

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st April, 1959.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 12 noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C.B. SEARLES; Hon. I. ST.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meetings held on the 13th, 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th March respectively have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be now taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, these Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 31st December, 1958, (Schedule to the Police Act, 1908-2).

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados, and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended on the 31st December, 1958, in respect of Schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

The Local Government (Contracts) Regulations, 1959.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Post Office advances for the payment of Money Orders to 31st January, 1959.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to waive the repayment of the sum of \$12,000 in respect of a loan made to the Barbados Cricket Association (Incorporated) towards the rebuilding of pavilion at Kensington Oval.

Resolution to approve The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.2) Order, 1959.

Resolution to approve The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No.3) Order, 1959.

Resolution to approve The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No.4) Order, 1959.

Resolution to approve The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No.5) Order, 1959.

Resolution to approve The Civil Establishment (Teachers)(Amendment) Order, 1959.

Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (Teachers)(Amendment)(No.2) Order, 1959.

Resolution to approve the salary scales and conditions of Head Teachers and Teachers in Government aided secondary schools.

A Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ended thirty-first day of March, 1959.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to amend the United States (Oceanographic Research Station) Act, 1956.

A Bill to amend the law with respect to the hire-purchase and sale upon credit of goods.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to discuss the subject matter and content of the statement made by the Hon. Premier at a meeting of this House on the 14th April, 1959 relative to proposed constitutional changes and his forthcoming visit to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

Is the Minister aware that owners of fishing boats at Tent Bay, Bathsheba, in the parish of St. Joseph incur

290

heavy expenses due to damage caused to the hulls of their boats by the large rocks at the bottom of the sea?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister take steps to remedy the situation?
12.25 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

Is the Minister aware that there is urgent need for a fish shed and counter for cutting up the fish at Tent Bay, Bathsheba in the parish of St. Joseph?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister have same erected as soon as possible?

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

Is the Minister aware that owners of fishing boats find it increasingly difficult to meet the payments due towards the loans made to them during the limited period allotted to them?

2. Will Government consider extending the time for repayment in order to help them to meet their liabilities in other directions in connection with the purchase of the engines of the said boats?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ended thirty-first day of March, 1959, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, a Bill to amend the United States (Oceanographic Research Station) Act, 1956, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, a Bill to amend the law with respect to the hire-purchase and sale upon credit of goods, was read a first time.

Mr. SEARLES APPOINTED TO ACT AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. James be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for today's sitting in the absence of the Hon. Chairman of Committees.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX PURPORTS TO MAKE A STATEMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you call the first Order of the Day, I would just like to make a Statement in connection with an expression made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter during the discussion of the Resolution on the McKenzie Report.

This is the Statement:-

"The Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs has released a Statement -----"

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister pardon me for interruption. Discussion is at present going on relative to the Resolution in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter about the McKenzie Report. I think the Hon. Minister is the next member who is to speak on the particular matter and in that event I think it is rather complicated to have a Statement put in at the same time in connection with the same matter.

I think that should come during the discussion. I do not like the putting in of a Statement when the matter is

still under consideration. The hon. member will have ample time to speak on the matter and possibly to include documentary matter in his discussion on the matter. I rather think that the Hon. Minister should not pursue with the Statement at this time.

Hon. M. E. COX: Very well, Your Honour.

Hon. R. G. MAPP MAKES STATEMENT re THE PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR THE EXTENSION OF BUS-STAND AT FAIRCHILD STREET

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the Day, I would like to make a statement in respect of the provision of funds for the extension of the bus-stand.

The statement is as follows:-

With the completion of the Central Market at Fairchild Street, it is now possible to carry out the work of extending the bus stand on part of the site formerly occupied by the Highways and Transport Department.

2. The cost of this work is estimated at \$59,216 but as no funds are available under the present Development Plan, it is proposed to meet the cost from the allocation provided for highway improvements as shown in the Capital Estimates, 1959-60, under Head VIII - Communications, Item 2.

3. This statement is being made for the information of the Honourable House in view of the fact that it is proposed to utilise funds provided under one item for a purpose other than indicated in the relevant Note in the Estimates.

ORDER No.1 POSTPONED

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No.1 and that it be placed at the bottom of the Order Paper.

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

12.35 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. Is the hon. Minister asking leave to postpone this Order for the entire day or until another meeting of the House? (Hon. M. E. COX: For the entire day.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The postponement of the Order is for the entire day.

Messrs. CORBIN and WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats"

STATEMENT re MCKENZIE REPORT

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a few minutes ago I objected to granting leave to the Hon. Deputy Premier to make a Statement to the House because when the Hon. Deputy Premier began to ask permission to make that Statement he made a reference in connection with the discussion which is presently going on as to the McKenzie Report. I told the hon. member that inasmuch as the matter was under discussion I would not allow him to make that statement; however, I have seen that Statement since then and it has absolutely nothing to do with the subject matter of the McKenzie Report. I am now in a position to give the hon. member permission to make that statement.

Hon. M. E. COX: I thank you, Sir. The Statement is as follows:-

"The Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs has released a statement declaring the recent allegations made by a Trade Union leader in the Barbados House of Assembly to be unfounded.

These allegations included criticism of the Federal Government for selecting a trade unionist from British Guiana to go to the United Kingdom to the exclusion of a Barbadian, and for spending Federal money on a trade unionist from British Guiana - a non-participating Territory.

According to the Federal Ministry, in May last year the United Kingdom Information Officer for the West Indies asked the Federal Government to select three Trade Unionists from the units of the Federation to visit the United Kingdom as guests of Her Majesty's Government to see how trade unionism works in Britain. Proposals to the Governments of British Guiana and of British Honduras to select one trade unionist each were also made. The expenses of this tour including passages were met by H. M. G. The three successful nominees from unit territories of the West Indies together with the nominee of British Guiana and that of British Honduras spent four weeks in the United Kingdom.

The Federal Government therefore had nothing to do with the selection of anyone outside of the Federation nor were Federal funds involved."

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, what kind of procedure is this, that you are permitting a Statement to be made in this House in reply to a debate from the Federal House of Assembly? Why does the Hon. Minister not make a statement from this Government? I cannot move a motion in connection with something for which the Hon. Minister is not responsible; I cannot make any motion for adjournment in connection with something for which he is not responsible. And the hon. member is making a Statement which cannot be debated. Can the Hon. Minister make a statement on Iran?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no control over a Statement made by a Minister of the Government. Ministers of the Government are allowed to make Statements in Parliament on matters which, in their opinion, are of some interest to the House. From what the Hon. Minister has read out, it does appear as if some member of this House has made a statement which the Minister thinks this Statement would tend to clarify. That is the opinion which I have and which other members of this House have from this Statement; I think that it is perfectly in order.

CUSTOMS TARIFF (AMENDMENT) (No.2) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Customs Tariff Act in order to grant certain tax relief in so far as material is concerned material for the manufacture of certain items in this country. I should like to say that the reason for this Bill will be obvious to all hon. members. Under the present Customs Tariff Act and under the pioneer concessions law, and so on, there are certain concessions made to people who manufacture certain goods. In addition to that, we have what is known as the drawback system under which, when goods are re-exported, the people who re-export them are given drawbacks when these goods leave the island. Perhaps I should say that this matter has come to a head largely because of the fact that certain items are being manufactured in this island and are re-exported, and in addition to that, the items, if they had come in already manufactured, would be granted duty-free concessions. I refer specially to the manufacture of rollers which are used in the manufacture of sugar in this island.

We have had representation made to us that the Barbados Foundry has been manufacturing rollers and disposing of them to various factories in this island and the various items from which these rollers are made are not subject to duty free concessions. These items are subject to duty, but if a roller came in for the sugar industry, that roller would come in duty free. I think that it was the hon. senior member for St. Peter who raised this point some time ago in this House and during that time the matter was under active consideration. I did not say anything at that stage - at least I do not remember saying anything then - because the matter had not yet received Cabinet approval. However, I have been reliably informed that in addition to the supplying of rollers to the local factories, rollers are being manufactured and sold to some of the neighbouring islands. That, we feel, is very helpful to us

in that it employs and keeps more of our artisans employed in this island than would normally have been the case. In other words, many more man days in so far as employment is concerned are obtained, which would not have taken place if this type of undertaking was not carried out. That is one of the reasons, or rather it is the main reason which has prompted the Government to come down to the House with a Bill of this sort.

As hon. members will see from the Objects and Reasons, this Bill has general application. We are not confining it to any particular item; we are providing for Orders to be made from time to time just as Orders will be revoked from time to time. In other words, if we feel that iron should be an item which should be exempted from Customs Duty, an Order will be made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to that effect. That Order will be submitted to the Legislature and after that Order has been laid in the Legislature for forty days and no annulment is made of that Order, then it becomes law although perhaps from the time when the Order is laid on the Table of the House, these concessions can be granted.

12.45 p.m.

