertinent or to say that a member is impertinent? Which is wrong? 5.15 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Philip. Rule 129 of the Rules of this House says this:

"No member may use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House."

And on page 474 of "May's" the word "impertinent" is set out among the expressions which have caused the Chair to intervene from time to time in the Debate. I am therefore asking the hon. member to withdraw the word "impertinent" which has been used with reference to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

MR. CRAWFORD: Well, let us say that it is the height of presumption on the hon. member's part.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member withdraw the word?

MR. CRAWFORD: I do so with the greatest respect if "May's" is so ticklish on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member withdrawing the word?

MR. CRAWFORD: I said I withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I now hear that.

MR. CRAWFORD: It is the height of presumption for any member of the Government Party, constituted as it is now, to presume to tell the Opposition how to carry out its business. If the Opposition feels that an issue before the House is not deserving of its support, it need not explain anything in detail to anybody as to why it is not going to support that issue. More often than not when you explain in too much detail, you talk above the heads of the Government, as happened last Tuesday, and, as you will remember, with the Markets and Slaughterhouses Bill which came back here with 53 amendments. Mr. Lightburn sat on his heels in Country Road for fully three years, glad for work to do, and told his friends that never in his life has he had to deal with individuals like those which comprised the Government. If hon. members had been following the "Maude" Report, they would have seen its age.

Ask the Government what they have done during all this time. Mr. Ramsay went to England and had a course and returned; the "Maude" Report must be about five or six years old. I understand that it was produced in 1952. In other words, six years have elapsed and what have they done in that six years? Is it necessary for the Opposition to come in here and give details for the benefit of hon. members who have now come, because they do not know what has flown under the bridge? It is for them to sit and learn, but to come here and state that we have repeated all that we said *ad nauseam* from 1952 until now is both stupidity and presumption. I believe it is more a question of disgust than ill health on Mr. Lightburn's part, he having to sit down and do nothing and we paid him all these years for doing nothing. If Mr. Lightburn is ill - and we are sorry to hear that he is ill - it is due to the lack of activity. Some people instead of wearing out, rust out, and Mr. Lightburn rusted out; the Government sat down and continued to pay him his salary month after month and year after year for doing nothing. From the beginning of the current Session, the Officer administering the Government said that the Local Government elections would be held later this year and people would be looking forward to these elections being held this year. The Officer administering the Government told us earlier this year that we would have Local Government elections this year and instead of the Government coming down and saying: "We are going to have Local Government elections on a specified date" what do they say? They say that it is expected that it would have been possible to hold these elections before the end of the year. Is that good enough, Mr. Chairman? As a matter of fact, the entire Island knows that so much has been done to lay the framework for Local Government elections that it is almost beyond the realm of possibility that they will be held this year. In spite of the fact that they have not put down any definite date for these elections, they are going to appoint a number of officers whose duties are not quite clear. If more work had been done for setting up a basis for elections and the subsequent formation of Local Government Bodies, one could well understand the practicability of beginning with these officials now; but, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask you something; what will a Local Government Commissioner, a Local Government Officer, a Clerk and a Treasurer in the City area, a Clerk and a Treasurer in the Northern area and a Clerk and a Treasurer in the Southern area do from now until these elections are held? One must remember that the Vestries are still in existence; each Vestry has a Vestry Clerk and each parish still has a Parochial Treasurer; therefore it does appear to me that this is an unnecessary duplication of offices. If you still have your Parochial Treasurers and your Vestry Clerks, what on earth are these additional Treasurers to do at this stage? Do you mean to say that we are so well off with money which we cannot find for essential purposes, that we can afford to squander \$33,000 odd between now and the end of the year appointing these people to Local Government Offices when the Local Government Offices are so far from even the appearance of beginning to function? The Government told us last year that they could not find money for educational purposes and we are to remove the Sixth Form at the St. Michael's Girls' School on the grounds of economy; but we can find money to squander to the extent of \$33,000 odd for reasons which are not clearly defined. Can any hon. member on that side of the House tell this Committee in reality what work there will be to keep these gentlemen employed from now until when these Councils will function next year? Must we appoint all of these people now? If you, Sir, or anybody else in this Chamber - as a matter of fact, if all of us in here had had the pleasure and privilege of hearing the comments of Mr. Lightburn as to the scandalous manner in which this Government has gone about the translation of the local Vestry system into the proposed system, we would not vote one cent of this money today, and incidentally, Mr. Lightburn is not the only Head of a Department who is fed up with the Government's policy in this matter. It is a scandal throughout the service; the laziness of the Government, the indifference of the Government and the slow, slow tiresome process by which anything is being done in this Island is indeed scandalous.

5.25 p.m.

I am not going to vote this money, Mr. Chairman, because

I do not see that at this stage it is justifiable to expend this money for the purposes set out in this Resolution. For instance, Mr. Chairman, this Bill to set up these Local Government bodies was riddled with errors and had to come back before this Legislature. God only knows when it will become Law. It has to come here in the slow snail-like fashion in which Government does its duties, then it may be discussed one of these days, then it has to go back to the Other Place to be passed, and Mr. Chairman, neither you nor I nor anybody else knows when it is likely to become Law. As a matter of fact, I go so far as to say that if the amending Bill were before the House now, I would vote this money; but for God's sake, let us get on with the local machinery for creating these Councils before we begin to spend money on officials of the Council, when only God knows when the actual Councils themselves will begin to exist.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, there are a few questions which I would like to answer. The hon. junior member for Christ Church asked about the amendments to the Bill. The amendments to the Bill, I have every reason to believe, will be presented to this House in another four or six weeks. The date of the elections we cannot say definitely.

Now the hon. senior member for the City asked a question. When Mr. Lightburn came here there was a member of the Civil Service who who seconded to work with him. As a matter of fact, Mr. Lightburn chose that gentleman himself. He worked with Mr. Lightburn all the time he was here and in addition he was sent on Mr. Lightburn's recommendation to one or two of the best Councils in England for training. The gentleman has already been appointed; so there is no secret; his name is Mr. Ramsay. Of course, I do not want to answer those nasty remarks about whose relative he is. Mr. Ramsay happens not to be related to anybody on this side of the Chamber. I do not usually go to that level in the gutter, but to clear the air I want to say that he is not related to anybody over here. Besides the hon. member knows that we do not appoint anybody.

MR. TALMA: On a point of order. Is the Hon. Premier referring to me?

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: After Mr. Lightburn took sick and had to leave, obviously the best person to succeed him was the person whom he had trained and who had been to England for further training.

MR. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Ramsay is the brother-in-law of Mr. D. H. L. Ward and a protégé of the present Federal Labour Party Government. I think it was the hon. junior member for St. John who made the point, but in his absence I wanted to make things clear.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Of course, that sort of thing does not emanate from the minds of this side of the Table.

As I said before, Mr. Ramsay has been trained, and that is why I am asking for the appointment of these Clerks and Treasurers as soon as possible, so that he should have these men trained by the time the new Local Government Act is introduced. I really do not see any objection to that. Everybody knows the difference between the present Vestry system and the Local Government system. If you do not know anything about it you should be trained.

Now the hon. senior member for Christ Church said that he had to do a lot with this Bill when it was first here, and that nobody over here knows anything about it. Ten members were elected to a Select Committee and the hon. senior member for Christ Church happened to be one. As far as I know he did not handle the Bill in this House; he did not pilot it through the House for him to say that he had to clear up a lot of things, and that he is the only man who knows anything about this.

MR. TALMA: On a point of order. On one occasion I handled both the Local Government Bill and the Representation of the People Bill when the Hon. Premier had to attend some Conference either in Curacao or Aruba. The

present Minister of Communications was out of the island and the present Hon. Minister of Trade declined to handle these Government Bills because he was not *au fait*; the ex-Premier was ill at Tyrol Cot soon after the hurricane in 1956, so if the hon. member does not know he should not try to discredit anybody.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Hon. Minister of Communications who is now the Minister of Trade was quite right not to handle the Bill because he knew nothing about it, and obviously a member who sat on the Committee was the person to handle it because he knew more about it. 5.35 p.m.

MR. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Premier is trying to make me out a liar. He said that I handled it when it was dealt with in Committee I am saying that I handled it in here.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: That is what I was saying. I am saying that you know more about it than the hon. senior member for St. Michael. Sir, I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. George is not here because he quoted a reference in answer to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, by John Hatch. It applied to Trinidad. I have it here before me. Barbados was not mentioned at all.

MR. MOTTLEY: Before the Hon. Premier sits down, I would just like him to answer me one question. I see here included in the Resolution the sum of \$1,145 for equipment. Can the Hon. Premier tell me what has become of the equipment used by Mr. Lightburn? I attended that office several times and at his office there were typewriters, tables, desks and chairs.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As far as I can remember, those bits of furniture were borrowed; a desk from here and a typewriter from there. Now that we are establishing the Department, we have to give them furniture.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. Mapp, seconded by Hon. F. E. Miller, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee and asked leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the sitting of the House be now suspended for half an hour.

HON. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

5.45 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On resumption,

MR. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1958-59 No. 3 TRADE DISPUTES

HON. R. G. MAPP: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$5,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the estimates 1958-59, Part 1, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1958-59, No. 3 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. As hon. members will see from the Addendum to this Resolution, the provision in the Estimates for this item, Trade Disputes, is \$2,000. As hon. members will know, this estimate has been really based on previous years' estimates and it is impossible to foretell what will happen in any one year. It has so happened, as this Committee knows quite well, that we

have had a Trade Dispute and we have had to set up a Board of Enquiry into the Sugar Industry and the result is that it has cost us \$3,000 more than what was estimated. We have come down for this amount of \$5,500 in order that we can have a further amount in reserve should there be further enquiries this year.

Hon. members are aware that it is the intention of the Government to have a further enquiry into the Industry as was broadcast by the Hon. Premier, and we have therefore come down for the total amount which will give us a reserve of \$2,000. We are now asking that this amount in the Estimates be supplemented by \$5,500.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

HON. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should like to say a few words. This Resolution has been found necessary, according to the Addendum, because of disputes in the Sugar Industry, and supplementary provision is now required to meet the past calls as well as to make provision for possible calls during the rest of the year. What is fore-shadowed therefore, is the possibility of further enquiries into the Sugar Industry as has been confirmed by the Hon. Minister who is in charge of the Resolution. This enquiry deals only with Trade Disputes and one thing which has emerged from the past trade dispute is that whether you have a Board of Enquiry or not, the workers in the industry are fairly able to take care of themselves. There is another section of the industry to which I want to make a passing reference while we are discussing this Resolution; I am suggesting that the terms of reference of any subsequent enquiry which is conducted this year into the Sugar Industry should include an investigation into the price which is being paid for canes. It is not very often realised that the price for canes forms an unimportant part of the remuneration of Sugar Workers, for the simple reason that a great portion of these workers reap canes mostly from the rented land - - - -

MR. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. I do not see what relevance that has to the Resolution on hand. Are you going to re-open the whole dispute now?

MR. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is apparently very anxious to have himself heard. On a matter like this,

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member said that he wanted to make passing reference to the matter; he will recall that. I am advising him, therefore, not to go very far into the Sugar Industry as a whole.

MR. CRAWFORD: If the intervener is anxious to have himself heard and if he knows anything about trade disputes or anything about the Sugar Industry, there is ample scope for him to speak later on during the debate on this Resolution. You must have read here in this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, that the Addendum says that this money is necessary, because of a dispute in the Sugar Industry; therefore, I am entirely within my right to make a passing reference to all phases of the industry which are involved in the dispute. That is what I was saying when I was unfortunately and misguidedly interrupted; I was saying that the price paid for canes constitutes an important part of the wages of sugar workers. I am saying, Sir, in all seriousness I am well within the scope of the debate to make this reference and I am not really debarred from talking about cane prices as such. (Laughter). I can well understand the joviality of the hon. senior member for St. George, but not the joviality of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. While within the scope of the Resolution, I can talk about cane prices as such; I can talk about cane prices in so far as they apply to agricultural workers. The majority of workers grow canes on the eighth of an acre, quarter acre or half an acre of land which they rent from the estate on which they work and you, Mr. Chairman, although you do not represent a rural constituency, you keep your ears so closely down to what is passing that I am sure you must have heard the rumblings of discontent among agricultural workers in the dispute not only with regard to the wages they were paid, but also with regard to the price which they were getting for canes. Therefore, I say that in the

interest of all who sell canes, and in view of the fact that the price which is being paid for canes throughout the Island by all of the factories does not bear any proper relation to the price of sugar. If the Government is interested in the matter, the Government would see to it that any subsequent enquiry into the industry includes an inquiry into the price paid by sugar factories for canes. 6.30 p.m.

Most of us will welcome the news there is to be a further inquiry, and we also sincerely hope that no extraneous pressure will be brought to bear on any subsequent inquiry, as was attempted last time, to influence the decision of the investigation. It is well known, Sir, that political pressure was attempted on the part of the last enquirers in the Sugar Industry, and it was a scandalous and almost criminal thing; therefore I am justified in sounding a note of warning now that investigations of this kind are expected to be beyond reproach, and that no outside interference from any level should be allowed to influence their decisions one way or another. The Report must be based on the facts which they have found after a thorough and impartial investigation. The enormous profits being made by the Sugar Industry in Barbados warrant a thorough inquiry. It is all well and good for people to disparage a dispute as we have heard, and to speak in terms as if the entire issue was unnecessary but when it is known, Mr. Chairman, or remembered that the Sugar Industrialists in this island were actually trying to get away with an extra \$4 million profit, then the justification for the dispute becomes so apparent that one marvels. In British Guiana last year in consequence of the wide variations in sugar prices as between the price of sugar sold in the guaranteed market - - -

MR. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, - - -

MR. CRAWFORD: I am not giving way at all, because what I am saying is relative to the Resolution.

MR. F. G. SMITH: Am I to understand that the amount of money which is being passed is for canes?

MR. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member is not sober or is sleeping, I would suggest that he wakes up, because if he is not asleep, he is conveying the impression that he is not sober, because I have not said anything about canes in the last ten minutes.

MR. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, perhaps I woke up when I left the Party to which the hon. member belongs. (Cheers from Government Bench.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Having made a passing reference in connection with the price of canes, I am asking the hon. member to stick to the Resolution.

MR. CRAWFORD: I am talking about the sugar industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already made the point.

MR. CRAWFORD: Which point?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point about the terms of reference in the Sugar Industry, and I am suggesting to you not to go any further into the Sugar Industry dispute.

MR. CRAWFORD: Are you suggesting that I am talking about the price of canes? I thought you were listening to what I was saying. I can understand the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, because he left the Party to which I belong because we could not give him a job; we could not make him a Magistrate or Solicitor General. (Laughter)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to deal with the Resolution.

MR. CRAWFORD: Apparently you did not object when the hon. member made the remark that he woke up when he left the Party to which I belong. The point is that he still will not get the job. I am saying, Sir, that this Resolution refers to a dispute in the sugar industry; and if members of this Committee realise what we are dealing with, any of them with any iota of understanding would understand the justification for my remarks. If I am not allowed to

comment on the sugar industry or the unfair conditions existing in it, I would like to ask why are they going to appoint another Committee. If everything is now fair, reasonable and satisfactory, why do they want more money? You are asking for money to have another enquiry, and I am telling you that it would take a long time before anybody can stop me from talking on this. The implication is as clear as a pike staff; Government itself is not satisfied with conditions in the industry; and if the Government is implying here today that they know that there is still something wrong in the Sugar Industry, it is crass ignorance for me as an elected representative of the people of Barbados to sit down and not say what is wrong. The dispute this year was quite justified because of the wide variations in prices between sugar sold on the guaranteed market and sugar sold on the international and free market. As a matter of fact, I go so far as to say that one of the reasons for this dispute was because the workers themselves engaged in the industry realised that there was a record production and fluctuation of prices, and they were not getting a fair share from the price of sugar. I cited the fact that in British Guiana where the sugar industrialists made an extra \$2 million, they were fair enough, and without any dispute, to present the workers with \$1 million out of the \$2 million which they made. In Barbados where so many millions extra were made, they had to have a row to get their share. 6.40 p.m.