If the Order is then revoked or annulled, then the individual, if the 40 days have not expired, would be called upon to pay the duty for the remaining days which would make up the forty days which give the Order absolute legal status.

As is set out here, "this Bill primarily seeks to simplify the procedure whereby the Customs Tariff Rates on the Importation of goods may be varied."

To the above end Clause 3 of the Bill seeks to enable the Governor-in-Executive Committee to vary by Order the customs rates of duties on articles listed in the First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1921 and to amend the Second Schedule to that Act.

To safeguard the authority of the Legislative Bodies of this island with respect to the imposition of customs duties, Clause 3 of the Bill seeks further to provide that every Order made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall be laid before both Houses of the Legislature and that within the period of 40 days beginning with the date on which such Order is made before it either House of the Legislature may annul the Order."

I do not think it is absolutely necessary to say more, because with the few remarks I have made, I think that members at least have a grasp of what the intention and the purpose of this Bill seeks to bring about. It also says here in the last paragraph of the Objects and Reasons that the opportunity has been taken to remove the expression "British Empire" from the Customs Tariff Act, 1921 and to substitute therefor a Schedule listing those countries to which the British Preferential Tariff applies (Clauses 2 and 4).

That, Sir, is the gist so far of this Bill, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in so far as this amendment to permit greater employment opportunities is concerned, I think it is a step in the right direction. Not only on the last occasion, but I made statements in this Chamber on some three occasions on this matter, because in view of the short time working of Foundry mechanics, there has been a loss of employment, wages and earnings to these workers through the Foundries making the statement that they have not been able to get assistance in modern times to meet these modern conditions, and they have been forced to lay off some of the staff.

I will give this Chamber an example of what takes place. After the crop some of these skilled workmen are laid off for as much as 20 weeks, during which time they have no guaranteed income. This is a good idea now in that the Union can use its influence and use this as an argument for having a better system of employment, because in this island I find that there is too much haphazard employment among people who are required to

work every day. You get in Barbados the relics of slavery and feudalism, where these men are required to work week after week, month after month, and year after year, just as in the Transport system where Government requires buses to be on the road, but you find the perilous situation where conductors and drivers are employed on a day to day basis. It is illogical because if you have a continuous service, employment should give greater security.

This is an industry which provides not just a matter of trading but the manufacture of goods, and I think it is a good thing to give this assistance.

I would also like to draw to the Government's attention the matter of the printing trade. I believe the time has come - printing being a skilled craft - that you should understand that if you train a man to be a printer, it is difficult to make him into something else when he is mature. He may have to look for a job if he is forced to, but in Trinidad they do give the printing trade some assistance, and I do not believe that the Government here would lose any money by this method, because what you lose in the Customs duty is better in the sense of the employment force in the community. I think that matters like these should be examined more so in the new context of the implementation of industrialisation wherever you can help, and I believe this is a wise thing, especially in cases where people are employed. These two Foundries employ over 200 people and you will realise that it is not easy to find employment in Barbados for 200 persons, and with our growing population and the pressure of population on our limited resources, any step that maintains our employment force is a step in the right direction.

I hope in addition to what has been stated here that some investigation will be made into the printing trade because we know that printers at the *Advocate* have been passing through a lean period. Undoubtedly the *Advocate* pay better wages than some of the other printing establishments in Barbados, and there is no point in driving out a business that pays better wages and allow those that pay lower wages to remain, because it means they are paying lower wages and remaining in business on an equal footing. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the time has come when some examination should be made of this aspect also.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, this is so obvious that the only thing I wonder is why it was not done soon after it was drawn to the Government's attention by the last speaker. If you are importing into this island for the sugar industry ready manufactured articles free of duty, and if that same article is manufactured in the island the company has to pay on its raw material, it is obvious that it had to be changed to bring things up to date. The only reason why it was not done in the past was because no one foresaw conditions in Barbados developing to the point where we can now manufacture things for ourselves. As I said, it is so obvious that it does not take any argument. 12.55 p.m.

I agree that we should lay stress on finding employment for our people and things should be done to help them. I also agree that anything which would create employment for our people is deserving of special treatment, but let us go further and say that anything which would strengthen the economy of Barbados should also be done. It may only be something which would employ two people, but it may so strengthen the economy of the island that it would be deserving of attention in its own rights. If you establish a business with two people and you make \$100,000 as a result of the business being here, it means that the island is strengthened in its economy because you would be paying taxes on that business and because of the profit it is making it will raise the standard of living. Let us see it in that light as well. Let us also say that anything which will help to raise the standard of living by any means is deserving of Government's attention.

By this Bill to amend the Tariff Act, the Government now can facilitate these things. The only thing which I would draw to their attention is that in doing so we have to pay attention to the Tariff Act or the Tariff Association

to which we belong. I do not think I need stress that point because, as they also know, there are certain things which you cannot do. I can readily understand that this thing has had to be done and the only thing wrong about it is that it is only brought down today.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a little correction to what I said originally so far as the difference between the amount which this Order may impose on any material and what the present position is now. The people who apply to the Comptroller of Customs for an Order will have to pay a deposit. If the Order is annulled that deposit goes to the Treasury; but if the order is not annulled that individual is given back his deposit.

I appreciate the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and it is our intention, like all people who have the interest of the community at heart, to do whatever is possible to provide work for the people of this country. We know what the hon. member says well enough because the population is increasing year after year, the island is not getting any larger and the economy apparently is not extending in proportion with the number of people and, therefore, that tends to reduce the standard of living. Therefore, it is our intention wherever possible to create jobs or opportunities for the people of this island.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church said that we brought this Bill in late, but I would like to tell him that Government cannot move as swiftly as private individuals can and I think he appreciates that although he has not had the opportunity to run a Government. That is on the humorous side. The position is that every individual can criticise the Government for anything it does; therefore, Government has to weigh things very carefully before it brings them down to the House, because although with the best intention you have brought down something, you can still get hon. members of the Opposition criticising the Government and putting a different slant on the purpose for which it was brought down, and then, when the public does not understand it or the intricacies or the importance of it, the people may be inclined to follow the trends of the slander on the Government. We have to weigh these things carefully before we bring them down and we always have to think that the worst will happen in order to satisfy the apparently insatiable desire of the people on the other side.

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

On motion of Hon. M. F. COX" seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SEARLES in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2, 3, and 4 were called separately and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

1.05 p.m.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed"

for RATES OF INCOME TAX 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 settle the rates of income tax for the year 1959, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is the usual annual Bill which comes before this House in connection with the fixing of the rates of income tax

for the year. During last month when the Budget was before this House, there were certain proposals made with regard to the lowering of the rates in certain brackets, and that matter is reflected in this Bill which is now before us. As I said earlier, this is the usual annual Bill. Before I sit down, or rather before I move the second reading of this Bill, in Clause 1 there is an omission which I will seek to insert - it is the omission of the word "Act" - when we reach the Committee stage I merely draw the matter to the attention of hon. members at this stage. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is something to which we have agreed in principle, but I think that one should take the opportunity from time to time to draw to the attention of the Government any changes which one sees are necessary. I am not saying this in any personal way, but I believe that the Ministers themselves must have come upon this income tax business since all of them have been in a bracket which would be heavily taxed, and they have found that the taxation policy which was created was a bit burdensome at some stage. As one can see, the higher your income tax goes, the more relief you are going to get. That is to say, that somebody with a taxable income of about \$6,000 - and the majority of the Ministers would be in that category - will get more taxation off than in the case of the original bracket where it was 40%, the new one being 24%. That is where you have this tax jump; you have a 16%. On every thousand dollars above that, you will find that the difference is about roughly \$60; you will see that on every thousand dollars somebody will get a reduction of \$60 which is a sizeable amount. What I would like to draw to the attention of the Government is this; and I make this statement from the floor of this House because I am not afraid of my constituents in this matter. If this Government has initiated a policy that Ministers are entitled to draw travelling allowances for travelling on Crown business, I cannot envisage or imagine that any member of this Chamber would believe that any man today can represent any of his constituents and say that travelling is not something which should be taken into consideration in the light of Income Tax. I feel that that is a reasonable thing and I have mentioned it before. I do not quarrel with anybody for money, neither do I ask anybody to pay money. I do not ask that hon. members should draw salaries approximating Ministerial salaries; but what is being paid to hon. members is small as compared with what is paid to Ministers and members of Parliament in other territories. I feel that when it comes to the question of travelling allowance, hon. members are entitled to treatment such as that I have mentioned.

The next point is that some people have to make voluntary contributions to illness and charities and things like that. In the United States of America people are allowed concessions for charity; and I think that in Barbados it would be a good thing to have that provision so that these charitable organisations can receive even more aid than they are at present receiving, because people who now give grudgingly will give more freely when they know that they will be getting something off. I feel that these charitable organisations would benefit to a greater extent if what I suggest is done.

As regards medical expenses, when I go to pay my income tax I find that there is discrimination as to what would be regarded as medical expenses. For instance, if you go to a doctor and that doctor examines your eyes, that would be regarded as medical expenses because he is a medical practitioner and he has made a prescription for your eyes; but if the doctor makes a prescription for spectacles, that is not regarded as medical expense. I do not see how you can make that differentiation. There is also the question of dental expenses. Where are you going to draw the line between medical attention in so far as a person who goes to a dentist is concerned and who goes to a medical practitioner? If a person goes to a dentist, that is something to do with his health; that is a part of his health. I believe that any hon. member who has ever been afflicted with toothache has the experience that that is a very painful thing. I think that there should be more liberalism in these matters.

1.15 p.m.

I feel that in these medical provisions which you are giving, there should be more liberalisation provided you are willing to give them. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because I do believe that these things sometimes are oversights and I do not believe that basically one can say that these items should not be included.

I make this point at this stage because already last year and the year before I have been pleading for more liberalisation.

I do not know if the Hon. Premier made this statement during the Budget, but I have been asking for some time and have never got a reply as to what is the position with the Income Tax collections now that you are collecting on the P.A.Y.E. system. I should like to know what has been the improvement, because in Trinidad they undertook this task later than Barbados and the Finance Minister there gave the House some comparison of the money collected under the P.A.Y.E. system as against the position as it was before the system came into operation.

It is astonishing to me, Mr. Speaker, - and I think some investigation should be made - to hear the amount of arrears in Income Tax, and when it is remembered that the Minister of Social Services came in here and made mention of the collection of medical fees and what the Government was going to do to collect them, I think it is time that the public should be made aware of the outstanding amounts of Income Tax arrears, among whom they occur, and what steps are being taken to collect them as expeditiously as the proposal to collect the medical fees. I say that because from the time I had the privilege of paying Income Tax I have never owed, and I do not think I am in any better position or in as good a position as some of the people who I understand are in arrears. I do not have a Bank Account and I feel that if people with large Bank Accounts, with property, and people who have a standing in the community have outstanding arrears in Income Tax, that is something that should be drawn to the attention of the public. I should like to know what is the amount of Income Tax arrears so that we will know what our position is. This is the kind of information you do not get in Barbados, but it is the kind of information you get in Trinidad when the Minister of Finance can say that the amount of arrears is so many million dollars and that some people have not paid Income Tax for the last four or five years. I do not like to go by rumour because Income Tax is a business in which, unless the person owing tells you that he owes, you can only work by rumour. If there are large arrears in Income Tax, they should be collected, because it is not fair to some of us who have to borrow money and suffer all the necessary privations to pay our Income Tax, while others can go on living as they please and it does not matter what they owe. I do not believe in that sort of discrimination. If I have to pay my tax, I feel that everybody should be called upon to pay; and the relief for which I ask is sought because I am an honest taxpayer. If I am asking for relief, I am asking for it to pay what the Law says I should pay. What I ask for is relief for those necessary cases.

I should like to know the amount if it can be stated, and how our Income Tax now compares with the situation before the P.A.Y.E. system, and the number of people who are defaulters.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, while agreeing generally with the rates set out here, I strongly feel that some concession should be made in so far as small companies are concerned. We see, Sir, that small companies, no matter what their profits may be at the end of the year under their Profit and Loss Account

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member in order? This Bill is to settle certain rates of Income Tax and companies do not come into it, and even if they do, I think the proper time to discuss it would have been during the Estimates.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not rise and say he was speaking on a point of order. We have here the question of Income Tax rates which are being discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER: For individuals.

Mr. TALMA: The question of companies is mentioned.

Mr. SPEAKER: It can be referred to in passing, but it is no part of this Bill.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that a separate and distinct Bill will be brought down to consider the rates for companies or is this the only opportunity I will have?

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot imagine that this is the only opportunity the hon. member will have to speak on taxation of companies.

Mr. TALMA: I am asking, Mr. Speaker, if a Bill to deal with companies will be brought down?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not usually dealt with in this Bill.

Mr. TALMA: In the absence of that, Mr. Speaker, I crave your indulgence. What I am saying is not irrelevant. I am making a point and I shall continue to make it. I am saying that no consideration, and apparently no effort at all, has been given in so far as small companies are concerned where their profits are less than \$25,000 per annum. A small company is given no incentive or no inducement to carry on, and yet the Government is

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking to the point? Is this the place where concessions can be granted to companies? How can any concessions be granted in this Bill?

Mr. TALMA: I am just drawing the point that small companies

Mr. SPEAKER: But the hon. member need not make it the substantive point. If the hon. member is given latitude to make any reference, he should not deceive himself that he is given the opportunity to make it a substantive point.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, while commending the Government in taking certain steps to reduce the rates and in granting certain allowances in the case of individuals, I am simply saying that no concession or consideration has been given to small companies, and while we are dealing with the rates before us, I was wondering whether Government will, in their next step, have some revision made. You will see that on every complete dollar of taxable income up to \$500 the rate is 3%. Why is it \$500? Because it was \$500 twenty years ago, it does not necessarily mean that you must stick to giving the lower rate only in the case of the first \$500. After the first \$500 of taxable income the rate is 6%.

1.25 p.m.

What I would suggest to the Government is that instead of your taxing on the first \$500 rateable income at 3% and on every complete dollar of taxable income for the next \$500 at 6%, you should say that the rates should be 3% on every complete dollar of taxable income up to the first \$1,000 and for the second thousand dollars, the rates should be 6% and on the third thousand dollars, the rates should be 10%. If the Government intends to give relief to the ones who need it most, that is what you should do. Of course, I know that it is a question of the Financial Secretary and his other assistants going into the question and seeing how much it will cost.

As I have said, I think that a step has been made in the right direction as regards certain concessions granted under the new proposals. That is a move in the right direction because at the end of each year the Government finds itself with an extra collection of over \$2 million or very often a collection in that vicinity. That is money which they did not budget for. I am saying that it is time that you make some proper concession especially to the ones in the lower brackets, because owing to the high cost of living today - and it is going up by leaps and bounds every week - I am speaking of essential commodities - it is imperative that something should be done either by lowering the rates for

those in the lower brackets or widening the scope or granting further relief. When you compare the cost of living in Barbados today with that of other places, you will find that while foodstuffs locally produced are lower in price, yet they are going up each week; and when you compare the cost of clothing which is not controlled, you will find that the merchants in Bridgetown are charging all sorts of fancy prices for these things. You have to pay in Barbados two or three times the price for similar things which you can get in Trinidad or some of the other islands. Last week we talked of controls but what are we controlling? I am hoping that the Government will look into these rates of income tax and fix rates to help those people in the lower brackets; and along with that, Government should take into account the high cost of living and do something about it.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter correctly, but he seemed to infer that this was prompted by self interest and said that the greatest relief was made in the \$6,000 taxable income bracket. Apparently, he had not read the Bill because the Bill shows that that is definitely not so. As hon. members will see, the relief starts at the second \$1,000. The first \$500 carries the same rate of 3% and on the second \$500 the rate is 6%; then you get a more progressive scale and a less regressive rate.

Some time ago, Jamaica adopted a method like this: but because of the cost of administering the lower grade they found it was far greater than what they were collecting and they did away with it. They said that by so doing it would save forms and prevent them from having a vast number of inspectors and, therefore, they did away with the lower rate; that is to say, they let off the people at the bottom and they upped the exemptions. They made a more progressive rate in the same way as we are considering it today.

We have given relief in these same brackets, as hon. members will see, starting at \$1,000. A single man exempted on the first \$500 would have to work for over \$1,800 in order to have any relief under this Bill. As hon. members will see, it goes up to 16% instead of 18%, 22% instead of 24%, 28% instead of 30% and 34% instead of 40% and it stops there.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That is the point which I made. It is a higher ratio than the others. I said that it was 34% instead of 40%.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: We stopped a little below Ministerial level. I would not like the hon. member to give the impression to the public that it is at that bracket which you have the greatest relief. To my mind that is not true.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing which I would like to say. The hon. senior member for Christ Church made a statement that in Trinidad the cost of things is two to three times lower than it is in Barbados.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation, I said that in Barbados the cost of certain essential commodities - and I referred to the cost of clothing and wearing apparel - was two or three times higher here than they were in Trinidad.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am saying, Sir, that that is not correct from recent experience. Through the Federal service, the Unit Governments in the area get quarterly reports as regards the different brackets as far as cost of living is concerned. We are kept informed of what is going on in the other islands and from those reports I can tell him that his explanation is not correct.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, if I may give you an instance, this tie which I have on was bought in Trinidad for 25 cents but we would have to pay \$1.20 for it here. 1.35 p.m.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SEARLES being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier with respect to this Clause, after the words "Income Tax", the word "Act" should be inserted. I am asking leave to insert that word.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Premier.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 1 as amended stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what is the aversion the Government feels from giving information when it is asked for in this House. When information is asked for in the Other Place, the Minister in the Other Place will inform hon. members that he will do his best to give that information. Here we have this sort of rugged treatment being meted out to elected members of this House. I wonder if it is because hon. members are a bit complacent about these things that the Ministers feel that they need not answer questions which we ask. I asked questions pertinent to this matter which is before us and I expected that I would be given some information. I read the Premier's Budget Speech but I did not see in the Premier's Speech what is the difference in the collection of Income Tax under the P.A.Y.E. system as compared with the old method, taking the deductions into consideration; if that system has boosted the economy, to what extent is that so? I also mentioned that, with regard to some of the allowances granted, there seems to be some discrimination having regard to some medical allowances and I wanted to know if that was the settled policy of the Government. If you go to a doctor and he says that you need spectacles, to what extent is that charged as medical attention? You do not discriminate between paying a fee to a doctor and having a surgical operation, but there is discrimination as regards your eyes where the prescription for spectacles is concerned. Are these things which we should not know about? Are they things which are private?