I submit that it is because the Government itself is convinced of the view that conditions are not fair in so far as that industry is concerned that they themselves are willing to spend money to get somebody here to make full enquiry into the industry. As I have said before, I want the man to do the job thoroughly and impartially, and I do not want anybody to influence his decision one way or the other. If the dissatisfaction in the sugar industry were minor or settled already, there would be no cause for a further inquiry and one sincerely hopes that the money we have voted today for another enquiry would be very well spent, and at the end of this subsequent enquiry there shall be little cause for dissatisfaction on the part of either the workers or the small cane producers in the sugar industry.

MR. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I rise to endorse the remarks of the previous speaker and I will not tire hon. members in repeating what he said. I feel very pleased to hear the Hon. Minister who introduced this Resolution say that a further enquiry into the Sugar Industry will take place very soon. I presume that the enquiry would be of an economic nature and in a way as that which was done by Professor Sheppard. I would suggest that the Hon. Minister, and the Government, in appointing an expert or experts to do this job, select men of the calibre of Professor Sheppard who did a good job in going into the economics of the sugar industry on the last occasion and something fair and equitable to the sugar workers island wide. When you think of men of his calibre, of his ability and training, you can think of nobody better than Dr. Jolly of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture; and it is only if you get a man of that calibre that the workers will feel that they are not robbed, as they felt this year when we of the Democratic Labour Party had to go to their assistance and had to bring pressure to bear on the Government who claims to represent the same class of people.

Sir, imagine the Board of Enquiry into this dispute recommending a 7% ad hoc bonus to be paid out to sugar workers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for Christ Church. Keep to the Resolution.

MR. TALMA: I am dealing with the recommendations of the last Commission of Enquiry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What the Board of Enquiry did is not in the Resolution.

MR. TALMA: This Resolution is for money to pay these people, and I am saying here and now that the Board of Enquiry made certain recommendations which merely confused the minds of the sugar workers, and I am referring to the recommendations with respect to the ad

hoc bonus. That is not clear to the workers. The 7% ad hoc bonus means an additional 7% in wages. Why not say that and pay it weekly? Why say that it is a bonus? Up to now the workers have not been paid the 7% ad hoc bonus and the Government should not allow a Board of enquiry to make recommendations to confuse workers. The Government is a Labour Government which claims to represent the same workers. The members of the Government got in here on the back of these same workers and cane cutters; and now that they are in power, they are forgetting the same people who put them into power. Recommendations have been made which they cannot understand and which apparently will never be implemented; and if they are implemented the workers will never know the conditions thereof. If you want another enquiry like that, you will have another confusion; and when that confusion stirs up again you will be saying: "political mongrels" referring to members of the Democratic Labour Party. Now that you are in power, you will say that; but when you are out of power, you will not say that.

I am suggesting to the Government which claims to represent the cane-cutters as they formerly did represent them, that they see that a man of proper calibre be appointed to enquire into the economics of the industry. Only an economic expert should be appointed. He should be a man who understands figures and who can work out the economics of this thing. I welcome the statement made by the Hon. Minister and I do hope a proper man will be chosen; and the man of the proper calibre to choose is Dr. Jolly. It is only by the appointment of a man like him who would be impartial that the workers will get a square deal and a just reward.

MR. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, unlike my colleagues I really agree with the Government that they may well have to hold another Board of Enquiry soon into the sugar industry because the agricultural workers of this colony have had such a bitter experience that they are not prepared to start cutting canes at the beginning of the next crop season until they know where they stand.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not know if the hon. member is serious about what he is saying. He has made a very strong statement.

MR. TUDOR: For the benefit of the hon. senior member for the City and his colleagues, I have said that the agricultural workers of this colony - the cane cutters - are not going to reap the cane crop at the beginning of the next crop season until they know where they stand in the matter of wages and the conditions of work. Put that in the *Beacon* next week. I say that, Mr. Chairman, because of the bitter experience they have had in the last two months in this dispute which has just passed, and I agree with my colleague, the hon. senior member for Christ Church, for pinning quite emphatically all the blame and the responsibility for that dispute on the shoulders of the hon. members opposite. They are the people who even before they knew or investigated all the facts of the case ran with indecent haste to the microphones or on public platforms to take the side of the employers in the sugar industry against the employees.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Is that anything to do with the Resolution? This Resolution deals with money to provide for trade disputes.
6.50 p.m.

MR. TUDOR: As a matter of fact, something has just come to my mind which had escaped me. The hon. member who has just crossed me to no purpose, I mean the Premier, made an ineffectual attempt to stem the tide and landed in an ants' nest. (Laughter). That was the limit of his contribution to the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is true that this Resolution makes reference to the payment of expenses in the recent enquiry, but the Report of the Board is not before us, as I have already said. I do not agree with the hon. member in going into this matter.

MR. TUDOR: With all due respect to you, I have fought many battles in this House with regard to the freedom of

hon. members in the debate, I hope to fight many more and I hope that during Your Honour's regime you will not clash with me. It is a breach of privilege for you to interpret the matter in that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will not have any clash with me as long as I am in the Chair.

MR. TUDOR: If the Chair is right, I am not suffering any breaches of the privileges of hon. members in debate. I know the Rules of Parliament as well as any hon. member of this House, and I propose to debate this Resolution in the way I know it. The trouble with this Resolution is, Mr. Chairman, that the Hon. Minister has not told this House that the money which we voted in the Estimates was not sufficient to cover the expenses of the last enquiry; he made an attempt to do it, but he did not sufficiently make it clear. If he wants money, both to pay the expenses of the last enquiry and also for those of further enquiries, then it is pertinent to this debate to refer to the cause of a trade dispute, the cause of the enquiry and the enquiry itself; I will not be beaten off that point. They went to the microphones; they went on public platforms. (MR. MOTTLEY: They, who?) The members opposite; they intervened into the dispute precisely in the way they should not have intervened in it, and on the side of which they should not have intervened, in order to make the workers believe that the dispute never existed.

HON. R. G. MAPP: On a point of Order. The hon. member is out of order, and he is doing that for mischievous purposes.

MR. TUDOR: I take that word "mischievous" to be unparliamentary and offensive, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

HON. R. G. MAPP: When the hon. member

MR. TUDOR: On a point of Order. I deem the hon. member's remark "mischievous" to be offensive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Two hon. members are on the floor; will the Hon. Minister take his seat?

HON. R. G. MAPP: I am speaking on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The word "mischievous" does not appear in the expressions which are set out in "May's" as being offensive. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. TUDOR rose to speak.

HON. R. G. MAPP: On what is the hon. member speaking? You have already ruled, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled as to the use of the word "mischievous" and that is the end of it. The word does not appear in "May's" as an offensive word.

MR. CRAWFORD: On a point of order

HON. R. G. MAPP: How can the hon. member be on a point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Philip take his seat?

MR. CRAWFORD: On a point of Order

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas is speaking on a point of order; I will hear him.

HON. R. G. MAPP: I am speaking on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am hearing you.

HON. R. G. MAPP: I am saying that this Resolution here is not to provide for the setting up of a Board of En-

quiry into any disputes; this Board has already sat. If the hon. member wants to enquire into any cause, any perverted cause that he may have

MR. TUDOR: I object to the use of the word "perverted" by the hon. member.

HON. R. G. MAPP: I am speaking on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Objection has been taken to the use of the word "perverted" by the hon. member, and I am asking him to withdraw it.

HON. R. G. MAPP: I will withdraw that word and say that if the hon. member wants to enquire into any cause which, in the opinion of others, is a righteous cause—if this Resolution sought to provide for the setting up of a Board of enquiry, the hon. member's remarks would have been in order; but they are now out of order. Fancy, in a serious matter like this, instead of the hon. member rising on a substantive motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has made his point of order.

HON. R. G. MAPP: I will bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Lucy may proceed.

MR. TUDOR: I am mentioning this because you will see how relative it is to what we have under discussion now. The Government members had the effrontery to tell the cane cutters that if they did not go back to work, if they did not do what they wanted them to do and did it quite promptly, they would be ruining the economy of the island. However, they did not tell the other side that; they could not tell them that, because they were afraid to do so. One of their own colleagues, who was a member of the Other Place and who is now a Senator in the Federal Parliament, was on the point of buying a plantation and was offering £35,000 for it; he was prepared to buy it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, what is that to do with the Board of Enquiry? How does that affect it?

MR. TUDOR: It is simply to substantiate my point that the Government Party was telling that to all the land owners and the big employers of labour, because one of their members who was to be a landowner and who has now been appointed a Senator in the Federal Parliament held back. I am talking about Dr. Cato and I am talking about Clermont Plantation.
7.00 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already drawn to your attention that that has no connection with the Resolution, and if you continue I will have to rule.

MR. TUDOR: They had to set up a Board of Enquiry because the kind of connection which they had with the other side made it impossible for them to speak with a clear voice to both sides of the Industry. They had to take sides with one and tell the other side to do things to the other's disapproval. They could not imagine that when they came to us to ask for money, because they have exhausted what was given to them because of that enquiry, that we were going to use our freedom to question them and their policy to the dispute which has gone. They had a top level conference at the Ministerial Buildings to decide whether they should arrest members of the Democratic Labour Party and the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That has no bearing to this Resolution; if you continue to say things which are not relevant, I will have to rule you out of order.

MR. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, if you choose to rule me out of order, I cannot stop you, but I will still speak. They wanted to have us arrested along with the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is now absent, because we represented the workers and put them to shame. It is only because one of them, more cowardly than the others but with a little more foresight, saw through the thing and warned them against it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am warning the hon. member for the last time that the points he is making have absolutely nothing to do with this Resolution, and the very next time he says anything irrelevant, I shall rule him out of order.

MR. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I sympathise with you for what must be a difficult task, but you interrupt me so often that it is difficult for me to put my thoughts to you as quickly as possible; I have to give you in bits. That was the stand they took to their eternal shame and when they brought the Committee of Enquiry here, the most important of them did all manner of things to humbug the working of the Committee to make it give a biased Report; for it is reported that a person not now a member of this House but serving in another capacity, had the Chairman of the Board of Enquiry to dinner and begged him not to award anything at all to the workers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is again straying.

MR. TUDOR: May I continue, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. (After a pause) The hon. member may continue.

MR. TUDOR: I am thankful to hear that I am in order. I was saying when I sat down that an influential member of their Party, having the most influence, is reported to have put pressure on the Chairman of that Committee of Enquiry not to award anything at all to the agricultural workers. Now we find ourselves here being asked to give them more money to provide for a contingency which they have not explained to us, but which they just say is foreseeable. At what time, may I ask, during the rest of this year are we to have this other Committee of Enquiry set up for the purpose of adjudicating agricultural disputes? If they feel that the position is not yet satisfactory, and that soon from now another Committee will have to sit, which is what they imply, they have a right to tell this House that. If, on the contrary, they do not foresee any such contingency or if they do not believe that it would be necessary for another Committee of Enquiry to sit, they do not need all this money, and the Addendum itself, as it is worded, is an incitement to industrial disputes in this island. If you feel that there is going to be a dispute, you should tell us why you want the money; if you know there is not going to be, it is they on the other side who are irresponsible people who are fighting perverted purposes and using the people's money for inciting a riot.

I notice, Mr. Chairman, that when the Democratic Labour Party has to do anything, there is always weeping and gnashing of teeth, and even those people who do not have so that they can gnash. The hon. junior member for St. James is the case at point.
7.10 p.m.

Well, our party exists for one purpose only and that is to see that agricultural workers and all underprivileged persons in this island get their fair share of the wealth of this island. I am sorry that an hon. member who was a foundation member of our Party and who at our last annual Conference spoke to the assembled delegates in open session was asleep when all that happened. There was no member around where we are sitting who did not seem to like him: so I wonder why he was asleep; but he must decide what side of the helm and what side in politics is good for him. I do not think it is a good thing for him to deprive of his counsel and services the association which he has enjoyed and which he, when he enjoyed it, found pleasant and courteous.

HON. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I really had no intention of joining in this debate, but I do so because of certain remarks which the last speaker made against the Government. He is playing to the gallery, hoping to get political recognition, hoping that the agricultural workers are so gullible as not to know their friends and he is trying to do the thing which another organisation has done in the past and failed miserably.

We have all agreed that there is need for investigation into the economics of the sugar industry. We thought that

it would have come before from the side of the Union. The Government is not here to initiate a dispute between workers as such and their employers, but members of the Democratic Labour Party are trying to fool the agricultural workers throughout the length and breadth of the country and trying to make them believe that the Government should initiate an inquiry when these negotiations were going on.

What are the facts? When these negotiations were going on and the Hon. Minister of Labour was told by the Labour Commissioner that there was likely to be a deadlock in these negotiations and there was likely to be a breakdown, the Minister of Labour and myself as Minister of Agriculture—although I had no business really in the dispute of the workers: it was a labour question and not an agricultural question coming under my portfolio; but because I was interested in the matter and the workers, we met the members of the Sugar Producers Association along with members of the Labour Office and we discussed this matter most amicably. We asked the members of the Sugar Producers Association to try and settle this thing at once and fairly and squarely. They are all alive. They were anxious to do so but they asked pertinent questions. This is what they said: "The Head of the Union who is the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union made an agreement with us. It was a three-year agreement and this is now tantamount to blackmail that he refuses to recognise that agreement. They went on to say: 'It is not the money which we have to pay out about which we are worried; we are worried about the principle, because if we settle it today in this manner the same thing may arise tomorrow.'" They were about to give in when we asked them not to do anything which would harm the industry, but they insisted on the three-year agreement which, they argued, existed.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister said something which might be misinterpreted and I am trying to put him right. He said that they were about to give in. That can be understood to mean that they were about to give more. I am doing this because I have a great regard for the Hon. Minister. What I am doing for the Hon. Minister I would not do for a lot of hon. members over on that side.

HON. D. D. GARNER: I do not think the hon. member has quite understood me. I am capable of saying what I am saying. I particularly emphasised that the members of the Sugar Federation were concerned over the fact that they had a three-year agreement in existence and it was on that point of principle they became adamant. Therefore, they felt that all we were telling them in the interest of the workers and of the industry meant nothing to them save the principle which they felt was broken.

When it comes to some of these irresponsible statements by members over there about cane cutters, it should always be noted that a Government exists to maintain law and order, and there are those who would like to go about stirring up strife only to get political recognition and to get responsible places and then the workers would be scattered. I know a lot of people who are talking of the poor worker, the poor agricultural workers and the like, if some of the people were to know what was done to the agricultural workers behind closed doors, a lot of people who now stand up and laugh will not laugh. If I were to get worthless and were to tell the workers of this island, as I see I will have to do at a later time, what was done to them by some of the people who talked of the poor worker and the poor agricultural workers, I am sure they would not believe it. I sometimes feel sorry that some people seem to have no soul, no sense of respect; and I am going to warn people of this island to be very careful when they hear certain people talking of the poor unfortunate fellow. I am only saying: be very careful.

Mr. Chairman, going back to the Resolution, I want to say that the money is necessary because the Government has decided that it must have another enquiry into the economics of the sugar industry. We want to know the facts. We want to know how much the employers in the industry can pay. Because of that, we must have expert

knowledge. However, do not expect the Government to foment chaos when in truth and fact the Government is responsible to all the citizens of the island. A Government exists to maintain law and order. We could only get at that time a Commission of Enquiry into the working of the industry, but the people are not being told that the unscrupulous politicians who are hoping to ride to power on the backs of ignorance. I say that it is not only ignorance, but lies. Sir, I had the misfortune in my parish to hear a meeting and from what I have heard, Ananias is small in comparison with some members of the Democratic Labour Party. He is like a Sunday-school teacher.