Then I asked the other pertinent question - I do not know if it affects the Ministers - the question of the arrears of taxes. If people who owe income tax are not paying it, is that not a matter about which the public should know? I know of some poor people who come to the Barbados Workers' Union, people who are barmen and stevedores, and they have been prosecuted for the non-payment of income tax. If you are going to sue a man who is at the bottom, are you also going to sue other people or are you taking it as a matter of respectability? People have been sued for the non-payment of income tax; I want to know if you are going to sue some people and not everybody? Should the public not know these things? You do not want the public to feel that "A" should be sued and not "B". Nobody likes to be prosecuted unless he is a born criminal, but what about these arrears of taxes?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: First of all, I did not realise that the hon. member was asking a question. I thought that he was making an observation. With regard to the arrears of income tax, I cannot tell who was sued or who was not sued; I know that the Commissioner is making every effort he can to collect arrears and he has even asked people in the lower brackets to have these arrears settled.

With regard to the question of dental treatment, if the Government had decided to include that in the relief which has been granted, that would have been mentioned. With regard to the matter of the collection of revenue under the P.A.Y.E. system as compared with the old system, I am not in a position to give the figures, but I do know that there is a general improvement. It has been

said that people who used to slip through the net before cannot slip through so easily now. That is the general observation.

With regard to Income Tax in the six thousand dollar bracket, it is stated that on the taxable income before this relief was granted, the amount was \$12.85 and now with the relief it is \$11.45 - a difference of \$1.40. As stated by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, it is not true to say that members of the Government are having any special benefit as a result of this relief.

Mr. WALCOTT: I never accused any Minister of having any special benefit. All you have to do is to work out the percentage of income tax you get over \$500 and the hon. member is correct. The amount which a man would pay would now be \$12.85 as compared with \$11.45. All I said was that I wondered if, now that the majority of the members who are Ministers happen to come into the high income tax rate, this matter has come about. I believe that I would get some relief too; the sun shines on the just and on the unjust; therefore it means that I would get a little relief as well.

1.45 p.m.

When you get over \$2,400, you get 6 per cent on that and then it goes from 24 to 30 per cent as compared with the narrow steps of 2%; that is to say, my income tax relief might be \$50 as compared with \$144 owing to the ratio.

I want the Hon. Premier to understand that I am a precise man and say precisely what I mean. I have asked this question long enough and it is in the interest of good Government to know the difference in income tax. There is nothing wrong in that. You should give us the opportunity of knowing that the income tax position in Barbados has risen 2%, 3%, 4% over what it was before you had this system with all the deductions and expenses. Is that not some valuable information which every legislator should possess? If I am asked to give an analysis of the country's revenue, I should be able to give an intelligent answer since we have changed to this system to show that it is worthwhile. Let us have that factual information.

What I do not understand in Barbados or in this House of Assembly is that you cannot get factual information on pertinent matters pertaining to Government as if you should not have it. I do not want to know who are the persons because he cannot tell me that; but what the hon. member can tell me, or anybody, is that the amount of arrears in Barbados is so many thousand dollars. That is what the hon. member can say without divulging any secret, and it is something that should be known. I want to know what the arrears represent in relation to the total amount collected, so that in this House members can see what is taking place. Suppose you are taking up \$8 million a year and you say you have \$1 million in arrears, you may come to the conclusion that that represents a very substantial proportion of the amount; but we do not know that because there is no information. What I say about these matters is that there is not enough verve for this kind of information from the Ministers themselves; they never ask for it; and as they do not ask for it, therefore when we ask we cannot get the information.

I do hope that we can get the promise that we will get the information, if not today, at sometime, because it is not the type of information which you can go and pick up anywhere, even in the Statistical Department. We would like to know because it is the sort of information that affects your fiscal policy and we are entitled to know it at some time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I promise the hon. member to get the information for him.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do believe that in this matter of P.A.Y.E. the Commissioner should have wider and more discretionary powers with regard to collections from temporary or casual workers. Too often one gets complaints from people who are temporarily employed from whom income tax is stopped on the P.A.Y.E. basis when the total earnings at the end of the year do not warrant their paying income tax, and they have to go to the trouble of trying to get a refund.

Only yesterday a number of people who said they were employed in Queens Park with the Coney Island there came to see me telling me that they have been told by someone in authority that deductions will have to be made from their earnings under the P.A.Y.E. system. That is manifestly absurd. People were working for two or three weeks—and in the case of one man who was talking to me, it was his first job for about four months and he did not know when he would get a job again—and even to be told about paying income tax under circumstances like those is the height of stupidity. I imagine that the employers or managers of Coney Island would have had more sense than to confuse themselves with deducting the income tax from the earnings of people who worked there for a few weeks; but there must have been some talk about it from somewhere that the people were agitated about it. On the whole I say, Mr. Chairman, that if the powers are not there, there should be wider powers and more discretionary powers given to the Income Tax authorities in the matter of making deductions from temporary or casual workers under the P. A. Y. E. system. One can quite understand that the general principle must apply; but it seems as if there is still need for further revision of the provisions of the Act with regard to people who are not permanently employed.

The question that Clause 1 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

CUSTOMS TARIFF (AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) ACT, 1959.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill. When the Budget was before the House, the Hon. Premier told the House at that time that the duty on beer would be increased to \$1.13 per gallon preferential and \$1.20 per gallon general. That had the effect of Law from 11th March, and this Bill now seeks to finalise the matter. There is hardly anything more that I need say on it because I think it was fully discussed when it was mentioned in the House.

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

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

1.55 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has little or nothing to commend itself to this Chamber. It is quite true that we have been reminded that during the budget speech the Hon. Minister of Finance told us that there would be an increase in the preferential and general duties on these commodities of beer, ale and stout imported in this island. As a result of that and the increases that were consequential, the price of beer in every district, certainly in the rural areas, has risen to as much as thirty-eight cents per bottle. Even if it is felt that people employed in agricultural work are being able to purchase a bottle of beer now, yet, Sir, this is not a temporary or seasonal increase; this increase will be for all time. Whether it is an increase for the purpose of discouraging the use of beer and encouraging the use of grog or discouraging the use of imported beer in order to support

the proposed brand of beer now being brewed in British Guiana or Trinidad, it is not at all clear to me; but this is an increase which affects only the poorest classes, as the other class can afford to pay the increase in the price without feeling it very much.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock, the sitting of this House now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock. 2.00 p.m.

On resumption

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I notice that there is no quorum and I ask that you instruct the Clerk to ring the bell.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Question Time was called.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Lucy is not in his place; therefore, we cannot deal with Orders Nos. 1 and 2 which stand in his name. As regards Order No. 3, is the hon. senior member for St. Peter prepared to go on with that?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am prepared; but I am not the person was last speaking on that Order.

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON RESOLUTION re REPORT ON SUGAR INDUSTRY

Hon. M. E. COX: Perhaps, Sir, I should go over what I said on the last occasion in reply to the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The hon. member started off his speech by referring to the fact that there was a discussion between the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Ministry of Trade in connection with the dispute which existed at the time. I pointed out then, and I am prepared to point out now, that this discussion which took place was not a discussion for the purpose of asking the Sugar Producers' Association to give in to the demands which the Union had made, but was merely a discussion which the Sugar Producers' Federation wanted to have with the Ministry.

2.35 p.m.

Perhaps I can say what the nature of that discussion was. It was that they wanted to explain their position, and they wanted to know if the Ministry had any objection to their advancing without prejudice to any future decision a 6% increase on the wages on the crop which was the Commonwealth Wage Index. At that discussion I made it clear that it was a matter entirely for the Union and the Federation, and not the Government. Therefore, in so far as the Sugar Producers' Federation advancing to the workers this 6% increase is concerned or in so far as I was concerned, it was up to them to do as they jolly well liked. The opportunity was taken then to suggest to them whether or not they would compromise with the Union, so as to try and get the crop reaped. I want to say here and now that even if it could be regarded that the Government or the Ministry had attempted to discuss this question in the absence of the Union, it was a very good thing in favour of the Union and not against it. I believe I have disposed of that first question.

Now the hon. member said that the Government had set up a Board of Enquiry with terms of reference similar to what the Sugar Producers' Federation had requested and the Union did not agree with those terms. During the course of my speech, I am attempting to give the lie to that statement and I am prepared to do it today. Before I go any further, I would like to say at this stage that a most unfortunate remark has crept into this debate, made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who, no doubt, whenever the opportunity avails itself, accuses me of doing something dishonest in my Ministry or rather as a member of the Government and of the Party.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Your Honour should not allow me to rise so as to ask the hon. member

to withdraw that allegation; he has said that whenever the opportunity arises, apparently he means in a debate in here, I accuse him of something dishonest in his Ministry.

Hon. M. E. COX: As a member of the Government.

Mr. WALCOTT: Accusing a member of being dishonest or making him out as being dishonest is saying that he is dishonest.

Mr. SPEAKER: If an hon. member accuses another hon. member of dishonesty, that does not make him dishonest.

Mr. WALCOTT: Then there is nothing wrong in saying that a man is a dishonest man.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh yes. The hon. Minister said that an unfortunate remark was made during the time when the hon. senior member for St. Peter was discussing the subject, to the effect that whenever the hon. member gets on his feet he seems to take the opportunity of accusing him

Mr. WALCOTT: He said whenever I get the opportunity I accuse him of something dishonest in his Ministry.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member is quoting the Hon. Minister *verbatim*.

Mr. WALCOTT: If I accuse him of something, he cannot say that I have called him a dishonest man or that I have accused him of dishonesty unless I have said that. I will not stand here and let him say that I said something which I have never said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member takes his seat, the Hon. Minister has mentioned that the hon. member, whenever he gets an opportunity, accuses him

Mr. WALCOTT: Of something dishonest

Mr. SPEAKER: I am about to grant that, but I do not think that he got as far as that. If the hon. senior member for St. Peter wants to deny that, he has every possible right to do so.

Mr. WALCOTT: If Your Honour is permitting that, then I am free to say that an hon. member is dishonest.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot permit anything. The Hon. Minister has said that the hon. member whenever he gets the opportunity, accuses him of something.

Mr. WALCOTT: No Sir, of dishonesty.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of something dishonest.

Mr. WALCOTT: Of dishonesty in his Ministry. If you can permit him to say that, then I am free to say it without having to withdraw any remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is deluding himself if he thinks so.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I will come straight to the point. The hon. member has done it in this House and on public platforms.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not mind the public platforms.

Hon. M. E. COX: Well, I will stick to the House. The hon. member has said that nobody has ever had to enquire into his behaviour.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to get this discussion in its right perspective. We are here to discuss a matter dealing with the McKenzie Report, and as far as is humanly possible, I want the debate to centre itself on that Report. I do not want anything to be said either on one side or on the other which is apt to bring the personal side into the matter and to lead to any more acrimonious debate. I hope that that is the line which all speakers are prepared to take. There is no need for anything otherwise; nothing

will accrue to the advantage of the people of Barbados if we continue in this debate referring to personalities. There is absolutely no good which can accrue to the citizenry of Barbados if we continue the debate in this way.

Hon. M. E. COX: I want to appeal to your patience in allowing me to reply to a statement made in the course of this discussion when the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: The debates are not yet in my hand and I am rather at a disadvantage to be able to say if the hon. member said this or if he said that.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am prepared to say what he said.

Mr. WALCOTT rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will have an opportunity to reply.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not have any money and I do not believe that I will ever have any; but I know I can be relied upon and nobody can, with any justification, accuse me of doing anything dishonest in my political life. This is what I am saying. I am saying that during the course of this discussion the hon. member has accused me of being dishonest and he has done it on more than one occasion in this House. I am therefore replying to that accusation once and for all and I want to set the records straight so as to let the House and the public know what the position has been and say when this thing arose.....

Mr. SPEAKER: When what thing arose?

Hon. M. E. COX: The enquiry into the Sugar Industry. 2.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, when the hon. member said I referred to an inquiry, the only inquiry I referred to was the McKenzie Inquiry; but if the hon. member is accusing me, I am going to object. He is accusing me of referring to him as being dishonest. I challenge the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think we have passed that stage.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the hon. member is talking about being dishonest, he said that I stole Trade Union money.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member referred to the question which arose in the island in 1951 when Sir Clement Malone made an inquiry.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there was no such statement made by me in this debate at all and the hon. member knows that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the hon. member will allow the Minister to develop.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the hon. member wants to accuse me.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has risen a little too quickly.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to set the record straight. It arose during the discussion on this debate, and I am saying that the member referred to the removal of a building from Seawell in which he said I had lorries involved, and gave the impression that I was driving one of the lorries. I have never driven one in my life.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has a peculiar technique. Now that he is replying to my speech, he is making out something which he knows quite well did not occur in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is my difficulty now; I have no notes. I am at the mercy of the memory of the two hon. members.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member is getting a little bit confused, because at one stage in this debate I do not think Your Honour was in the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member went further and said that he never took any stones out of the Park. That is the sort of thing which the hon. member threw at me when this thing was under discussion; and although perhaps I should ignore it, I said I was prepared once and for all to let the House know the facts, and I am prepared, Sir, to say here and now what transpired.

The hon. senior member for the City is always slandering.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not allow the hon. member to do that because the hon. senior member for the City is not in his place, and the word "slandering" is too strong a word to use in Parliament in reference to another member of Parliament.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will withdraw the word and use the word "accusing"; he is always accusing me of being involved in the removal of a building from Seawell. As soon as I heard it - and I heard it from a Pressman who telephoned me where I was living at Codrington Hill - the following Thursday I got in touch with Premier Adams who did not live far away from me - he was not Premier then. I told him about it and told him that my character was at stake with this thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member defending himself against charges made by members in this Parliament?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: During the course of a recent debate on this matter? I want the hon. member to stick to the present discussion and not go into any long desultory debate relating to the history of any background which is of no interest, at least to me as Speaker of this House.

Hon. M. E. COX: I refer to myself as being charged before the Bar.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member need not take that opinion at all; I do not agree with him doing that because this House has charged the hon. member with nothing.

Hon. M. E. COX: Not the House, Sir, but the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not let us go back and take the House into a monotonous recital of incidents long dead and past.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will not be long, Sir. I was merely saying that as soon as I heard it I went to the Executive Committee with the Leader of the Government and insisted on more than one occasion that an inquiry should be made, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter was present at every meeting. I appealed to the Governor, Sir Alfred Savage, that an inquiry should be made, and I even incurred the wrath of the Acting Attorney General who felt it should be something left alone because he had to go on holiday and this would keep him back. I just want the line I took to be understood. If I did not do that, there could be no inquiry. I brought it upon myself because I wanted my character cleared. I did not have a cent; but despite the wicked things said from time to time, I did that to clear my character, and Mr. Speaker, that was done in no uncertain manner by the Report which came out. I have never driven a lorry in my life nor have I ever associated myself with anything dishonest; yet I am accused regularly by members of this House for doing something dishonest. I had to do something to get the qualification to be a member of this House and that meant that I had to have an income of at least \$80 per month.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is speaking in vindication of himself.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am trying to point out that I had to engage myself in some undertaking in order to have a seat in this House to represent people. If, for example, a man driving a lorry for me passed down the Wharf and some thief got on and removed a few bags of cement, are you going to tell me that I am guilty of the offence? This is what the hon. member has been doing despite the fact that

he knows I would eat my fingers to stumps before I would act dishonestly. The hon. member in this House in 1954 when we were discussing the Estimates said that he knew me and that I was an honest and truthful man, and yet when it suits him he gets up and tries to belittle me and make people believe that I am crooked. He gets up whenever he likes and refers to this investigation; he has done it on public platforms and in this House, and once and for all it must be stopped; otherwise he will hear something from me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member finished?

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I was allowing the hon. member to come to the last stage. I will excuse him for saying that I accused him of being crooked. (Hon. M. E. COX: "Dishonest.") I am going to repeat the words he used. He speaks quickly and does not remember. (Hon. M. E. COX: I said both words.) I will only remind him, Mr. Speaker, that if he can accuse another member of being a thief and stealing Trade Union money.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member referring to? He was not making a speech then.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I only want to remind him that an honest man must say honest things about people, and an honest man would not say that I stole Trade Union money.

2.55 p.m.

The Hon. Minister said - and it was recorded in the debate - that I knew the person and I said that that person was an honest man.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing wrong in that.