This is what I am going to say and I say it in all sincerity. We sit and watch what one man can do. We see them joining back friends together. When you see that, you have to be very careful because you know that there is no real alliance and there is no reality; the only thing which they have in common is that they each wish to head the Labour Party. Sir, I can tell you a lot of things; but what I am going to say is that all of the people of Barbados are not gullible or foolish. They were presented with a spectacle more grave than this at one time or the other, and after all the riding on the waves, I saw sanity.

7.20 p.m.

MR. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. I think that the hon. member has answered the extraneous matters raised in this debate and it is time that we get something done in this Chamber.

HON. D. D. GARNER: How could I sit here as a responsible Minister and allow each member over there to get up and say things which are utterly untrue and then it goes into the Press? The Press reports what the Opposition says and not what we say in reply. If they think that we cannot reply we will reply, and we will reply effectively on the platform and in here. I am not afraid of anybody; the day that I am afraid of any human being like myself, may God take my life! I am not afraid; afraid of whom or what? All these slanders by all these people who want to get into power through ignorance and lies must fail. With these cheap lies, and dirty slanders working on other people's character are you not ashamed? Do you not realise that you have to enter Eternity? This is a short life, a mere span, and more time will be spent in Eternity than you will spend here.

If you hurt your brother's character by lying on him, then you are worst than a thief. I would rather be a thief than a liar. What are you trying to do? When you get here and make people feel that you feel more for them than this Government feels for them, that is a joke. We are not going to use the reference which they have used. When I was among the people who constitute the Sugar Producers' Association they were at pains to press the point that they did not want to do anything to embarrass the Government. We do not want to hide anything in the Sugar Industry, but we asked if there was an Agreement, was there a three year Agreement or not? That is the answer which they wanted. When you want to slander somebody and say that somebody did not want the agricultural labourers to get more money, why do you say that? You say it because it suits your purpose to say it, but you should not throw these things against people. If you do that, do you not realise that your own people will reap it? Have you not got a soul? This malicious slander and all that is said is said merely for the purpose of capturing the Government; but when you capture the Government, what have you done? Have politicians not got any soul?

Mr. Chairman, I am going to stop now, but I will say this: this money is for the purpose of enquiring into the economics of the Sugar Industry. I want to say here and now that there is no member here, whether he belongs to or represents a rural district or otherwise, who has not got the agricultural workers—and as a matter of fact, all workers—at heart. We cannot play politics as hon. members—at least some of them over there—are trying to play. Quite recently, there seems to have been a new wave of resurrection; somebody seems to have resurrected somebody. I do not know who it is, but, Mr. Chairman, I will say this: the workers of this colony after this phase has been passed will, as in the past, realise who are their friends, who are inspiring them and who are trying to incite them.

Nobody is saying that the Barbados Workers' Union should not try to get more money for the workers, because I have preached all over this Island that these workers should join the Union. Some of the people whom you hear talking have no Union; they do not investigate anything about the conditions of workers; it is only after the workers could not get enough or sufficient quota to get his canes sent in to the factories that he became disgruntled. The quota system, the loss of factories in this island, is what is having a grave reflection on the industry now. As the cost of living, we control the cost of items abroad; hon. members say that we should not do anything about it. Only yesterday, in my office, a man was discussing the various prices of items. Beef is the scarest thing—all of these things are said so irresponsibly as if the Government is made out of tin or something like that. At some time or other somebody will have to answer all of these malicious charges; but we can debate things as intelligently as anybody else. I can only say that a strange line has been taken in this matter, a line which was never intended. This Government is doing a lot to create better economic conditions here and to provide better social amenities for the workers in this colony. Therefore, I could not sit here as a member of this Government and let these irresponsible things be said about the Government, when I know the facts.

As to this question of wages, when the Labour Commissioner and the members of the Sugar Producers' Federation met, they decided to give workers an increase of 5.95% in wages, but the members of the Sugar Producers' Federation said that they were going to pay that increase when the workers resumed work. The Government had to be most emphatic on it: "If you are in good faith, now that the men have struck, pay all of it to them now that they are not working." That is what was said. Furthermore, "the Commonwealth wages increase was 5.5% and to show that we are in good faith, we will round it off at 6%." That is what they told us; they did not even want to go in for an enquiry; they wanted to go to arbitration. We began to move before there was a crisis and the men who took part in it are alive today; they are not dead.

7.30 p.m.

Before the crisis came we had two meetings at Headquarters under the Chairmanship of the Minister of Labour and I asked to be called in because I was interested in it; so it is not true to tell the public these things when in truth and in fact we are still alive. We asked them in good faith to do these things because they asked why they should pay while there was a strike. That was as far as Government could go. We made special pleas to save the situation. I want to say that this wild talking about the Government over here being opposed to agricultural workers getting more wages is untrue, unsound and wicked. I can only say that people reap what they sow. I have faith in righteousness and I know that if you sow a grain of corn you will live to reap an ear of corn.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in view of the magnitude of the distortions with which the House has been afflicted, although I cannot hope to equal the dervish gymnastics and the revivalist exhibitions of certain hon. members, I hope in a few words to set the record straight, more especially in view of the malicious and lying accusations which have been laid against an hon. member who is not in his place. More than one aspersion has been cast upon the Leader of the Workers' Union in Barbados, and in addition, Sir, aspersions have been cast on the Opposition Party for not fighting the Union. I merely want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the most significant thing about this entire matter is that the credited Leader of the Union in Barbados, the Representative of the people in the only Union in Barbados, thought it fit to align himself with the Opposition Party in this dispute. Although the Union is supposed to be aligned to the Government Party, the Leader of the Union found himself on the platform of the Opposition in this dispute, and that is an indication that the Union's Leader felt that this Party was equitable and righteous in its cause and was prepared to assist it. That is the only answer we have to give them about the business of the Democratic Labour Party and the Trade Union.

To say, Mr. Chairman, that the sugar producers in this dispute contended that they were not going to acquiesce to

any demands by the Union or the workers because of the existence of an agreement is to present only half of the story. It is a wilful, malicious distortion because the person who said it knew fully well that the Union contended that there was no Agreement. You cannot present one side of an issue and leave out the other side and expect to arrive at a just conclusion. The sugar producers said that there was an Agreement and the Union contended just as strongly that there was no Agreement. (HON. R. G. MAPP: What did the Board say?) The Board was completely impartial on that point; for the reason that the arguments adduced by the legal representatives of the Sugar Producers on the Board of Enquiry were completely nullified. In the Report, Mr. Chairman, there is no definite statement at all with regard to the Agreement or its existence; but that is not the whole point.

Let us assume, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of argument that there had been an Agreement and that it tied the producers down to paying 5.95%—when people want to talk and rant about righteousness, one has to hope that they know the meaning of the words they are calling,—\$4 million more than last year that the workers were not entitled to call for something more? As a matter of fact, as I said earlier, in British Guiana where the sugar industry made \$2 million more through variations in sugar prices, there was no dispute and they did not wait on the Union to call for more money—and they had an Agreement with the Citizen's Manpower Association, that is the name of the British Guiana Trade Union—but in spite of the Agreement they gave half of the profits to the Union. Normally the sugar producers here expected to make \$5 million; they made \$9 million. Even if they had an Agreement, and they did not have an Agreement according to the Union's claims, don't you think, Mr. Chairman, they were entitled to say they made \$4 million more than was anticipated through an unexpected rainfall, and say "here is your share"?

A lot of people talk about agricultural workers and being interested in them and what not, but we know some of these people have to go to the estates and ask them to send labourers to cut their canes. We know that the labourers cut their canes and leave them in the cane-holes. This is not merely trying to score a debating point or trying to spread propaganda as has been claimed, but I would ask any reasonable person in this island what would have happened in this island to the agricultural workers if some Party, any Party, did not come out boldly and take their side. The Union's administration was divided in two; one half was in favour of Government and the sugar producers, and the other half was led by Frank Walcott favoured the workers; but the administration was so tied up that they could not go out and tell the workers to strike. The General Secretary of the only Union himself admitted that he was so bogged down through conflicting circumstances in his own Union, that even he could not give a definite lead to the workers in the issue. When that took place, Mr. Chairman, what was the Party representing the workers and fully aware of its responsibility to do? Nobody on this side of the House was inciting them to riot or anything like that, but it is an open fact that the Government Party appeared both in a broadcast on the Radio and on public platforms to come down heavily on the side of the planters. For this reason, though it was merely a question of presentation of the case—it might have been a wilful and malicious bias or perjury—if you get on a platform and say "go back to work, if you don't you will harm the economy of the island" and at the same time tell the planters to meet them half-way, does it not mean that you are putting the blame on the backs of the workers?

7.40 p.m.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have just said so. We did so before the crisis came on when we had a talk with the people. We particularly emphasised those points.

MR. CRAWFORD: I am not talking of any secret conference behind closed doors; I am talking of speaking on the radio and by public speeches of the members of the Labour Party. The Secretary of the Workers' Union complained to the Governor of a speech made by the Hon. Minister of Trade.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Governor did not

stop the Minister of Trade from talking.

MR. CRAWFORD: Let us say that the Premier intervened to stop his own Minister from talking because it is a fact that he was stopped from talking. I do not care by whom it was. I am really saying in passing that I am pleased to see the Hon. Premier is so jealous of his constitutional powers, but the point is this: the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour found himself in the parish of St. John on one occasion and his speech was such as almost to incite the people to riot. The Hon. Prime Minister went to St. George on the same errand, and, Mr. Chairman, ask him why he did not talk. Was it because of the popularity of his Government? He could not talk for one or two reasons, either he had nothing to say or was afraid to say what he had to say. I say, Sir, that in these speeches emanating from the Government Party, they appeared to be biased and in favour of the planters and the workers interpreted them as such. The important thing about this dispute is this: never at any time did the Sugar Producers Association say that they could pay more. All they said was that there was this three-year agreement and under the terms of the agreement they should pay more than so and so; therefore, Sir, it is important to remember the entire circumstances surrounding the dispute; what led up to it; the action of the Government during the dispute and the importance of any Party, whether it be our Party, a Communist Party, a Fascist Party, or any Party in the island feeling itself in some way obligated to put the case of the workers. It is important for all the facts behind the dispute to be put before the public view. In the ordinary sense of things, any particular organisation, if it is a political organisation, seeks to influence a community with the contribution which it is making on behalf of the people in the island; therefore, not only in a sugar dispute issue but in any issue any party in this Chamber, any political organisation, is entitled to come down on one side or the other and present the case for that side strongly as possible. In this issue, our Party is proud of the part it has played and if it did not play that part, it does not deserve to be in public life. If the workers of this country were left entirely in the hands of their employers with the Government sitting on the fence, well then, God help them!

I go further and say that every responsible person in this Chamber knows that the allegation made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy that an influential political person in this island endeavoured to influence the commercial body is absolutely correct and the report could not come from a higher source. Nobody is saying for a moment that every single member of the Party over there would have done a thing like that. Some of them might have or some might not have, and I believe a lot of them did not dream of doing it. There are members of the Ministerial Bench and backbenchers who would not by any action of theirs prejudice the conditions for workers in this island but the fact remains that it was done by someone associated with that party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member again, to what action is he referring?

MR. CRAWFORD: The action to which I have just referred. I am referring to the tirades by the Government Bench against this Party and the prognostications and fooling the people. It is, Mr. Chairman, an unmistakable sign of fear by the Government Party because the evidence is there; the evidence of the country is there for all to see; and neither the Government Bench nor the Opposition has any special endowment with the gift of prophecy. I should be the last person to assume the mantle, but I am willing in the ordinary course of events, as humans do, to throw the challenge. I would take on a bet; I will offer a bet and I am willing to challenge my friends on the other side of the Chamber without any fear of defeat that the people in this country know that we capably handled their cause in the sugar dispute and that was appreciated as such; therefore none of the fulminations, none of the war dances, none of the flourishes and dervishes and none of the tunes of the tom-toms can change their opinion of the contribution which was made by this Party. And nothing can be said by the Government which can bring to their minds anything to the extent to make them forget it.

7.50 p.m.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, this debate has drifted at length into a discussion of the whole dispute in the industry and the Opposition has been so well answered by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that even the kind of defence made by the last hon. member who spoke from the other side, cannot blind the eyes or shut the ears of anybody as to the facts in this case. I do not know if what that hon. member has said is of such importance or of such weight that I need reply to it. There is only one thing I want to say and it is that when the hon. member drags the name of the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union into this matter

MR. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I was not the first person to drag in the name of the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union; I was merely replying in the defence of a man who is absent.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Nobody referred to the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union; so I do not know to what the hon. member has replied. From year to year, since the Domestic Agreement has been made in this Island, the hon. member, who has just spoken, has headlined in his Newspaper that the workers were being robbed by the same gentleman to whom he is now referring.

MR. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. On the floor of this House when the Agreement came here for ratification by the Legislature, I said then that the authors of the Agreement were on the wrong track and I accused them of robbing the workers and he knew that my remarks applied to the then senior member for St. Joseph; they did not apply to the General Secretary of the Workers' Union.

HON. R. G. MAPP: From year to year even after Cabinet Government came into being and the then senior member for St. Joseph had left the Union, the hon. member would write the same headlines. Is the hon. member hugging people to his breast now?

MR. CRAWFORD: Does the hon. member understand that the basis of the Agreement is the same as it was? Therefore, it cannot work rightly because the basis is wrong.

HON. R. G. MAPP: The Agreement is still in vogue and he still says that the workers could be paid more. Every year, he would write that we were robbing the workers. There was nothing about the basis of any agreement; he said that the workers should be paid 17 1/2%. Do not let the hon. member opposite fool himself; the workers have known him for too long, and they still know him today; the hon. member cannot help being dishonest. Even about this Report

MR. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I object to the remarks of the biggest traitor ever in this House, a man who lies to the people of his Party behind their backs and before their faces, a man who induced his colleagues to hold a meeting to betray the Premier and then told the Premier that his colleagues were holding a meeting to betray him. A man like that is calling an hon. member a dishonest person; I am not having that at all.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Even that concoction the hon. member can make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the Hon. Minister. Objection has been taken to the use of the word "dishonest". I am asking the Hon. Minister to withdraw it.

HON. R. G. MAPP: If the hon. member withdraws his remarks about my being a traitor, then I will withdraw mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Objection has been taken to the use of the word "dishonest".

HON. R. G. MAPP: I object to the use of the word "traitor".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member withdrawing the word?

HON. R. G. MAPP: I withdraw the word "dishonest".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister has withdrawn the word "dishonest"; I am now asking the hon. senior member for St. Philip to withdraw the word "traitor".

MR. CRAWFORD: According to the Rule 132, "Every such objection is to be taken at the time when such words are used and not after any other member has spoken."

I have spoken twice since then. (*Laughter*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The word which the Hon. Minister used and to which the hon. member objected, has been withdrawn. It was my intention to ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "traitor". Anyhow, I will draw your attention to Rule 129 which says this: "No member may use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House". The Hon. Minister has withdrawn the word "dishonest" and I am asking you to withdraw the word "traitor".

MR. CRAWFORD: I withdraw the word "traitor", but as to the concoction referred to by the Hon. Minister, there are at least three witnesses in this Chamber as to what I have said.
8.00 p.m.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is in good company, but when a member can get up and call attention to a Report that is in the hands not only of this Chamber, but of the entire public

MR. BRANCKER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, exception has been taken to the use of the word "concoction", and I may remind you that there is action to be taken.