Mr. WALCOTT: There is nothing wrong in saying that, but there is something wrong in calling a man a thief.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Hon. M. E. COX: I regret that I was not able to develop it. I want to establish once and for all the fact that if the member or any other member gets up and try to lick me up, he will get what is coming to him. Of course, if he did it outside, it would be a different question. You can only shelter in here because it is free speech. Why can't he say it on a public platform?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has already dealt with that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Some people do not own anything just because they want to slander people. When they do that and you try to discover if they have anything from which you can recover damages, they have nothing. Whatever I have is in my name. If I say anything that anybody regards is not the truth, I want to pay the penalty for it; but other people do not want to do that. If they do you an injustice and you try to recover anything, you cannot get anything because you will discover that they own nothing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has already dealt with that at length.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this is what the hon. member said. He said that the Government had to set up a Board of Enquiry with terms of reference as to what the Sugar Producers' Federation had suggested and the Union did not agree to those terms. On the last occasion I wanted to read for the benefit of the House the first letter which was sent from the Union to the Ministry of Trade as well as that from the Sugar Producers' Federation.

This is the first letter from us on the question. It is dated 19th April, 1958:-

"Sir, - I am directed to refer to correspondence on the subject of the present dispute in the sugar industry, resting with the Labour Commissioner's letter to you No. H. 5001 of the 18th April, 1958, and to say that it has been decided to establish a Board of Enquiry under Section 8 of the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Enquiry) Act, 1939, to investigate the dispute and to recommend what wages should in all the present circumstances be paid to

workers in the industry in respect of the year 1958. The precise terms of reference remain to be finally decided.

"I am to enquire whether your Union or the Federation (and you will see "Union" precedes "Federation") has any suggestions to offer as to the membership of the Board, for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor.

"It is proposed that a further Enquiry should then be instituted, probably by a single individual, into the economic state of the industry, with a view to obtaining recommendations, which would serve as a basis for negotiating and settlement, on the wages and conditions of employment to be adopted in the industry after 1958. Here also I am to enquire whether you have any suggestions as to the person (or persons) by whom the enquiry should be conducted."

This letter was signed by Mr. Secchi, Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour and was sent to the General Secretary, Barbados Workers' Union, the Secretary of the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Labour Commissioner.

Now, Sir, we go a little further. This is the first letter which we got from the Union. In fact, as I mentioned on the last occasion, it was a telegram from Port of Spain from the General Secretary of the Union; it reads as follows:-

"Port-of-Spain, 29/21/13/28, Labour Commissioner, Bridgetown, Barbados. We have agreed nominate Osmond Dyce as workers Choice on Board Enquiry stop Dyce's address here is care CADORIT 942 Frederick Street Trinidad - Frank Walcott stop"

That was on the 21st April.

This is what we sent in the meantime to the General Secretary, Barbados Workers' Union. It was written on the 23rd April and it was signed by the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour.

"Sir, - I am directed to refer to paragraph 1 of my letter No. C. 626/25 of the 19th April, 1958, and to enclose a copy of the terms of reference which it is provisionally proposed should be given to the Board of Inquiry. If you wish to offer comments on these terms of reference, will you please let me have them by Friday, 25th April, 1958?

A copy of this letter and the enclosure are being sent to Mr. F. L. Walcott in Trinidad."

As I have said, this was sent to the General Secretary, Mr. F. L. Walcott, in Trinidad and was also addressed to the General Secretary, Barbados Workers' Union.

Before that, we got a reply from the Secretary of the Sugar Producers' Federation, on the 21st April and this is what they said:-

"We have acknowledgment of your letter, No. C. 626/25 of the 19th April, 1958, on the subject of the establishment of a Board of Enquiry under Section 8 of the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Enquiry) Act, 1939.

"The Federation desires to draw to the attention of the Government that in their opinion the sole cause of the dispute at present between the Federation and the Workers' Union is as to whether or not there is in fact in the circumstances an agreement between the Federation and the Workers' Union governing the wages of workers in the sugar industry for 1958 and as to the true terms thereof.

"Accordingly, in the opinion of the Federation the Board of Enquiry should first consider and determine this question and in case the opinion of the Board is to the effect that there is in fact no such agreement then the Federation would be prepared forthwith to enter into negotiations as to what wages should be paid to the workers in the Sugar Industry in 1958.

"As to the question of the membership of the Board which has been referred to the Federation for its consid-

eration, the Federation is of the opinion that the membership of such a Board should be composed of not less than three persons and should have on it at least one person who is legally trained preferably also with experience in industrial relations.

"As regards the further enquiry proposed into the economic state of the industry, the Federation is of the opinion that some recognised economist with knowledge of the sugar industry such as Professor C.Y. Shephard should be appointed."

This was signed by R. Grey F. Mandeville, Secretary. 3.05 p.m.

The discussion which I mentioned just now took place on the 22nd April with Sugar Producers who felt that they were prepared to offer

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is dealing with this subject matter because he remembers that the hon. mover of the Resolution said something pointing in that direction; that is still long before the McKenzie Enquiry.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member made a statement that the Government was setting out what were the terms of reference

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister now dealing with the Lewis Report or with the McKenzie Report?

Hon. M. E. COX: We are dealing with Mr. Lewis and we are going on to Mr. McKenzie. I have the extract of the hon. member's speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: You have more than I have.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am a member of the Government which has a duty to perform to the public and I am going to do it in the best possible manner. When accusations are made against this Government it is my duty, as a member of the Government, to defend the position of the Government in the eyes not only of the members of the House, but in the eyes of the public as a whole. Now, Sir, this is the position. You have heard me read the terms which the Sugar Producers' Federation has submitted to us. This is what we said at first:-

"To investigate the present dispute in the sugar industry having regard to all relevant circumstances including the terms of the Agreement on wages reached in 1957 between the Barbados Sugar Producers' Federation and the Workers' Union and to recommend what should be the respective rates of wages for all workers in the industry in respect of the year 1958."

That is what we sent to the Union and also to the Sugar Producers' Federation. Later on, the Premier made a broadcast and after that, well, I have already mentioned the first reply which came from the Sugar Producers' Federation. I go a little further. I should say that while the Premier and myself were in Trinidad, we made it our business to see whether we could get somebody to carry out this enquiry here. We tried our best and in the end we got Mr. Lewis who was acceptable to the Union and to everybody else. We also had Mr. Dyce and Mr. Dear.

Mr. Speaker, this matter will take a little time to deal with it but I hope that hon. members will bear with me because when these allegations are made against the Government which occupies a very vulnerable position we must be able to defend any accusation which is made against it. This is what the letter of the 24th April from the Sugar Producers' Federation to the Ministry of Trade stated:-

"We have to thank you for your letter No. C 626/31 dated the 23rd April, 1958, in which you mentioned the suggested terms of reference which it is provisionally proposed should be given to the Board of Enquiry and you asked us for any comments we may wish to offer.

"The Federation desires to stress the importance of both parties to an agreement being required to honour

these terms and maintains that any departure from such terms should only be done by the consent of both parties. It therefore becomes of great importance to the Federation and to all parties that first there should be a decision as to whether or not there is an agreement in existence. If the Board of Enquiry should so hold, the stand taken by the Federation would be upheld, and anything further which the Board might advise would be a matter for further consideration by the Federation.

"The Federation cannot agree that the terms of reference as suggested by the Government would be honoured in all the circumstances, where the question of whether there is an agreement or not is only to be regarded as a relative circumstance to be dealt with and enquired into merely as a side issue. The Federation considers that this issue should boldly be faced by the Board, and subsequent thereto and possibly consequent on its findings the Board should determine and advise accordingly.

"In view of the above the Federation suggests that the terms of reference should be set out somewhat in the following form and in doing so the Federation is not endeavouring to dictate in any way to the Government....."

Mr. Speaker, indeed they cannot do that, not as long as I have anything to do with the Government. The letter goes on:-

"as to what these terms of reference should be, but merely availing themselves of the opportunity offered by the Government to commenting on the same.

"It is recognised that neither party to a dispute is in any way bound by the decision or report of a Board of Enquiry although as a matter of practice both parties to the dispute always endeavour to carry out the advice offered in any such report.

The suggested form of terms of reference is as follows:

The Board is hereby required

(1) To enquire into and to investigate the cause or causes of the present dispute between the Sugar Producers' Federation of Barbados and the Barbados Workers' Union and particularly as to whether there is existing an Agreement between the Federation and the Workers' Union and the terms thereof and whether the dispute arose by reason of one or both parties refusing to honour such Agreement.

(2) In case there is in existence such Agreement, what steps, if any, should be taken to determine the dispute.

(3) In case there is no such agreement in existence, what wages should be paid to the workers for the year 1958."

Those are the terms of reference submitted by the Sugar Producers' Federation to the Government. Now, Sir, we go a little further. On the 26th April, my Ministry received a letter from the Barbados Workers' Union. 3.15 p.m.

This is what the letter says:

"The Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour, Government Headquarters, Bay Street, Dear Sir, with reference to your letters". They are replying for the first time to two letters. The hon. member will be able.....