HON. R. G. MAPP: What is unparliamentary about the word "concoction"? Later on we will be saying things about the hon. member for St. Lucy, and if he can prove they are concoctions, he can say so. The Hon. member quoted from a Report

MR. CRAWFORD: I am not having an irrefutable statement called a concoction because the hon. member knows in his throat, if he has one, that it is true.

HON. R. G. MAPP: The Rule is that when an objection has been taken, no other member must speak, but the hon. member has spoken. (*Laughter from the Opposition Bench*). As I was saying, Sir, ...

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman. I hope you will remember that I withdrew even after three speeches had been made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope you will remember that I was about to call on you under Rule 129 to withdraw.

MR. CRAWFORD: I cannot read your mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I intended to call on you under Rule 129 to withdraw.

MR. CRAWFORD: What is in your mind does not help this Chamber.

MR. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, if I must continue to respect the Chair, I do not consider that as being very favourable. The ex-Premier of this House when he was in this Chamber made an hon. member withdraw those words. You must ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "concoction" if you want to retain respect to the Chair.

MR. BRANCKER: I rose on a point of order after objection had been taken to the word "concoction" to remind the Chair that no oversight should take place in the early occupancy of the Chair.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Hon. members do not like the word "concoction"; do they prefer "fabrication"? How can "concoction" be unparliamentary? If members charge others over here with something and it is not true, we say it is a deliberate concoction. If they object to the word "concoction", I will withdraw and substitute the word "fabrication".

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am not objecting merely because it is unparliamentary

HON. R. G. MAPP: What the hon. member speaking on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am asking both hon. members to take their seats. I understand that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has withdrawn the word. Am I right?

HON. R. G. MAPP: Yes.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am objecting to the word "fabrication" not because it is unparliamentary, but because the hon. member knows in his heart that it is true. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy, the hon. member for St. Andrew and the former junior member for the City, Mr. A. E. S. Lewis was summoned

MR. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the debate.

MR. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is saying that it is a fabrication that something took place and then he went behind the other members' backs and told the Premier that the members were planning to overthrow him.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, everybody knows the hon. member and what has been said about him in the Law Courts regarding his ability to speak the truth. If that is not a concoction, let him say what it is. I will not ask

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, you have to rule that the hon. member withdraws the word.

HON. R. G. MAPP: On what is the hon. member speaking?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am objecting to the use of the word "fabrication".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Objection has been taken to the word "fabrication".

HON. R. G. MAPP: If it is not a fabrication, it is a deliberate untruth.

MR. CRAWFORD: I know that the hon. member is constitutionally incapable of speaking

MR. CHAIRMAN: On what is the hon. member speaking?

MR. CRAWFORD: I am objecting to the statement "deliberate untruth", because if he had any idea of what is true he could not say that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas; there has been another objection to the words "deliberate untruth".

HON. R. G. MAPP: I will withdraw. The hon. member referred to a Report that is not only before this House, but is in the hands of the public. What is said about that Report? The hon. member said that when the Minister of Agriculture met the sugar producers, they argued that there was a three year Agreement and the Government heard their side, while the Union argued that there was no Agreement. I asked in a *sotto voce* remark what the Board had found. The hon. member replied that the Board was impartial. (MR. CRAWFORD: And I went further.) Mr. Chairman, the hon. member made certain remarks, but he must think that people who are listening to him must either be deaf or stupid. There is a Report in his hands which he can read as regards the Agreement, and it is not only specific but categorical in its findings; so he cannot say that there was nothing definite in it.

The Report reads as follows:

"The Board has given the fullest and most anxious consideration to all the records of the negotiations of the 1957 Agreement in the light of the submissions made by the Union as to their interpretation, and are clearly of the opinion that the agreement reached was for a basic wage rate calculated on a 17 1/2% increase on the 1954 basic wage rate with subsequent adjustments for the years 1958 and 1959 in accordance with the movement of the Common-

wealth Wage Index Figure for those years, and that that movement was to be the only factor to be taken into account in fixing the 1959 and 1959 wages, other factors having been taken into consideration in fixing the new basic wage for 1957".

8.10 p.m.

They then give a summary of their conclusions which was as follows:

"(1) That an Agreement as to wages was entered into between the Sugar Producers Federation of Barbados and the Barbados Workers' Union in March 1957, establishing basic wages rates for 1957 1957 based upon an increase of 17.5% calculated on and added to the 1954 basic wage rates.

(2) That this Agreement was intended to be for a period of three years, 1956-1959, and to incorporate Clauses 1(a), (b), (c), and (d) of the 1954 Domestic Sugar Agreement."

The hon. member got up in here and said that so far as that side of the question is concerned, the Report did not come to anything definite. They said that this Agreement was intended to be for a period of three years, from 1957 to 1959 and the hon. senior member for St. Philip gets up and says so far as this side of the question is concerned, the Report did not come to anything definite.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am really at a disadvantage because I have not the Report before me, but I am fully aware in my mind that the Report by the Board with regard to the Agreement was conditional. There was some dispute between the planters and the Union as regard the fluctuation of the figures, according to my memory of what the Report stated; but I do not remember the Board definitely saying whether there was an agreement although I am fairly sure that it said that the wages had something to do with the Commonwealth figures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that the point of order?

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, of course. I have not the Report here.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I am going to be short because the Hon. Minister on my right replied at length to criticisms of hon. members opposite and I think this debate has taken a very long course; therefore I have absolutely no intention but to reply to the hon. senior member for St. Philip on that matter. When the hon. member can get up and say that the Report of the Board of Enquiry was not definite on that point, all I can say is "God help us in this island if that is the kind of thing we will have from supposedly responsible members!" It is nothing else but twisting the Report.

Sir, I can only say this. I hope in the future of Barbados that industrial matters will be carried on on a proper footing and that an industrial dispute will be treated as an industrial dispute, and we will have none of this political bargaining in.

Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things which were said by hon. members opposite which I think I will just answer. The hon. senior member for Christ Church used the phrase "this Government has been robbing the sugar workers" and the hon. member was the Minister of Agriculture and a member of this Government in 1954 to 1956, Yet he says we have been robbing sugar workers. Is the hon. member serious?

MR. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Let the Hon. Minister sit down.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Who is the hon. member telling to sit down?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for Christ Church has risen on a point of order.

MR. TALMA: I am referring to the attitude taken by the Government this year. The Government is supposed to represent the sugar workers and they came down heavily on the side of the planters. They said on the microphone: "Go back to work" without giving assistance to the workers. They have taken the stand; "look how you are representing people."

HON. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member said that they are robbing the people. He was the Minister of the Government.

MR. TALMA: I said that I welcome the remarks of the Hon. Minister—referring to the same Minister—in taking the steps to have another enquiry into the sugar industry and I recommend Professor Jolly who has succeeded Professor Sheppard as a guide to whom they should choose to hold this enquiry and the type of man to do the investigations.

HON. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member really has a very convenient memory. I specifically wrote down these things when the hon. member was talking. If that is the attitude of the hon. member opposite, what can you do with them? They do not have the guts to stand up to what they say. I really do not think the hon. members opposite really deserve being answered by this side of the House.

So far as Professor Sheppard is concerned, I am informed that he cannot do the investigation and we will have to get somebody else to do it. This matter is very simple. This is nothing new in the history either of this island or the history of other countries. It has happened already in this country, and workers in this country are not so foolish as the hon. members opposite think. I am sure that the workers will see through all of these things. The very fact that we are holding an inquiry into the economics of the industry will show that it is nonsense their talking of our joining with the employers, and it will show that that is not true. They are just trying to make political capital out of the dispute and they are trying to carry on a political dispute which was carried on in St. John through political machination because a by-election was being carried on.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The Committee is accustomed to the silly fulminations over a period of time of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, but I want to submit to him that even though he is a manufacturer of fantasies, he is surpassing himself by saying that the dispute started in St. Philip and St. John because of political machinations of this Party and because of an impending bye-election.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Is that a point of order?

MR. CRAWFORD: My point of order is that the hon. Minister has distorted the facts.

HON. R. G. MAPP: How can that be a point of order?

MR. CRAWFORD: You are wrong; you are not telling the truth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see two hon. members are on the floor.

MR. CRAWFORD: I am prepared to stop him at every point of his distortion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you finished making your point of order?

MR. CRAWFORD: I have not made it because he stopped me. I say that it is not true to say that this dispute started in St. Philip and St. John because of political machinations and because of impending elections. The strike started in St. Philip and Christ Church and it was a spontaneous strike by sugar workers. It was not urged by anybody.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I think the time must come when you must stop hon. members rising on a point of order. You cannot get up on a point of order on fact.

MR. CRAWFORD: That is all nonsense. If the hon. member does not know what is a point of order, let him go outside and learn it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Philip please take his seat?
8.20 p.m.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, when I was rudely interrupted by the hon. member, there is to be an enquiry into the economics of the Sugar Industry. That was announced, and if the hon. member knows the Queen's English, he must know that economics must be included in an inquiry like this. How can you have an enquiry into the Sugar Industry if you do not enquire into all the aspects of the industry? These attempts are made to make people believe that only one side of the House is interested in the welfare of the sugar workers, when, for years, this Party, especially under the leadership of the ex-Premier of this Island, brought the sugar workers and the workers as a whole from the darkness in which they were, until today we can boast of having the best labour legislation in the West Indies and of having some of the best labour conditions throughout the West Indies. (MR. TUDOR: Having the most unemployment.) Hon. members on the other side got up and spewed out a lot of nonsense to convince people that they are the only people who are interested in the welfare of the workers. This matter was worthy of a debate on a substantive motion more so than a debate of this sort, but I do hope that in the interest of the workers, we will get on with the passing of this Resolution and get down this economist to give us advice in these matters.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to have it said without correction that the conditions of the workers in the Sugar Industry here are the best in the West Indies. In British Guiana the conditions which obtain in the sugar estates are much better than ours. There the agricultural workers get relief in case of sickness and other benefits, and attempts are made on the estates both by the employers and by the Government to make living conditions satisfactory. Similarly in Trinidad, the conditions of the agricultural workers are infinitely better than they are here, especially within recent days when, as is the case in Jamaica, the Labour Welfare Board which operates the Labour Welfare Fund, concerns itself with such things as the teaching of handicrafts, home economics, the running of ante-natal and child Welfare clinics, the setting up of basic schools, illiteracy and recreation groups, the organisation of councils - all of these things on the estates organisation of community councils - all these things on the estates themselves; therefore, when the hon. member says that the conditions of sugar workers in this colony are better than those in any other West Indian colony, he does not begin to know what he is talking about.

Finally on the question of the Agreement, the mere fact that the Board of Enquiry under the Chairmanship of Mr. Lewis awarded an additional bonus to the sugar workers after the enquiry, is enough to convince him or anybody else that the Board of Enquiry was not satisfied with the terms of the existing Agreement in the industry. They were not satisfied with it and so they awarded an increase in the wage rates over and above what the Agreement would have permitted. As I said earlier, I do not remember exactly what the Report said with regard to the Agreement, but I do remember that there were certain factors which influenced the Board's decision as to whether there was this Agreement or not. I remember reading in the Report two or three paragraphs in which the Board appeared to be not completely convinced that there was an Agreement and the arguments presented by the Lawyer for the sugar planters, Mr. Jack Dear, in support of his contention that there was an Agreement were said not to apply here, but to the United Kingdom. With further reference to the Hon. Minister's allegations about my insistence on the workers being robbed under the Domestic Sugar Agreement, I only want to say this: it is very unfortunate that we have to prolong this debate unduly, but we have to keep the record straight. When the hon. member tries to pontificate on matters of which he knows nothing he has to be set straight. When the Domestic Sugar Agreement was first set up, I, on the floor of this House refused to accept its conditions entirely. My contention was supported by one of the biggest planters in the Island who happened to be running for election in the same year - that is, Mr. Lisle Ward - and he said that the Domestic Sugar Agreement was the result of questions raised in this House by myself. He said this: "Mr. Crawford raised questions in the House claiming that the workers were not satisfied," and the Government got Mr. Duffie to make an enquiry into the sugar industry. Mr. Duffie

presented a report to the Government saying that the workers were being robbed and suggested that a bonus of 20% be paid. It was as a result of what the workers were paid that year that they, on that side of the House, rose into power in 1951. Mr. Ward said that they should have been paid 21% and they could have been paid even more. That was reported in the Advocate on the first Sunday in December, 1951. Mr. Lisle Ward was then running for a seat in this House as a member of the Conservatives. He said that we could have afforded more. In face of all that coming from a planter, was I not justified or reinforced in my contention that the industry could have paid more and they were still being robbed under the provisions of the Domestic Sugar Agreement? The hon. member does not know what he is talking about; if the provisions were not so binding on the workers in the industry, the Commission which has just sat could not have dared to recommend one cent more bonus.
8.30 p.m.

When he talks the way he is talking, he is really making an utter fool of himself, because the very Report which he has quoted substantiates our contention that the old Domestic Sugar Agreement has never worked to provide the maximum benefit for the workers which the prices of sugar would afford.

Finally, Sir, I want the hon. member to bear in mind that in spite of this Agreement, the workers took the matter in their own hands, went on strike and got more money; and it is part and parcel of what we expect from him to come in here merely two months after and try to tell us when he has withheld his own mind so long, that we called a strike because of elections. We merely went into it after the workers themselves had withheld their labour.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to get into this debate, but I would like the hon. member to give a break down of the figures. I am sure he can. I think we are entitled to know how much the Chairman and the other Commissioners were paid as well as the amount paid to the Secretary.

HON. R. G. MAPP: The Chairman was paid \$100 a day and the other members \$50 a day.

MR. MOTTLEY: For how many days?

HON. R. G. MAPP: For ten days.

MR. MOTTLEY: How much did you pay the Secretary?

HON. R. G. MAPP: I do not know the position as regards the Secretary, because he is a civil servant.

MR. MOTTLEY: I must thank the hon. member.

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

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and ask for leave to sit again.

HON. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended for three quarters of an hour.

HON. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

8.40 p.m.

On Reassembling,

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

INCOME TAX BILL

MR. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, to move the House into Committee on a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER. Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

HON. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

MR. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Clause is really the whole substance of this Bill. I pointed out last week that the Government surreptitiously introduced it during a thin House, the Premier having, as we are told, previously given the assurance to the hon. junior member for Christ Church that he did not propose to deal with it on that day. Hon. members on this side of the House therefore did not get the opportunity to debate it and discuss its importance. Moreover, we were not favoured with any explanation or reasons for the Bill in the speech lasting precisely two minutes by the Hon. Minister of Finance. (VOICES: Shame! Shame!) All that we were told then was that it was a routine matter and a simple matter. I felt then, as I do now, that any matter dealing with amendments to the Income Tax Bill is an important matter and unlike the Hon. Minister who introduced the Bill, there are those of us on this side of the House who can only know the right and wrongs of these matters by studying them. We are not invested as he seems to be by looking at the title, moving the second reading, and then imagining that we have done our parliamentary duties. Even when we study the context of this Bill, we become more convinced that it is important.

Now, Clause 3 of this Bill, as I understand it, is the meat and the substance of it. It makes provision for an amendment to the principal Act and says among other things that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may provide by order that the interest payable on any debentures or stock issued (whether before or after the coming into force of the Income Tax (Amendment) Act, 1958) pursuant to the provisions of the General Local Loan Act, 1933 or the General Loan and Stock Act, 1935 and in respect of a loan authorised to be raised by an Act referred to in such Order shall, so long as it is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the debentures or stock are in the beneficial ownership of persons who are not resident in the island, be exempt from Income Tax from the day and to the extent specified in such Order. It also sets out the conditions under which these exemptions work.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no place in this world, wherever you go, that a case cannot be made out for exemptions for persons who are subject to double taxation, whether they be in the West Indies or in the United Kingdom, and a lot has been done to ease the specific burdens. It is a recognised form of Income Tax administration that, wherever possible, persons should not be subject to double taxation. With that principle everyone agrees; but what looks simple to the Barbados Government because they know no better does not turn out to be simple in actual practice. Here in Barbados you have Insurance Companies which, because of the slack attitude in certain matters of the Barbados Government, are allowed to accumulate large sums of money which hitherto they have not been willing to loan to the Barbados Government. This applies not only to them, but to commercial banks as well. The last occasion on which the Barbados Government issued debentures, it found itself forced to go into the Government Savings Bank and take money up, and that is why it was said that the loan was over-subscribed. It was not over-subscribed because the banks or private persons ran willingly to lend the Government money, but because the Government, not being able to persuade the

big holders of money in this island to lend the Government money for whatever reason it was, found it necessary to take up the people's money out of the Government Savings Bank. They then inaccurately boasted that the loans were over-subscribed.

We knew why all that happened and that is why we on this question have sympathised with the Hon. Premier. He was in the Chair when that controversy was going on and it was no business of his to follow the technicality of that debate; he was there in the Chair to keep order.

He has introduced a Bill which he says is all right on the surface because its purpose is to exempt people who lend money to the Barbados Government and who get interest on that money from double taxation; but what about those persons here in Barbados who send their money out and then get their agents overseas to lend their money back to the Barbados Government? What happens then? It is obvious that the people who originally refused to lend the Barbados Government money here have hoped to avoid Income Tax by sending it out to their agent to invest for them - and it is even more important than that. Money from the Labour Welfare Fund (at any rate some of it) has been invested in the commercial banks, and the commercial banks of this island naturally, as their practice is, lend that money out. It may well be, if this Bill is passed as it is, and if more careful study is not given to it, that the Government of Barbados might find itself exempting from Income Tax the money ostensibly coming in from overseas, but in truth and in fact, it may be money sent out of Barbados.

When I listened last week to the Hon. Premier who said that it was just a simple Bill without any complications at all, I listened quite carefully for the two minutes he spoke and he gave the House then - the hon. members who were present - the same explanation which Sir Archibald Cuke gave to another hon. member in the course of that day. It is inconceivable and surprising to me that Sir Archibald's reasons, whether right or wrong, could be sufficient for the Hon. Premier and his Ministers, and that, even without saying whether the measure corresponded to their own policy, or whether the measure was their own idea, they could give to this House through him in two minutes' time a resume of Sir Archibald Cuke's idea which I had heard some hours ago.

9.20 p.m.

The point, therefore, is this. Nobody is opposed to the idea of people being relieved of paying taxes in two places, although there are cases when it may be necessary for them to do so. What we do say is this: in the circumstances of Barbados at the moment, and in the absence of any guarantees which the Government may give to us - and possibly this measure has been suggested to them by persons who previously refused to lend them money, who are now pressing them to raise the rate of interest and who, having got that done or when they get that done, will proceed to send their money out of the island. They will let their friends and or agents overseas send it back here and lend it to the Premier who will then say that, as it is loaned to us by persons not resident in Barbados, any interest which accrues is exempted from income tax. There is no Saving Clause; and the Clause which we are discussing now gives all the loopholes for blackmailing. I have listened to the ex-Premier admitting the fact that the people who had money in this Island, for some reason or other, never agreed to lend the Government any money. Of course, he only said that when he wanted to use it and make people believe that he and others were at loggerheads. He has admitted that, and we know it to be a fact, although not for the reasons which he gave. We warned that the people who had money also refused to lend it, because they wanted to carry out a sort of blackmail on the Barbados Government. They said: "We refused to lend you money until we get more interest on it." There will surely be a measure which calls for the increased rate of interest and I hope that the hon. junior member for St. John will have a lot to say on that measure when the time comes. If and when that measure is passed, you will notice that there will be a change on the part of those people, a change which is vastly different from the attitude which they have been taking up in this island. Whereas, they were saying last year and even now; "We have no money to lend you" and at the same time they say: "We cannot afford to lend you, be-

cause it is not profitable to lend money to the Barbados Government," as soon as you raise the interest rate, you will see how easily they will find the money for you. They will be telling you the sources overseas from which you can borrow money, and the Government will be falling into the trap of robbing the revenue of this Island, because the Government will not understand in that case that the people who formerly refused to lend them money are now lending them money and lending it from overseas through their agents. It is difficult for us, failing a full expression of opinion from the Government of Barbados on this matter, failing an assurance from them that nobody will be able to put it over - it is difficult for us to give this Bill our wholehearted blessing. If it is a matter of doing anything to bring money into this island for industrial development, naturally it will get the support of all sides of this House, but we are not prepared to let the Government get away with murder or to land into a blind alley merely because we want to see industrial development here. I think the greatest service which the Premier could have done, would be to have taken the time which has elapsed between last Tuesday and now to have acquainted himself with all the possible ramifications of this Bill, and the possible consequences of it so that he would have been able to give a full explanation to this House in this matter. That is what we awaited.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the service which the Premier did us on the last occasion when I asked because there was a rather thin House that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed so that those hon. members who were not here might be able to express their point of view. The Premier need not have done that because he had the numbers. Like the hon. member who has just sat down, most of us, although we do not like it, would think twice before we oppose a Bill which would mean bringing capital into the country for the purpose of development. This is a Bill which most of us may not like because it gives us a lot of worry; but although that is so, we would not like to vote against anything which would be bringing capital into this country.

What is the position with regard to this Bill? I am quite sure that if the Government's idea is that of attracting investors to this island, we will give them the right to say that people who invest their money here would be entitled not to pay any income tax on the interest which they would draw. Let us put it in this way; a man lives in London, New York or anywhere at all outside Barbados; he invests, say, \$10,000 in Barbados and gets 5% interest. The real position today is that if a man pays income tax on \$10,000 in Barbados and he secures from the Commissioner of Income Tax a certificate to prove to the Commissioner in London that has paid it, then he gets back that tax. Nobody can argue against that. 9.30 p.m.

I want Government to study this. When somebody in London invests money here, it is true that he has to go through some red tape to get the certificate to get back his income tax in London; but what you are really doing here - and I hope you will explain it further for us - is saying that if you can get loans raised in the London Market for the Government of £100,000, the interest on that money will be paid in England instead of being payable to the Barbados Treasury. In other words, for the benefit of investing your money here, you would have paid your income tax here and got a receipt to prove to the Income Tax Commissioner in London that you paid it and you would get it back. I do not want you to take umbrage to anything I say, but this is saying that if you pay income tax there, you do not have to pay it here. None of us would like to vote against anything that would bring capital here for the purpose of development. I hope the Premier has seen the point which I have made, and I am sure that the Income Tax Commissioner, if not the Financial Secretary, would have advised Government on that. Therefore what we are doing is passing a Bill to encourage capital to come into the island, but in the same breath we are saying that on the capital coming in we are allowing the tax to be paid outside. If there is a lot of money in Jamaica, in London or in New York to be invested, instead of your earning the money and paying the income tax here, you pay it in the respective Countries; that

is, we are giving up that much income tax to the source where the person is residing and from which he is investing the money. I am wondering whether that is right.

It might be a means of getting capital invested here, but on the other hand, Government should be able to satisfy us that the benefits to be derived from £100,000 so invested would be so much greater than the small amount, if you can so call it, of income tax which we will give off to the person investing.

What the hon. senior member for St. Lucy said is correct. You are saying that my brother in Trinidad will be able to invest \$10,000 in Barbados and get off income tax. That sounds good, but what is to prevent him from taking my money and forming a Company? Have you provided against my sending money to Trinidad and forming a Company? What is going to be the position with the Insurance Companies, the Canadian, North American, Australian, Indian and others? For a long time I have been asking Government to pay some attention to them, but nothing has been done. Naturally they collect a lot of money here. By War time Regulations you cannot send money to America or Canada, but Companies come from these places and register in Bermuda and carry on a 25¢ a week insurance, and from Bermuda they can send the money to the States or Canada. What is the position with Canadian and other companies who do this business here and by your Regulations cannot send money out? They have no other alternative than to invest with you until you relax these regulations, or with the commercial banks where they get 2 3/4% up to \$10,000 and possibly leave the money there; therefore they must invest with the greatest security which to them would be the Barbados Government and get 5% or whatever it is.

I do not expect the Premier who is not a financial man to know all these things, but we are paying a tremendous sum of money to a Financial Secretary to advise Government, and now you are going to pay an Assistant Financial Secretary a higher salary than the Income Tax Commissioner - a most important job - to become the laughing stock of the West Indies. Somebody must have advised the Premier and he should be able to tell us something about it. I should like to know how you are going to get over the Insurance Companies who by force of War time regulations cannot send money out of the island? If anyone had to send money to the United States or Canada, he could only send that much money as allowed by Government under the dollar regulations; so the money would have to be accumulated here and invested at 2 3/4% up to \$10,000, and the reasons for that are obvious.

I am not accusing Government of being a party to anything, but I can see what is happening. I am as anxious as Government to pass any Bill that will bring capital here for future development, but not such a Bill as we have in front of us. Are you giving up Income Tax which you would normally get from Canada, America or London, for which they could get relief in England only if they show a certificate from the Income Tax Commissioner in Barbados showing that the Income Tax was paid in Barbados? It is true that there is going to be some red tape, but not for a big company. I myself see great difficulty in this in that you have said it is for people outside, and therefore money can be taken up, sent to Trinidad and from there it can be sent to America or Canada, but it is not allowed to flow freely between the United Kingdom and Barbados and the other West Indian territories. 9.40 p.m.

When you say that, if I take £500 in Government bonds, I must pay my income tax here in Barbados, that is all right; but I can send it to my partner or brother in Jamaica to invest for me. You cannot stop the flow of capital to a country within the British Commonwealth. What incentive I have got is that if I send money to Trinidad or British Guiana I can get 8%; therefore I would in turn let my brother or partner in British Guiana set up a company there; then I would send my money to him and have it coming back here from British Guiana. We can name it the Mottley Trust Company of Trinidad.

That is a separate entity. We can then present an order to the Government saying: I am going to loan you £50,000 and because it is money coming in, it would be free from Income Tax.

I realise you have seen your difficulties and I should do nothing to hinder your passing this Act. I realise that finance is not actually the calling of the Hon. Premier and I do not expect him to answer me in the same way as he would answer me if it were a question I had put to him as regards medicine; but I do expect that he will have the answer from those whom he has got this question. Sir, I myself am somewhat worried over the question which I have raised and I hope when certain other hon. members have submitted their criticisms that the Hon. Premier will get up and clear up things for me.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This talk of insurance companies doing business here and this Bill making provision for them is not correct. This Bill is for the purpose of preventing double taxation and it emanates from the fact that the Government within recent years has been issuing Government stock. Enquiries have been made by people overseas as well as in the Caribbean as to relieving them of Income Tax on Government Bonds paid in Barbados. They say that they have to pay Income Tax on them in their country as well. That inquiry came from one or two people in the other islands and on further investigation by this Government, it was found out that this relief was given in other places in the Caribbean. The same thing is done in British Guiana as well as in Antigua; therefore the Government decided - and it was done even before my time because the last Premier in his Budget Speech here this year informed the House that it is proposed to enable interest on any loan to be entirely exempted from payment of income tax, when the bonds are to be taken from persons not resident in the island.

As I have said just now, a similar concession is granted in British Guiana; I am not quite sure of Trinidad; but I know it is also granted in the United Kingdom. I should also point out that has to be proved to the satisfaction of the Income Tax Commissioner that you are a genuine non-resident of Barbados. It is not a matter of twisting things; it has to be proved to the satisfaction of the Income Tax Commissioner that you are genuinely non-resident in Barbados. That is the information which came to me and I put this Bill before the House.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just that the Hon. Minister should not think that I am confused between this Bill and the other Bill, I know what exists is a fact. You have the North American Insurance Company and other Insurance Companies wanting to send out money to Canada. Let me ask you this: Do you allow such people to send out money to Canada? The answer is 'No'. There are certain Canadian Insurance Companies which have money lying here and you ask them to take bonds and so on. That money is here and those companies are really foreign companies. The point which I made was that they are only keeping money here. The other point which I have made is that you have said that it has to be proved to the Income Tax Commissioner that you are genuinely non-resident in Barbados. Can he say that I cannot register a company in British Guiana and be a share holder in Barbados? I can do that. The Hon. Minister over there can do that and call it the Miller Trust Company of British Guiana. You cannot stop the flow of money between one colony and the other. Do not mind what the Income Tax Commissioner says; it is not so easy to prove. As the situation stands now, everybody who paid income tax here would be entitled to relief of taxation in the United Kingdom. I am thinking more of the United Kingdom because you get capital invested here from abroad. If a man invests money in Barbados and he has to pay income tax in Barbados, so long as he presents such a certificate in England, he would not have to pay it twice. And the Hon. Premier said that any man paying income tax in Barbados who invested money from London, British Guiana or Trinidad and produced the certificate would not have to pay income tax there on it. That is what I am saying. Therefore, all that you are doing is fortifying the position here. I agree with you but I am wondering whether

it can be done. Let us say that you invested £10,000 here and we can collect £50 from you as income tax. As a means of encouraging you, we say to you: do not pay it here. Have you been advised of that? Follow my point carefully. You say: we are not going to collect income tax from you. The fact that he is in England should not prevent you from saying that the income from that investment is derived in Barbados and if it is £50, the income tax should normally be paid in Barbados, not in England.
9.50 p.m.

It does not matter whether he gets the income in Barbados or Honolulu. If the money comes from England or Barbados, he still pays income tax on it. You are giving up income tax from here to some other place. That is really what I am saying, and I hope that the hon. member sees my point now. It is absolutely necessary for you to prove that a case is a genuine one. I can only say that where cases are registered and they are genuine, whether a man puts money in the name of his children and establishes a company somewhere else, the same thing applies.

Goddards (Barbados) Limited and Goddards (Trinidad) Limited are different concerns, and Bookers (Barbados) Limited and Bookers (British Guiana) Limited are separate entities. What you are saying is that Barbados has given you income tax free and therefore you are not paying it here; what you are really doing is giving up income tax to another country.

MR. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, as I see it, this Bill is primarily intended to avoid the payment of double taxation on interest. If it went as far as that, and it was clear that our Government was able to make this agreement with other countries, then we would not have to go any further; but I know that when once the Income Tax Commissioner gets hold of money it is the Devil's own job to get it back from him. I can give an instance of a local company registered in England; I am speaking about the last Gas Company which we had here. There were certain local shareholders and they were paid a few dividends, but whenever those dividends were paid, they were paid their amount less the English income tax. The tax was taken out in England. I can tell you that not a single person ever got a refund. We want to have a reciprocal agreement between other countries and Barbados with respect to double taxation. That is the purpose for which I believe this Bill is intended. Our Government will forfeit any taxation on the interest on bonds which are held overseas, but the same holder of these bonds, if he is in England, will pay the English rate of taxation. He will not gain anything. The actual thing is that you should make it easier for him not to go to the Treasury and spend eighteen months in avoiding double taxation. I believe that an agreement with the British Government would have been better; that is how I see it.

I will put the case in another way; you are going to borrow something like \$30 million in another year, and most of that money will have to be found outside of Barbados. Have you computed what you are going to lose in income tax on that? Suppose you have to borrow that money at 6%, and suppose most of that money is invested by companies overseas! If it is a company, the local rate would be 40%; you are paying out 8% and you are in no way profiting by the present Rate of Interest Bill. However, that is coming tomorrow. I know that you need money - large sums which will not be found in Barbados; you are saying that money from abroad is more available than money from here, whereas, in truth and in fact, the money from here is worth more than that from abroad, because you will get your taxation from the local money as against that from abroad. You must always remember that when you are borrowing money you should try to get it raised in Barbados, because you will be saving yours and then you can try and give better inducement. If you can raise money at 6% from overseas, you can with advantage raise it locally at 7% and you will be saving something. That is ordinary arithmetic.