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I am appealing to the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not going to accept the appeal. The hon. member is making a statement which I clarified already. He said that on the 26th April we are replying to two letters. You see, his reading is a little bit faulty. He does not know that we could have replied to a letter already, but he says this is the first letter and that is the impres-

sion he wanted to give ever since, that this letter of the 26th was the first reply to the letter of the 19th which he wrote.

Mr. Speaker, I hate to draw any other person into a matter like this, but on the 21st there was a reply and I will read that when I get up. It was not signed by me and you know who would be another officer at the Union responsible for a reply on the 21st April, two days after the first letter came and not seven days after as the hon. member is making out.

Mr. SPEAKER: A reply was made on the 21st.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have not got that. I have a letter of the 18th but on the 18th we had not yet written to the Union. The hon. member said that a letter was written on the 21st, but I know that we received a telegram from the hon. member stating that he agrees with Mr. Dyce but did not answer the question as to the terms of reference; so I am saying that for the first time the member is attempting to answer the questions relative to the terms of reference. The hon. member has the right to reply because the letter is in his file, though it does not necessarily mean that it is in mine. He may have written it and never passed it on; who knows?

Mr. WALCOTT: On the 21st April, I was not in Barbados.

Mr. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, again I repeat that on the 26th April we received this letter from the hon. member.

"With reference to your letters No. C 626/25 dated 19th April, 1958, and No. C 626/31 dated 23rd April, 1958, in connection with the present dispute in the sugar industry, I have been instructed by the Executive Council to inform you that in respect to the first letter, the Union has nominated Mr. Osmond Dyce to be a member of the Board.

"The Union cannot at this stage make any statement on the Enquiry to be instituted, but would give this matter further consideration. The Union is in agreement with the proposal to set up this Enquiry with such terms of reference to cover the industry in its wide aspect.

"With reference to the letter of the 23rd April, and the suggested terms of reference, the Union does not agree with the terms of reference as stated by you. It is the considered opinion of the Union that the terms of reference should be:-

"To investigate the present dispute in the Sugar Industry between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation, and to make recommendations."

"Such terms of reference are wide enough for the Board to hear arguments of any kind and would give both sides the opportunity to state their case as they think best."

Yours faithfully,
F. L. WALCOTT."

Now, Sir, we go on a little further and we try to draw up these terms of reference, and I hope you will follow me as regards the terms of reference.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not saying that a letter was not written on the 21st because I saw the letter myself and apparently it was I who wrote that letter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I have the record here and it does not reveal it, and the fact that the member referred in his letter to two letters, explaining in that one letter his position, is sufficient to convince anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not convinced because actually a letter was sent on the 21st April signed by me. It is on the Union's files, fortunately or unfortunately.

Hon. M. E. COX: Now, Sir, this is what we again put up, and I am showing you how similar and almost

identical our terms of reference were to the ones suggested by the Union. It reads as follows:-

"To inquire into the present dispute in the sugar industry, and to make recommendations for its settlement."

Now compare that with what was put up. Instead of saying "to investigate" we said "to inquire." The Union said "to investigate the present dispute in the sugar industry between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation," but we did not feel it necessary to mention "between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation". The terms of reference are almost identical and convey the same meaning and impression, which shows in no uncertain manner that instead of our being guided by the Sugar Producers' Federation as the hon. member will have this House and the public believe, we were guided almost word for word by the Barbados Workers' Union.

When Mr. Lewis came here he thought that we should make a small amendment and that amendment was made.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just want the hon. member to read his letter of the 23rd and he will find a flap attached to the letter which gives the terms of reference as suggested by the Ministry, because it is from that I said that their terms of reference were similar to those of the Sugar Producers' Federation. Let the hon. member read the letter of the 23rd submitting terms of reference to which a reply was sent saying that we did not agree with the terms of reference.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I have already read the terms.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: He is saying that the letter of the 23rd April, submitted the terms of reference. He has only read the terms of reference which were agreed upon.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister understands your contention.

Mr. WALCOTT: Oh no, he said that the terms of reference were submitted in the letter of the 23rd April.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I have read that letter already. I have said that those were the first proposed terms of reference to investigate into the present dispute in the sugar industry. We said then:- "to investigate the present dispute in the sugar industry, and having regard to all relevant circumstances (including the terms of the agreement on wages reached in 1957 between the Barbados Sugar Producers' Federation and the Barbados Workers' Union)."

Mr. WALCOTT: That is where I said that the terms of reference were similar to what the Sugar Producers' Federation wanted.

Hon. M. E. COX: How can they be similar? This is what we sent to the Union and this is what the Union agreed to. These were the terms but they were changed slightly when Mr. Lewis came here. The terms were slightly modified. I tried to show the similarity between the terms of reference then and those which were firmly decided on. These were the terms of reference which were agreed to by the Union and which were accepted by the Government:-

"to enquire into the present dispute in the sugar industry, and to make recommendations for its settlement."

There was a slight amendment to that after Mr. Lewis came. I want to say this in order to make our position clear. The hon. senior member for St. Peter during the course of his speech said that I had gone wrong in saying that there was an agreement and he mentioned at some meeting in the country that I said that the Union had had a three-year agreement with the Federation.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not say that. I said that the Hon. Minister spoke on a Government platform on an issue when it was a mat-

ter upon which he himself had advised the Government to set up a Commission of Enquiry and as such he had no right to speak on a public platform on the matter after he had set up that Commission. The text of what he said on that occasion is a different thing.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is only interrupting me. He has the opportunity of replying. If he goes on like that I would have to stop and I know he would be glad.

Mr. WALCOTT: Glad? Why?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member argued that there was no agreement and I so took it upon myself to tell the people that there was an agreement. If I made a mistake, I made the error in accepting what the hon. member stated quite categorically not only in Barbados but in ORIT. This is what ORIT says. Before I quote, let me say that they send to the Ministry copies of ORIT. I do not know if they will stop sending them after now.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. He is wrong again. He is reading something from CADORIT not ORIT. Again, for his benefit, I challenge him to read anything which I stated in ORIT.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot challenge him yet because he has not read anything yet.

Mr. WALCOTT: He says that I wrote something in ORIT.

Mr. SPEAKER: He did not say so.

Mr. WALCOTT: He said that he is going to read what I stated in ORIT and I challenge him to read anything which I stated in ORIT.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am going to read this from a copy of CADORIT for March, 1957, which was received by the Ministry on the 6th April, 1957. This is what it says on page 2:-

"Within a comparatively short period of negotiations, the Barbados Workers' Union led by their General Secretary Frank Walcott, clinched a three-year contract with the Barbados Sugar Producers' Federation providing for an increase to 17 1/2% calculated on and added to the 1954 basic wage rates. The wage boost is retroactive to the 1st January of this year. The current wage rates in the sugar industry of the territory is 4 1/2% above the 1954 rates agreed on which means that the new rates agreed on will boost the current rates by 13% of the 1954 rates.

The Barbados Workers' Union is the first in the West Indies to reach an amicable agreement in the industry and also first to make a three-year contract. The agreement however provides for upward adjustments to keep pace with any possible increase in the cost of living during its life."

I do not know if a fairy carried it down there or who or what is responsible for this statement being included in the circular of CADORIT. I do not know, but I regard this as a proper organisation and more perhaps because the hon. senior member for St. Peter is its Chairman. I regard CADORIT as a responsible organisation.

3.35 p.m.
Although not expecting everything, I would expect and would conclude and more particularly where Barbados is concerned that when I read anything in it, it would have some foundation in fact. That is what I have read here. I regret having to handle this matter in this way, but the sugar industry is very vital to the economy of the island; it is the backbone of our economy and we cannot in any way attempt to make confusion and play politics with it. We cannot allow it to disintegrate because of internal strife and because somebody at some particular time would like to oppose some other person. It was most regrettable that these negotiations were concluded and further attempts had not been made to bring about an amicable settlement; that after the Union had done such a good job to get these conditions, aided and supported by the Government, the very people should go to the people of St. John and say that

it was not done either by the Government or by the Union but by the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, can you allow such a wilful lie? A man who is so dangerous a liar.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is breaking the Rules of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: His neck should be broken after that; he has done as much as any man has done to go to the gallows.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is getting beside himself.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I must be heard in silence; that is one of the Rules of this Chamber. I should like the hon. member to hear me in a calm mood. The hon. member is asking me if I am allowing the Hon. Minister to say what he has said; but the Hon. Minister does not get permission from me to say anything.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not mean literally that you permitted the hon. member to say what he has said; the dangerous thing about him is that it is about the fourth time that he has risen in this House to say something which is not true, and he is saying it for the effect of having it written. He said that the hon. junior member for St. John was responsible for this thing. How can a man be so outrageous as to say that? When some people go to the gallows you really have to sympathise with them. When a man can be so provoking as to get up in here and say what he knows is not true and then he says that he can get documentary evidence for things which are not true - not even the hon. junior member for St. John would say that. When the hon. member says that, well, his heart is as black as his face.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is what worries a lot of people; it is black but comely.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is comely but atrocious.