A more amazing matter is this: not so long ago when the last Premier was in office, he made us believe that it

was easy for him to get all the money he wanted almost on call in the London market; he only had to go there and take it up. It is true that the bank rate has changed, but it comes back to what I have been saying all along: that money is getting scarce, not only in Barbados, but everywhere. The Hon. Premier was there when we met the members of the last Parliamentary Delegation in the Other Place and one of the comments they made, he will remember was in warning us that money is not just there for the asking. You must be in a position to attract it and you can also drive it away by bad mathematics. When other hon. members spoke of development, that is development on the Government scale; it is not industrial development; not one penny is going to be put in a factory. Do you know whence I would like to see them getting this money? From the U.S.A., via the Federal Government. We have friends in North America and the matter only needs proper presentation to let them know that the money will be put to good uses; let them know that the people in Barbados are taxed to the hilt already. It is not a question of threatening them as how some people threaten and beg at the same time; you are asking them to do for you what they have done for other countries.

10.00 p.m.

If that is done, the bigger money which we need here is for industrial development, and that does not come by way of Government; that comes from private enterprise. You need money for two purposes, Government development such as schools, hospitals and harbour; then you need money for industrial development and machinery. That is my contribution, as I see it. This has gone farther than we need have gone. What you needed were agreements with other countries. Let me put it another way. Suppose you had somebody with £1 million to invest and he sent it to England, would they give off tax on his interest coming back here so that you could collect the whole amount? When they have taken out tax they leave you with nothing, but you are leaving it for them to take all on the other side.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the speech which has just been made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church has reinforced a conviction which I have held for a very long time in relation to the management of the affairs of this colony under the rampant capitalism under which we are now suffering, and that is, that the best Government to run a capitalist state is a capitalist himself. The hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. George both display an understanding of the machinations of capitalism in all its phases of which the members of the Government on the opposite side of the House are completely innocent. I am not going to say they are ignorant; they are completely innocent of the matters relating to finance under the rampant capitalists of this island which they bring to this House from time to time.

No one could belittle the contribution made in this matter by the hon. junior member for Christ Church, because taking the situation as it is, no one can gainsay that he has given a truthful analysis of the whole situation. As he is a capitalist, I want to congratulate him; but as a representative now of the people of Barbados, I want to take an entirely different approach to this matter, underscoring everything he has said in the premises. I do not think that capitalist is a 'bad word', any more than socialist is a 'bad word' for some people; but if you are going to have a half-baked socialism, you cannot bring in capitalist measures by members of a Government who do not even understand the simple workings of the bus fares, let us say, and expect to make it intelligible to members of this House in the first instance, and members of the general public in the final analysis.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question which perhaps you can answer for me, since you have answered one rhetorical question which I put to night. This is not rhetorical, but I expect an answer to this one. There is no Act on the Statute Books of Barbados called a General Loan and Stock Act, 1935. When was this Act passed? There is no Act on the Statute Books of Barbados called the General Loan and Stock Act, 1935; to which

Act does this refer? Incidentally, I would like to correct something said here by one of the previous speakers when the Minister of Finance had introduced this measure. If members go back to the Speech made at the opening of the present Session by the Governor, they will find that there is no portfolio for Education or for Finance. Perhaps they felt that they made such a mess of Finance in the past three or four years that it would be better not to designate the responsibility to any particular individual. We know that in the United Kingdom the Prime Minister may be a Minister of Defence or Minister for War; he is never Chancellor of the Exchequer ex-officio, but has some portfolio allocated to him. If no portfolio is allocated to him, he can look after Foreign Affairs; it has happened in British history before. We have a wonderful situation in Barbados of financial measures being introduced by every Tom, Dick and Harry on the Ministerial Benches without any final responsibility residing in any member present. I presume there may be a certain amount of method in that madness. I presume when the hon. senior member for the City referred to the Minister of Finance, he was alluding to the Minister for St. Thomas, the Premier of the island.

Now I see the hon. member for St. Thomas making some diligent research, but if he goes back to the debates of this House in 1953, he will see where I drew to the attention of the House, when the \$6 million loan was being authorised by the House, that the provisions of the two Loan Acts were being entirely confused by that side and there was the Minister for Finance or somebody in charge of the portfolio for Finance (because it was just before Ministerial status), and despite the warnings of the then hon. junior member for the City and myself, they persisted in their folly and had to come back to the House on a subsequent occasion to amend the whole thing. We have two Acts; you can only raise a loan in Barbados from two places and not from any part of the world or the Commonwealth; you can raise a loan in Barbados or in England. You cannot raise a loan on behalf of the Government of Barbados in Wall Street because it is contrary to the Law of the land and to the provisions of the Loan Act. You can either raise a loan here in Barbados or in England. Now you have the Local Loan Act which they confused at the time of the Five Year Plan, and the General Loan Inscribed Stock Act of 1935, which is a different matter altogether. I know that the Government will have to postpone this, but it is with regret sometimes that I have to get up and point out these things, because I do not subscribe to the theory of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas that my function is to congratulate the Government on half-doing the things which they are being paid to do properly. It is like congratulating my gardener for watering my garden half day when I am paying him to water it the whole day; so no words of praise will drop from my lips as far as Government is concerned. It must always go on record that I made an attempt to save them from their folly. When they can tell you that this is being done after mature consideration with the Financial Secretary, Sir Archibald Cuke, and other experts who have advised them, one wonders whether they study the measures which they want to foist on the unwitting public of Barbados.

10.10 p.m.

Right at the beginning of the Objects and Reasons of the Bill they say 'with a view to attracting investment by non-residents in Government loans, this Bill by Clause three seeks to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921, so as to provide that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may issue an order exempting from income tax, either in whole or in part, the interest payable on any debentures or stock which are or have been issued under the provisions of the General Loan Act, 1933, or the General Loan and Stock Act, 1935, and which the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is satisfied are in the beneficial ownership of persons who are not resident in the island.'

I am now going to very briefly endorse everything that the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said and the observations which he has made. It is not because I subscribe to his political convictions. It is because as a capitalist, he cannot forbear on the operations of the capitalist system, even although the immediate benefit does

not enure to himself or to his business associates. When you raise a loan, therefore, inside of Barbados under the general Local Loan Act of 1933, you are normally issuing debentures which operate by way of a kind of mortgage, that is to say, if it were a company it would be the first charge, that is to say, the debentures are a first charge of the Government of Barbados. When the Government raises a loan in the London Market they authorise the Crown Agents for the Colonies - the name of that office has been changed and known by another name - to issue a loan on such terms as they think fit; but there is a condition precedent to the issuing of such loan. They have to get the approval of Her Majesty's Treasury under the Inscribed Stock Act, and furthermore they have to get the consent of a body called the Capital Issuing Committee in London; but the part under consideration is that they must have the approval of Her Majesty's Treasury in the United Kingdom, under the 1933 General Loan Act, they do not need the approval or consent of anybody because the loan is in the first instance raised locally and you cannot transfer the prospectus from Barbados to London to raise money in London for a loan which is coming under General Local Loan Act.

Where I entirely agree with the hon. junior member for Christ Church is this. You are encouraging two things. The Hon. Premier has a very simple means of getting out of this dilemma. It appears that what I have said has created chaos and confusion. He can postpone consideration of this Bill and bring down a fresh Bill. All the ingenuity will not make it right. What you want is a proper Financial Secretary who would not make you get into this situation. We have drawn it to the attention of the Government and the Governor already that they need advice more than anybody else in this world. What you need is sincere advice; but this Government is badly served by its experts when it needs sincere advice just as it needs the grace of God. This Government is getting the worst possible advice and the worst possible draughtsmanship, and it is paying more than anybody else for the bad material which is put at their disposal. We of this Party give them free advice because it is our duty as representatives of the people to give them free advice; but if they do not like to follow that advice, then they can pay for it. Unfortunately, all of us have to pay for it.

As I was saying, I agree with the hon. junior member for Christ Church and it is the first time that I can remember I have got up and said that I agree with anything he has said or his Party. I am not going to anticipate any measure coming before the House; I will deal with it in the fullness of time and that is the Rate of Interest Act; I am not going into that at this stage.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to point out is this. In the first place, even if this Bill were correct it could not attract investment in Barbados; it could only encourage dishonesty by persons resident in Barbados, as the hon. senior member for the City pointed out, because there is absolutely nothing to prevent an investor in Barbados from sending his money outside to friends and allowing that money to come back in to be invested in Government debentures raised under one of the two Loan Acts, and then of course, with a secret declaration of trust or some paper of that kind transfer the money back to Barbados. There is no law against it, and there is nothing to prevent a resident of Barbados transferring all of his income or his capital to any British possession. The only restriction is on transferring your property, whether it be debentures, security or otherwise, to a hard currency area, and then you can do that with the permission of the Controller if necessity ever arises. But in so far as the British Commonwealth is concerned, whether it is England, Australia, Trinidad, Jamaica, British Guiana or any of the other British countries, there is no restriction in transferring your money and re-investing it in Barbados in order to evade our Income Tax Laws. That is the point made by the hon. senior member for the City.

Now, it is also acting as a deterrent to the Barbados investor to invest his money in Barbados, because with current investment opportunities he can get facilities out-

side of Barbados which would put him in a much better position than the conditions under which he will have to lend money either to the Barbados Government or anybody else in Barbados. If you want to encourage investment, Mr. Chairman, in the island, you have to extend these facilities not only to debenture holders of Government stock, but to industrial investment as a whole; that is to say, to preference share holders and ordinary shareholders especially where pioneer industries are concerned. I do not think one penny contributed by way of debentures is an investment at all other than putting your money in moth balls as it were because you do not want to use it.

10.20 p.m.

Anybody who wanted to use his money would not dream of investing one penny with the Government. Where you have a well-thinking investor who is a capitalist, a man who is living on what his money can make with possibly no kind of profit in the modern concept of Socialism, you are prepared to take back from that man unearned income within the definition of the Act, you are taking back a part as income which should be taxed on a higher rate than ours, and re-allocating it amongst the most unfortunate members of the community in social and welfare measures and Government undertakings which are fruitful and productive. That is the modern concept of socialism, but this is now socialism in reverse. You are making people get unearned income through Government debentures and giving them a dispensation which you do not afford to the local residents of the country. Where you have capitalists coming in from the hard currency areas - I would welcome any encouragement from those areas, of course, and people who would normally be on call to get the securities which the Barbados Government can put on the market, because they have surplus capital, and then you are giving them double protection by telling them: "you need not pay any interest on this amount."

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we begin to get tough with the people who are supposed to be helping us. Let the British Government have reciprocal arrangements whereby British subjects investing in industrial undertakings in Barbados and in the West Indies would be exempt from double taxation. I have not heard this Government doing what Trinidad has done; Trinidad has taken active steps to try and get the British Government to do something about it, and the Chief Minister of British Guiana is now telling the British Government that unless he gets money on the terms on which he wants it for the development of the Hinterland of British Guiana, he is prepared to resign. I would welcome the Hon. Premier getting in touch with the British Government and telling them that he would resign if he does not get any money. I give him the solemn undertaking that the members of this Party will not step in into his shoes unless they cannot see the facilities for which we are asking. I think I have the support of my colleagues in this matter, that we give our undertaking that we will join hands with the Premier and his Party. (ASIDES).

Mr. Chairman, I have the authority on the part of my parliamentary colleagues to give the Hon. junior member for St. Thomas the solemn undertaking that we will make it a national issue and if he resigns, we will not run the Government. I repeat, that if he makes a national issue and resigns, we will not run the Government. We want industrial development. They are not going to get any money; I told them that three years ago. The Government is not going to raise any money, no matter how many times they amend the Income Tax Act. They are trying to raise money at the most inopportune time; they were supposed to have \$60 million in 1956. They took the Governor away from his job and flew him to the United Kingdom and back here, as if it was a matter of bringing back something like nuts in a paper bag. We have not seen any money yet; we have seen the figures. The Deep Water Harbour is being constructed out of the colony's current revenue; they have expropriated some of the funds from the Government Savings Bank and not one penny has been raised on the English Market.

I disagree entirely with the hon. junior member for Christ Church on this point. I know that one of my col-

leagues is very strong on the point that investments should come from inside Barbados. I feel that the money which is left over - the margin between expendable income and income which is earned, the excess profits, the money with which you do not know what to do - few of us attain that object, though we all aspire to it. In the case of people who have income which they can invest, I think that money should be left to finance mortgages and matters of that kind and business interests of the Island. When we go in for any large undertaking, whether it is of a Government nature or of a private industrial nature, I feel that that money should come from outside the Island, because it will generate new purchasing power within the Island, which purchasing power was not here before.

If I may simplify that, I would say that when the Government raises money in Barbados, as they are raising now, they are only transferring money from one sector of the economy to another sector, and an unproductive sector at that. It is producing nothing but a lot of private bills and trips abroad for Ministers. They are not generating any new employment; they cannot deplete the ranks of the unemployment, because they are shifting about money inside the Island instead of driving the pump with money from outside. Whenever loans can bring in \$10 million from outside, they inject into the economy of this Island a stimulus in the form of \$10 million which was not there before. Let us say that that \$10 million provides 1,000 primary jobs in Barbados; the investment multiplier, about which I suppose the hon. senior member for St. Thomas will probably fulminate, because when I talked about the dynamic disequilibrium, he has not got out of it yet - well, I am now going to talk about the economic multiplier.

When you bring in \$10 million from outside and that provides 1,000 jobs for people, provided that they do not send it back out in the form of importing employees and people who use up money in importing all their machinery and equipment from outside when local material exist in Barbados where it would be more fully employed - provided they do not do that, the influential injection with the present multiplier effect on the economy of Barbados which is highly dynamic in a backward community like this will be felt, because people in this Island are living below subsistence, and therefore any money which comes into their possession must be spent very quickly.

10.30 p.m.

They are living below subsistence so that any money which comes into their pocket has to be spent very quickly and \$10 million become something like \$35 million put into circulation; so therefore, when the hon. junior member for Christ Church made the speech, Mr. Chairman, it was worthy of the hon. senior member for Christ Church and that is why I was worthy of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, and that is why I referred to it in its sanity and analysis; I do not mean in its philosophy. When the hon. junior member for Christ Church says how he would like most of this to be raised, they cannot subscribe to that. We want as much money as we can get from outside in the stability and the dynamism of the Government and people of Barbados. But what they mistake for stability is stagnation, and they think that in order to encourage people to invest money in Barbados you have got to be as reactionary, as retrogressive and as stagnant as possible. That is the difference in the approach in the Party to which I happen to belong and the Government Party. I cannot be in favour of introducing measures which are retrogressively capitalist in content and capitalist in philosophy. The other bogey which is waved in the faces of the people of Barbados all the time is that they must grant this and that concession, because if they do not grant it people will not provide jobs. For the ten years, and still recently, for the past six years during which they have had the economy of this island under their control, not one single industry has been set up.

HON. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order.....

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please listen a minute. In my opinion you have been making a second reading speech.

I have been waiting at intervals to cross you, but every time you seem to anticipate my action; you go back to the Loan Act.

MR. BARROW: If you give me a chance, I will come back to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will ask you to stick to Clause 3.

MR. BARROW: We differ fundamentally on the interpretation of Parliamentary Procedure, but I will respect the ruling of the Chair. I do not like my ruling coming from the Ministerial Benches. Mr. Chairman, anytime you want to rule, you should rule in your own right, but do not act as a channel or a funnel for pouring out the rulings of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to stick rigidly to Clause 3.

MR. BARROW: I am sticking as rigidly as any financial measure with such wide-reaching implications as the present one will afford me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not a second reading speech. This is Clause 3.

MR. BARROW: There is no definition in May's Parliamentary Practice of a second reading speech and a speech in Committee of the whole House. As long as I do not talk about the quarantine of dogs, I am within the ambit of this Bill. I am talking about the financial implications of the Bill, and there is nothing to the Bill but Clause 3; so I am not going to take any interpretation from the member for St. Thomas or from any members on the opposite side. Since when have they arrogated to themselves the duty to interpret Parliamentary Procedure to me or any other member of this House? The whole trouble is that any time you mention the unemployment situation in this island, it is like a red rag to a bull, like the tie which the hon. Bolshevik member is wearing. Unemployment is a 'bad word' which they do not want you to mention. We must just say that we are being nice and the people will respect us; but it is time that we begin to have a more realistic approach and see financial provisions from a wider perspective, and not in little piecemeal legislation like this. It is to be an overall policy, dove-tailing every measure into economic betterment.

I am saying that the effect of Clause 3 of the Bill - quite apart from the fact that the Bill is not properly drafted - is directly in conflict with the best interests of the people of this island, and it is not in the interest of any Party which purports to advance the causes of the working-class people of the island. No working-class person is going to benefit from this Bill; it is only people like the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior members for the City and St. George who will in any way be affected by this Bill. Private industry will not be affected by Clause 3; only Government investment, and what Government investment is there going on? Do you mean digging holes in the ground? That is all the economic activity going on in Barbados for the last twelve months; and throwing stones into the sea. If you go to Trinidad or Puerto Rico and any of those places, you are immediately struck by the dynamic atmosphere of expansion which you can see in those countries. In Barbados, all you see is digging up street after street and filling them back in with earth. There has not been any one industry of any importance or at all in this island in the last six years, and such

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again the hon. member is straying.

MR. BARROW: Do you want me to stick to Clause 3?

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the second time, I must warn you to stick to Clause 3 and leave out industries.

MR. BARROW: That is exactly what Government is doing. They are leaving out industries altogether. Why not amend Clause 3 to extend the provisions - I would agree with you in that - from the Government investment

aspect and general industrial investment? If you ask me to leave out industries, I cannot do that when I come to think of the economy of this island.
10.40 p.m.

I cannot contemplate Government running industries when I look around at the present time within the domains of the Government and see that the trained material which we should have at our disposal is incompetent to run it. What the Government has to do is to train the lower echelons and give them something to do. I am going to leave out industries in one aspect and bring them in in another aspect. If we are to be in favour of the Bill it will have to be in a more comprehensive form where industrial investments are also afforded the facilities for being extended by what was just engaging the attention of the Committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at this stage I have tried to condense all my suggestions and strictures to as narrow a purpose as I possibly can and there is nothing more that I would like to add at this stage. However I would like to go back to my first suggestion, and that is that through the ill-conceived planning of the Bill by the draughtsmen or the Executive Committee, or the Cabinet or whoever is responsible for scrutinising it before it was brought into this House. They did not seem to understand that there is no General Loan and Stock Act of 1935. It is not a simple matter or something where you can stick in a word, because the very fact that they have in at least two places, the General Loan and Stock Act of 1935, discloses that they have not read the provisions of that Act because this is written boldly that it is Inscribed Stock and I am not here to explain what is Inscribed Stock; therefore let them take back this Bill. One cannot teach them everything in one lesson. It would take them six years to learn. There is no point in sticking in a word or saying that we must put in the word "Inscribed" because it is referring to something which does not exist at all and you cannot make something out of nothing. How do you know that another word is not to go in? I can suggest a word, but you certainly cannot amend this by sticking in a word and saying that everything is all right. You do not amend legislation in that way. When you make legislation you have to come in with a firm grasp of the legislation and then you have to dovetail in your provision what is your general financial policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is

MR. TUDOR: Did you hear the hon. member just point out that there is something fundamentally wrong with the Bill.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the word "Inscribed" in line 10 of sub-paragraph (1) of the new section 13 A.

MR. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I object to leave being granted to the Hon. Minister to do what he wants, because I want to be sure if he is sure whether that is what he wants, and secondly, by the putting in of that word, I want to be sure whether he is sure that he will have the Bill which he wants and that that word will remedy the defects of it.

You see, Sir, much more is involved than merely putting in the word "Inscribed." If the Hon. Minister and his colleagues had been listening carefully to the speech of the hon. member who has just sat down, they would realise that he was suggesting that the whole concept of the Bill was wrong and that there were certain defects of policy as well as law, and he suggested to take back the Bill and bring back an amended and better Bill next week. They have listened to some one who has persuaded them that the Bill can be saved by inserting the word "Inscribed". Of course, that is for the Hon. Premier to decide.

The question that leave be granted the Hon. Premier was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that Clause 3 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. Thorne; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. L. E. SMITH; and Mr. F. G. SMITH - 8.

NOES: Mr. GODDARD; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA; Mr. BARROW; Mr. CRAWFORD; and Mr. BRANCKER - 6.
10.50 p.m.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

HON. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER who took the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Bill as amended was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "DATE OF PUBLICATION OF THE REGISTERS OF ELECTORS AND REGISTERS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORS, ORDER".

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, earlier in the day, I asked for leave to proceed with the Resolution seeking the approval of an Order extending the date for the publication of the Registers of Electors to the 31st July, 1958.

I am now asking leave to deal with this Resolution as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Order entitled the "Date of Publication of the Registers of Electors and Registers of Local Government Electors, Order 1958".

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks to extend the date for the publication of the Registers of Electors and the Registers of Local Government Electors until the 31st July, 1958. According to the Law, this publication should be ready on the 30th of June, this year, but it is not far from that date and it has been practically decided that this publication will not be ready by then. Permission of the Legislature is therefore being sought to extend the date of the publication of these Registers to the 31st July. A similar thing was done last year; the publication of these Registers was not ready by the time stipulated and an extension of the date was sought for and was granted by the Legislature. There are many reasons for that, reasons which we need not go into just now.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

HON. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

MR. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in connection with this Resolution which I am not opposing, of course, I should like to take this opportunity of saying a few words. It is the duty of the Government to make it quite clear to members of the public where and how they should become registered. There are a lot of people who are not registered up to 1956, but who are eligible to be registered now all over the island, and they are not sure as to where they are to go and how to achieve their registration; and the Government is apparently taking no steps to ensure that they are informed about it. I am surprised at the inaction on the part of the Government in this matter because we know the attitude of 99% of the people who were not of age and therefore were not qualified to vote in 1956, but who are now eager to be put on the Register. It is the duty of the Government whatever it feels its fate will be, to give all the publicity possible to the name of the places where one must get oneself on the Register of Electors. There should be this publicity over Radio, in the Press and through every possible source

to let people who have become eligible to register, know where they may go and make themselves registered electors, so that in the case of a general election or a by-election, they will find themselves on the roll of electors, they having attained the age at which they are eligible to vote.

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

RESOLUTION re SALE OF LAND TO BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT BOARD

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works & Housing:- To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the sale by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of a parcel of land situated at Grazettes in the parish of St. Michael to the Barbados Development Board.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the purpose of this Resolution is to effect the sale of a portion of land at Grazettes by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to the Barbados Development Board. In 1956 an area of land of approximately 2,041,372 square feet was purchased by the Government for use mainly as a Housing Estate, but it was anticipated at that time that a part of it might be needed for the establishment of an industrial estate. This parcel of land, which it is proposed to sell to the Barbados Development Board, comprises an area of approximately 523,727 square feet and this land is now required for the purpose of establishing an industrial trading estate. This land is near the main road, all the public utilities and facilities are there, and the money realised from the sale of this land will be handed over to the Labour Welfare Fund from which the funds for the purchase of the land were made available.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

HON. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

MR. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister who has introduced this Resolution if Natural Gas is in the vicinity of this land and how far away it is from it. If we are to select a site for industrial development, there will have to be all the services available. I am not so familiar with the site itself, but the Hon. Minister is and he could probably tell us what I have asked and tell us more as to the selection of the site. He could probably tell us who has selected the site and what they envisaged in the turning over, the leasing, the sale or otherwise of this land.

11.00 p.m.

Do they intend to do what some other countries like Puerto Rico have done to the extent of building, leasing, renting and selling? As a matter of fact, this is so important that I should not be asking those questions at all. When it was being introduced a fuller description and explanation should have been given to members on the development that is sought. We realise that we have to begin somewhere, and the siting of industries at one spot with all the services I have mentioned available is essential. It is nothing new to that. That is done in British Guiana and I understand that in Trinidad there is a development area. I am not saying this as a criticism; I am asking for information so that I might know as fully as possible what Government has in mind.

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

MR. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the establishment of this industrial estate which on the face of it does not set out how much land will be allocated for that purpose.

The Addendum to the Resolution states that an area of approximately 2,041,372 square feet of land is required for the establishment mainly of a housing estate, and that funds for the purchase of this land were made available from the Labour Welfare Fund. It has also been decided to sell part of this land to the Barbados Development Board for the purpose of establishing an industrial

trading estate. The Addendum does not state how much land will actually be set out for the industrial estate, and on what terms will this estate and land be given to prospective investors.

It is a good thing to see that a start is being made in this direction, but we are hoping that in establishing this industrial estate there will still be enough room at Grazettes to continue the housing programme. I would like to hear the Minister explain further the establishment of this industrial estate as well as the terms on which prospective industrialists will be able to secure land for industrial purposes.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member read the Resolution carefully, because he will see that not only is the amount of money embodied in the Resolution as such; but the amount of land which is 523,727 square feet. We are selling it at 5¢ per square foot to the Development Board. I do not think that natural gas is very close in the area, but I think that hon. members are aware of the way in which these industrial estates are set up; they are either leased or rented to industrial concerns. As hon. members know, you set out the land, build roads and instal water and invite firms in. There are no terms and conditions that I can reveal, because none are laid down. Members who have been to Jamaica will have seen how these estates are laid out. As I said before, this is being done with the idea of attracting industrialists in this country.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was thinking along those lines myself. I thought Government would have waited until they had reclaimed the land in the building of the Deep Water Harbour and used that land, because it would have been in easy reach of the various facilities. I suppose this is a good start, but I think the real attraction in big countries would have been where there are houses in the immediate area, and where you can get gas and other public utilities. I agree with this, but I do not know that it should be in an area which you are going to develop and there is no public utility such as natural gas. I would throw out a suggestion which Government should keep in mind, and it is that the best place to offer as an attraction would be the area which is reclaimed in the building of the Deep Water Harbour.

MR. CRAWFORD: I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, to learn that a member of the Government, a Minister rather, could not have told the House whether natural gas was in the area. One of the prerequisites of an industrial estate is the accessibility of fuel for power. Nobody is going to site an industry where adequate power is not readily available, and therefore the point raised by the hon. junior member for Christ Church is of tremendous significance. I am not surprised that the Minister confessed his ignorance about it because with this entire question of industrial development, Government is just deliberately playing the fool. The mere acquisition of land for industrial purposes does not mean, as the Minister suggests, that manufacturers are going to be attracted.

11.10 p.m.

What is holding up industrial development in this country is the lack of proper pioneer industries legislation, and the absolute indifference of the Government in so far as that is concerned is entirely to be blamed for the present position. They have the land there; they are not using it for housing; therefore they say that they are allocating it for an industrial estate. Ask the Hon. Minister of Trade whether he has not a draft Bill for the amendments to the existing pioneer legislation on his desk for about sixteen months? It is as far back as January or February last year that his Government had drafted amendments to the pioneer industries legislation and it just remains there on his desk like a piece of blotting paper without his paying any attention to it while the other islands around us are being developed to the amazement of visitors. Only the other day you had Lord Hastings or some member of the House of Lords who expressed amazement over the rapidity with which Jamaica was being industrialised and a few days ago you had representation coming from over twenty-two firms applying for industrial rights in Jamaica. Within

the last two years you had between twelve and fifteen firms in Barbados willing to invest in new industries. You had a few from America, a few from Venezuela and others from Europe and from Britain. Almost all of them left the country in disgust, either because they got little or no encouragement from the Minister or the Government or because of the inadequate facilities which were offered. The Hon. Minister knows that you are not going to get a single investor being interested in a single square foot of land at Grazettes until the Pioneer Industries Act is amended. Therefore I want to challenge him, if he or his Government is really interested in industrial development, to leave alone a lot of the nonsensical legislation which they bring here every Tuesday and get along with the amendments which they had so long to the Pioneer Industries Act.

The important thing, Mr. Speaker, that we in this country will find in the near future is that we have missed the bus. In the Federal Constitution it is stated that industrial development in the unit areas is a matter for the unit legislatures only for the first five years. After that, it becomes a matter of the Federal Government and that is one of the reasons why Trinidad and Jamaica more especially are racing ahead in the manner they are with industrial developments before it becomes the obligation of the Federal Government to allocate industries to the unit areas or to plan for Federal industrial development. Therefore, Sir, the Government of Barbados with its tremendous potentialities for industrial development which is marking time on this important question is guilty of criminal indifference and criminal neglect to the needs of the community: and I say, Sir, that the Resolution before us is merely begging the question of industrial development until such time as Government actually concerns itself with putting on the Statute Book of the Colony Pioneer Industries Legislation which would really attract investors to the country and which would really make an industrial estate of some value and importance.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I share the astonishment of the hon. senior member for St. Philip because one would have thought in the Resolution that one of the prime factors considered would be a source of power. I was a very relevant consideration proposed by the question of the hon. senior member for Christ Church when he asked how far was the natural gas main from Grazettes, because one of the prerequisites of successful industrial expansion must be cheap fuel power of one sort or the other available. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas should be the last person to confess his ignorance about the availability of natural gas because natural gas quite apart from the natural proclivities of the Hon. Minister - - -

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think I was asked by the hon. junior member for Christ Church if there was natural gas in that vicinity or if it is passing along there. The closest point I know is Lancaster. Why can't you pipe it from there?

MR. BARROW: The Hon. Minister has disclosed his ignorance by saying that is the closest point, because the natural gas passes all through his parish, down Rock Hall, through Bennetts and down to this proposed estate somewhere in the vicinity of Warrens Factory. He should have these things at his finger tips. I agree with him. You can run it from the back of Warrens Factory across by Clermont Plantation, down Lodge Hill and into Cave Hill which is over all a distance of about a mile and a half. So Sir, the question of fuel power is an important consideration: but in view of the distance which the gas would have to be piped one wonders whether they have taken this into consideration when they located this industrial estate in the Gazette area. Perhaps it would be better if they had taken the estate to the power itself, that is anywhere along the pipe line, that is to Waterford or Bagatelle where they already own land and where they can acquire more land for industrial development purposes, or they could have taken it into the constituency of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and located it there.

There are other considerations, such as the transport factor of the power to be taken into account. Anyhow, I hope they have all of these things clearly sorted out before they jump into any undertaking of this kind because the members

of the Government are notoriously unqualified in matters of this kind; therefore I hope they are well advised on this. I am only mentioning some of the factors which they should take into consideration.

The other thing is that they have taken over this land from the Housing Authority at a cost of five cents a square foot which I understand was the price which was paid for it. I think the total area was 44 acres and they are disposing of approximately 11 acres which is one quarter of what they originally bought. I ask and enjoin the Hon. Minister to keep an eye on this business of selling. 11.20 p.m.

I heard some mention made of the selling of land and industrialists coming in, but I do not think that that is desirable at all. If a man establishes a trade here, it has been brought here at the taxpayers' expense; the place is erected at their expense and then you are going to allow him to have the power to speculate and sell to anybody who may only use the place as a bond house. When you rid yourself of the fee simple in possession of any property, you cannot dictate to a person that he cannot sell it again; it would be contrary to the established principle of development under Government auspices, if you allow private owners to buy a part of an establishment on which to speculate. The Board has got to exercise eternal vigilance to see that the factory space which has been leased out is utilised to the fullest advantage, and non-discriminatory practices of legislation and restriction will have to be put into effect in order to see that the best employment use is made of it, and not merely such use as a bond house for somebody's rum or anything of that kind. I was alarmed when I heard the Hon. Minister suggest that when an industrial estate is set up, there will be the possibility of the area being sold to private enterprise. Sir, the very rationale of the establishment is that it remains under the control of the Government.

HON. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I specifically said that the land was under lease. I mentioned that, in other areas, industrial lands were sold or leased or rented, and that the Development Board would probably lease this land. I repeat that the Development Board would probably lease this land.

MR. BARROW: I want to repeat that the hon. member said that the land would be leased, rented or sold, and that the Hon. Minister when he was Minister of Trade cannot evince ignorance of this. If he cauterises his brain as soon as he switches from one portfolio to another he has a wrong perspective about history and evolutionary development. He said that this land would be leased, rented or sold; I would just like to point out to him that in those countries where they have sold industrial estates which have been initiated by the Government, it was because they admitted defeat, in the first instance, or in the second instance, projects become so unsuccessful that it was a clear undertaking after a probationary period, the estates would be sold out to private enterprise. However, to start off an industrial estate by saying that you are going to sell it to private enterprise is to begin a venture of this kind in a wrong prospective. I am not criticising the hon. member; I am just warning him of what will happen if he deals with an important matter of this kind in that way.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1958."

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Trade.

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

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the consideration of this Resolution will not take very long. As hon. members will see from the Addendum, the Customs Department

wants to replace the present hand-operated stamp, used for countersigning the warrants passed by the Customs Officer in connection with the passing of entries of goods for home consumption, for the use of an accounting and numbering machine. In order to have the authority to do so, we must change the Regulations. These Regulations have already been laid in the Legislature, and this Resolution seeks to give effect to these Regulations.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

HON. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

ORDERS POSTPONED

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to postpone Orders Nos. 5 and 6 and to take Order No. 7 as the next Order of the Day.

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

REGISTRATION OFFICE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

MR. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Registration Office Act, 1903.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Registration Office Act, 1903 as amended by the Registration Office (Amendment) Act, 1947. The purpose of this Bill is to increase the rates paid to certain staff at the Registration Office. The members of this staff are not Civil Servants, and therefore, they do not come under any Civil Service changes for salary increase and so the Act has to be amended to give effect to any increase which may be coming to them.
11.30 p.m.

As set out here, Sir, the Objects and Reasons read as follows:—

"Under subsection (4) of section 2 of the Registration Office Act, 1903 as enacted by section 2 of the Registration Office (Amendment) Act, 1947, persons engaged in recording or copying documents are paid at the following rates:—

(a) three pence per folio of 90 words for copying voters Lists; and

(b) five pence per folio of 90 words for recording or copying any other document.

These rates have remained unchanged for ten years, and in view of the increase in salaries of Government employees since the time these rates were fixed, Government has agreed to increase the rate for copying Voters Lists to 8 cents per folio of 90 words, and the rate for recording or copying any other document to 13 cents per folio of 90 words. Clause 2 of the Bill seeks to amend the Registration Office Act, 1903 accordingly.

In order to meet the cost of these increased rates, Clause 3 of the Bill provides for increases in certain fees to be received by the Registrar as provided in the Schedule to the Registration Office Act, 1903.

Clause 4 of the Bill contains provisions for the conversion of pounds, shillings and pence into dollars and cents in the principal Act."

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

HON. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

MR. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I agree with this, but there is another matter which is of a similar nature which Government should no longer continue to overlook, and that is in respect of an increase in the cost of copying proceedings which is done by the Clerks of the Court. The figure of two pence per folio of 90 words has been in existence for half a century, and we find that as a result they take as long as possible to do them, and sometimes although they are paid as soon as the order is given, take so long that

they forget they were paid and ask for a second payment, because the two pence for 90 words is out of conformity with the present cost of living and other rates of pay. When it comes to the Assistant Court of Appeal Act, the cost of these proceedings fifty years ago was fixed at \$2. It is still \$2 which the Clerks may legally charge. Since Government has given this matter consideration, that is a matter which is on exactly similar lines and which I think is entitled to similar consideration, and there would certainly be a great boon to the Clerks to charge something somewhat in proportion with present day rates than that which by Law is charged now, and which has been in force for the past half century.

MR. F. G. SMITH: I shall not be long. I welcome the amendment as brought down, but I know for a fact that the Registrar of the Supreme Court recommended slightly more than this amount. In one case I know he recommended 15¢. As you will see, the rates have remained unchanged for over ten years, and in view of the increase in salaries of Government employees who have had at least two increases during the last ten years, you will agree with me no doubt that the amount as recommended is extremely small. I should like to know whether the reason for not granting the Registrar's reasonable request was financial. While I welcome the increase, I must voice my disapproval of the fact that the increases are so small after ten years of neglect. I think to increase one from ten cents to thirteen cents instead of fifteen cents which the Registrar recommended, and the other from six cents to eight cents where he recommended more is really very small and almost negligible; but this, I understand, is just like the pension increase - a token increase - and does not go as far as I would have hoped Government would have taken it, because you have to realise that these persons involved are doing a job which will remain necessary for quite some time. If you have not got the equipment and the necessary legislation to remove them, then at least you should pay them a reasonable living wage. They get no vacation when the year comes; as a matter of fact, I think it was one of the ideas of the Registrar that money should be provided to give them at least two weeks per year to which other more humble employees are entitled by Law. Their job is such that the moment they do not work they do not get paid, with the result that some of them who have been doing this job for years find it impossible to get vacation at all. I feel that for anyone doing a service for Government, Government should be in a position - just as Government imposes on private employers the necessity and the legal obligation to grant holidays with pay - to see that he is entitled to some sort of holiday when the year comes.

I welcome this increase, but I hope Government in the near future will find it possible to be a bit more generous to those persons who under our present system are doing a very difficult and very necessary job.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Government is in the habit of introducing in the Twentieth Century legislation which is more appropriate to the horse and buggy period of civilisation. For a long time, along with the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and other members on this side of the House, we have been pointing out the difficulties under which the Central Registry in this island operates from day to day, and we have been advocating to the Government for a long time that the method of reproducing and filing documents is antiquated and obsolescent. The persons who are supposed to be engaged in the Registry are not Civil Servants, Mr. Speaker. They enjoy no pension rights; they are piece workers or task workers in the same way as a man cutting stones in Mount quarry or at Chapel Plantation quarry.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. Is that anything to do with the Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is describing the method of work; he said they are not Civil Servants.

MR. BARROW: I do not think the hon. member realises this is a second reading; I think that is his real

difficulty. When you are in Committee you make speeches on the second reading, but you do not have speeches on the third reading.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to point out is that this Bill is to increase the rate of pay for the people whom we call copyists in the Registry. They have very important legal documents to enter into the vellum folios, and also the task of not only keeping documents in the Record Books, but when a member of the public goes into the Registry to demand a copy of a legal document, they have to copy it from the Record Book into which it has been placed from the original back on to foolscap for sale to members of the general public.
11.40 p.m.

In other words, this is not a charge on the Treasury at all and, as a matter of fact, I am suggesting that we can make an amendment here, if we like. We can suggest an amendment. Even if the Crown Solicitor is in need of a document from there, he has to pay for it. They are not entitled to legal documents as a right. They are not even entitled to look at them or consult the index. They have to pay for the privilege of getting copies of these documents.

I do not see why the Government is being parsimonious about it, but this is not the observation which I got up to make at this stage. I am saying that for years we have been suggesting to the Government that this is an outmoded method of recording important legal documents and it is almost like a kind of work which galley slaves had to do. It is laborious. What I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier is that the Registry is months and months behind hand and that is the contention which has been thrown out by anyone who went in there even wanting a Birth Certificate. It is so because you employ people to sit down and write out in longhand documents which are recorded in milligraph in other countries, and the obvious thing for this Government to do is to immediately investigate the feasibility, if they are not convinced of its advisability up to the present, of incorporating a photographic machine or a copying machine. The difference, as far as I understand is that with a photostatic machine you get the reverse of the print, but the copying machine is one which can turn out any document as the original; and the same people who are now employed in this laborious process of copying documents can be the same people who can work this machine and get what they want copied in three or four minutes' time. We have a Clerk of the House. He can tell the Hon. Minister that the same people whom you employ to do this work can be trained free of cost to work this copying machine because I understand that the firms that manufacture this particular machine - I do not know the firms; I have no interest in any particular firms; I only have an interest in seeing that the process of law is expedited and people do not suffer any disadvantage from the documents which they need being delayed - will send out people to train the copyists - or such persons whom the Government seems disposed to employ - into the methods of operating these machines. Therefore, instead of your going into the Registry and paying five or six dollars and waiting three or four months to get a document, you will be able to go in there and get it in ten minutes in the same way as it was in the original.

I seem to remember somewhere that the hon. junior member for St. George before he was elevated to the eminence from which he now looks down on matters in the interests of the inhabitants, supported some such idea, and I would have thought that he would have given his colleagues some assistance on this matter when they were deciding on it. I do not know whether it is that since he is on the Ministerial Bench he has lost his flavour for progressive matters of this kind as he has become benumbed by too long an occupation on the ministerial side, or whether it is that his higher technical senses for matters of this kind have deserted him. I am sure that if the Hon. Premier discuss this matter with him, he will get a lot of technical information about the matter; at any rate, he will get some information on the matter from the Hon. Minister.

HON. F. E. MILLER: Sir, I happened to be in here all the time that the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking and I sat down and listened to all his arguments and I listened with pains to what he said. What the Hon. Premier is asking for is a change in the rates for the present compilation of the documents in the Treasury. The hon. junior member for St. John is talking about getting a photostatic machine but the Hon. Premier is not talking of any photostatic machine; that is not really what we want. We are satisfied that the rates which we are asking for the compilation of these documents now are what they should be.

(A VOICE: The Hon. Minister seems to have been asleep).

Sir, I am aware of what is going on. We were at pains to discuss this in Cabinet and long before it was sent down to the House. If you search the record, you will see where you have documents which you want to copy. We have not yet reached the stage where we require photostatic machines. Of course, if the hon. member is speaking in terms of modern ways of doing things and he wants it to apply to everything, let him say so. For instance, if you are talking of modern ways of doing things, you can take out special insurance for members of the Government for everything, including the loss of a fountain pen. You can bring almost everything up to date in these modern times but a photostatic machine is not necessary yet. For instance, again, you used parchment paper over 3,000 years ago and that is still being used today. Two thousand years ago, you had filing cabinets and you still have filing cabinets today. The hon. member is talking of photostatic machines to create a scant image. I do not see what the hon. member is worrying about. If the hon. member believes that since I have been a Minister I have lost contact or lost touch with progressive matters, that is a mistake. The hon. senior member for the City knows this. He has come to my Ministry many times and have seen me. I dislike even taking a little rest period. I think he knows that I can find something to do all the time.

MR. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. BARROW: I too rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister said that I made reference to his character. I merely asked the Hon. Premier to consult him about this matter because I had a dim recollection that he had spoken along the lines that I was advocating that there should be such machinery for copying and he said they used parchment. Does he suggest that they should have caves for filing these documents?

HON. F. E. MILLER: The hon. junior member for St. John accused me of using the word "character". I have not used the word "character". He seems to be inventing things. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy got up on a point of order. I did not understand what he said. He seems to have had an overdose of saliva which he could not swallow.

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

11.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive - were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

HON. R. G. MAPP: The consideration of that Bill concludes Government Business for today.

MR. SPEAKER: Government Business having been concluded, the House will now proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

PAROCHIAL EMPLOYEES PENSION (COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE) BILL

MR. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. senior member for the City:— To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Parochial Employees Pension Act, 1944 as amended by Acts of 1947 to 1951 inclusive and the Parochial Employees Pension (Cost of Living Allowance) Acts, 1953, 1954 and 1955.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a Bill to amend the Parochial Employees Pension Act. I may say at the beginning that this Bill had been duly advertised and a Petition in this connection was presented in this Chamber. This Bill seeks to amend the Act which now gives a Cost of Living Allowance of 20% on the first £100, 7 1/2% on the second £100 and 5% on the third £100. We are, in this Bill, asking that the cost of living allowance be 20% on the first £100, there are 47 pensioners and 42 of them will benefit from this Bill, because the other five retired before the increase in salaries was made. The highest pensioner gets \$279 and the lowest gets \$3.60. At no time will anybody receive more than £35 per annum. This Bill may vary a little from the Government's rates, but the number of people who will benefit from it, is 42, as I have said, and the highest pensioner will receive \$279 and the highest he will get is 5%. I do not think that there is anything controversial about this matter.

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

MR. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

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

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY seconded by Mr. TALMA, the Preamble was postponed.

The five Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The Preamble was called and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY seconded by Mr. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. MOTTLEY seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

12.02 a.m.

THE PAROCHIAL EMPLOYEES PENSION (COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE) ACT, 1958

MR. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for the City: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Parochial Employees Pension Act, 1944 as amended.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend the Parochial Employees Act which has been advertised. There is the question of laying the rates in accordance with local pensions and therefore the cost of living which they

got before up to 24th March must be consolidated before we can pay them a cost of living bonus on what they are being paid now.

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

MR. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY seconded by Mr. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY seconded by Mr. TALMA, the Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY seconded by Mr. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Mr. MOTTLEY seconded in each case by Mr. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE EDUCATION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1958.

MR. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for the City, to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Education Act, 1890 as amended.

MR. MOTTLEY: This is a Bill to amend the Education Act. I am sure hon. members will agree with me that just a few months ago permission was given to the Parish of St. Philip to do a similar amendment. If St. Philip with two-fifths of the population of St. Michael is entitled to more scholarships, certainly St. Michael is too, because we have as many as thirteen hundred applications for the few scholarships which we offer. At present we send 20 boys to Harrison College, eight girls to Queen's College, 50 boys to Combermere School and 50 girls to St. Michael's Girls' School, making a total of 128 pupils. The Vestry is asking to amend the Act so that it can send 30 boys to Harrison College, 20 girls to Queen's College, 60 boys to Combermere School and 60 girls to St. Michael's Girls' School, making a total of 170 exhibitions altogether. I do not think that any hon member would disagree with this. We have discussed this with Headmasters and Headmistresses of the various schools, and arrangements have been made for these pupils to enter at the beginning of the school year.

Hon. members might ask if this might not present the same situation as in the Parish of St. Philip where they had to ask for more money, but it would be interesting to let them know that we supply the other things, apart from fees, under Poor Relief. As a matter of fact, the money we spend on scholarships at present is over \$6,000, and for books and lunch the amount is over \$2,000 per annum.

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

MR. FG. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY seconded by Mr. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

On motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 1st July, at 3 o'clock p.m.

HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

MR. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that last week I gave notice of a motion in connection with certain statements obtaining in the statement made by the Hon. Premier earlier, but in view of the fact that it is now Wednesday morning and particularly as regards our employees who are our greatest concern, we are all rather fatigued and I do not propose carrying on with that motion this morning. But I am giving notice to the Government that you will expect them to afford us reasonable accom-

modation for dealing with that motion in view of the attitude of us this morning. I hope the Government will allow us the opportunity of discussing this matter at our next meeting at a reasonable hour: that is, either tea or supper. I am sure that Government would not like us to carry on business until morning breaks out. This is an important debate and we would like each point fully ventilated.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, under Private Members' Business, I would like Item 10 to be put as Item 1.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member missed the fixing of the Order Paper.

MR. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Premier one question which I have been asking in this Chamber for a long time. It is with reference to the Court in Belleplaine which has been shut for the last two years. We have expended the taxpayers' money in putting up a building and not using it. I am asking him to discuss the matter with the Chief Justice and let us know what is happening. The last Premier promised us an answer which we have not got.

The question that the House do now stand adjourn until Tuesday, 1st July, 1958, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.