Hon. M. E. COX: He can go to the platform at Four Roads and say.....

Mr. WALCOTT: I will go again if the necessity arises.

Hon. M. E. COX: That settles my point.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage, if there is going to be this sort of cut and thrust, I will stop the debate; I will not allow the debate to be carried on any further and I will call the next Order under Private Members' Business. We cannot proceed in this Chamber in this manner; we either have to get to the McKenzie Report and remain there or let us get out of the McKenzie Report.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have always been trained to respect the Chair and I will always do so; what I am saying I regret is incurring the wrath of the hon. member, but the truth is very strong. A lot of other people were present at that meeting and I can quote very many things to bear out my statements. When the Board of Enquiry was set up and the Chairman of the Board drew to the attention of the hon. member who gave evidence - perhaps I may as well go right through with this matter. This is what the hon. member wrote on the 2nd March, 1957, to the Labour Commissioner:-

"Dear Sir,

Further to the negotiations held under your chairmanship between the Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation at the Labour Department -"

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not mind the hon. member reading, but do you realise what he is doing now? There is evidence of a private nature which was given to the Labour Commissioner, which was given to the Commission of Enquiry; the Commissioner has not published the evidence from either side and the hon. member is now pretending

that he is taking the position of a Commissioner. The Report of the Lewis Commission has not carried any evidence; the Hon. Minister is now reading private correspondence between the Labour Commissioner and the Barbados Workers' Union on a matter before an enquiry was held.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Parliament has not jurisdiction over that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have the correspondence and I can read too.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not a Court.

Mr. WALCOTT: The letter which the hon. member now brings forward justifies my position in the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is nothing which is *sub judice*.

Mr. WALCOTT: He is reading from a private file.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not attempting to read anything which is private and confidential. What I am quoting now is what was quoted in the newspapers of this island. The Enquiry was held in public, the Press was admitted and the Press has reported all of what I am saying now.

Mr. WALCOTT: When the hon. member can get on a platform and say what he says, he should have been kicked down. He is reading what took place before the enquiry was held.
3.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Now, Sir, I will not read all, but I will read at least the part made out that even if I said there was a three-year agreement existing which the hon. member denies and which he was very loud in condemning me for, I want to say these are the findings in addition to what we have seen published in CADORIT. These are the findings reported to the Press by the Commission of Enquiry under the Chairmanship of Mr. Lewis:-

"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 wage rates for 1957 based upon an increase of 17.5% calculated and added to the 1954 basic wage rate;

that this agreement was intended to be for a period of three years from 1957 to 1959 and to incorporate Clauses 1(a), (b), (c), and (d) of the 1954 Domestic Sugar Agreement;

that under this agreement the increase in wages due to the workers in the sugar industry for the year 1958 is 5.95 on the 1957 basic wage rates in accordance with the Movement of the Commonwealth Wage Index figure."

As Minister of Labour when stones are thrown at me, I must be in a position to convince the public and the people concerned that I did nothing against their interest, that I did not mislead and that the accusations made against me by the member or any member or anybody in this respect were unfounded and false and might even have been malicious.

I will go on further to the McKenzie Report. No doubt the hon. member has been very caustic in his criticism. I want to make my position very clear in this matter. It has never been the intention of this Government and least of all of the Ministry of Trade to defend any Report made by anybody. This Report, Mr. Speaker, was not a Report to fix wages and conditions of work, but rather a Report to recommend a basis for negotiations between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation. I remember well when we got down Professor Shephard after we had a lot of cane fires and the workers were not satisfied - this was in 1945 - that we appealed to people then - and the hon. senior member for St. Peter was a member of this Party at the time - to reap the crop. We went the length and breadth of this island, being a responsible Party, and assured them that we were prepared to bring somebody to this island who would go into the

Sugar industry as a whole, the economics of it and otherwise, and would get that person to recommend rates from trashing back up the scale.

Mr. Speaker, as you will remember we got Professor Shephard down here - a one-man Inquiry - and he made an investigation, and I am sure that his Report with the exception of the recommendation which he made in respect of the rate in prices paid for canes purchased from peasants, was accepted without question. The hon. member who is the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union had a lot to do with that Report because he went before the Commissioner and explained certain factors in so far as the workers were concerned and everybody including the workers were satisfied. From then on the workers had confidence in the Government of this country, so much so that they decided to reap the crop every year without knowing what the final price would be. That went on for some time. No objection was made to that by the member nor did he come to the House of Assembly and say anything against it. He was quite satisfied with this one-man Court.

Now, Sir, bordering on 1957 when we had what could be regarded as the Magna Charta for Barbados in so far as the sugar industry is concerned, the Governor, Sir Alfred Savage, a very sympathetic man towards the working classes and towards the development of non-self-Governing territories - I wish I could say that for a lot more of them - was not satisfied that the workers were reaping the full benefit from their labours in this industry, and he consulted us and told us that he knew of a great man, an economist of note, whom he could get down here by the name of Duffy, to go into this industry. The gentleman came here and investigated the sugar industry and made recommendations, and among the recommendations made, Sir, was this production bonus. He said that the factories were taking too much of the overhead expenses of manufacturing sugar, and recommended that that should be reduced by £1 per ton, and that money should be distributed among the people who grow canes and especially the peasants. That recommendation, as I said just now, was regarded as the Magna Charta for Barbados; a lot of publicity was given to it; it was signed by the Sugar Producers' Federation, and on the other hand it was signed by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the present Prime Minister of the West Indies, our present Premier and your humble servant.
3.55 p.m.

That was signed by us; and from then on you got your Production Bonus as never before according to the number of tons of sugar produced in the island. That, I repeat, was done by one man and not by a Board of three or ten. Having that before us as a guide and realising that it was not a question of a wage dispute as such because the wage dispute was already settled for the year 1958 and that was done by three people of whom the Union nominated somebody, the Sugar Producers' Federation nominated somebody and the Government nominated someone and the discussions were in public, we proceeded to make arrangements for this second enquiry. This enquiry was not a question of investigating a dispute; this was a question of getting somebody with the know-how and know-all to sit down seriously and to go into all the facts and figures which were to be presented from time to time to him and it was a question of getting somebody who was capable of analysing those facts and who was capable of reaching some conclusion as to the establishment of a basis upon which the Union and the Federation could discuss the question of fixing rates and wages. That is all.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter attended the Ministry of Trade with a delegation on the question as to whether or not we should have these terms of reference and in addition to that, the question of it being a one-man enquiry. I was convinced when he left my Ministry that the delegation was convinced that it was the right thing to do, that is to say, to have a one-man enquiry. As a matter of fact, the hon. member said that the person should be an economist and that he should be somebody from the U.C.W.I. I told him that this man was an economist and so able a man he was that he was appointed Agricultural Adviser to the Federal Government. Again, I repeat, I was convinced when the hon. member left, and the other members of the delegation, that they were convinced that it should

be a one-man enquiry. They actually said that they did not understand it, but that I had explained it to them in full that they were satisfied. I understand that they made certain attempts to have a delegation from the Union to go before the Commissioner to explain the various questions which would have arisen out of the memorandum which was submitted to the Board by the Workers' Union. Well, Sir, that was not done. Perhaps, the hon. member was able to use his influence on the Union: so they did not send anybody.

I do not know how he looks at that, but I feel this way about it. I feel that if there was one time when the Union should have gone to put forward their points of view or to answer questions, it was then. To shelter under the veil of saying "Oh, if I cannot give my evidence when a Reporter is there to take down every word, I am not going to say anything" was not in the best interest of the workers. What is the point of saying that? This is what I know. If you want figures and facts from these business people you can only get them by holding a private enquiry. What they are going to show you in private they are not going to show you in public. If the hon. member wanted to succeed to the fullest on behalf of the workers, I contend that the Union should have attended on the Commissioner and the hon. member should have given his evidence and replied to the various points raised in the memorandum. Staying away has done absolutely no good, unless of course, that the hon. member was only looking for cheap political propaganda; but if he really wanted real results on behalf of the workers, just as he submitted a memorandum I contend that he should have and ought to have seen the wisdom in going before the Commissioner and putting his case as strongly as possible.

I go further and say that the hon. member knows that there is an Act on the Statute Book which prevents members who attend Boards and Wages Councils from revealing figures and facts which they may get at those meetings; so, Sir, I contend that the hon. member has absolutely no excuse in his attacks upon the Government in his request to have his speaking in public to the Commissioner with a Reporter at his side. I contend that that was shortsightedness on his part and he could only have wanted to publicise himself as apparently doing something when in truth he was doing nothing.

The hon. member has been in this Trade Union business for a long time and I see no reason why he should have any doubt in his mind that the workers are going to doubt him if he did his best behind closed doors. The only reason I can give as to why he wanted this thing done publicly is that he feared that the workers did not have that confidence which they once had in him; therefore, his utterances would have to be publicised to show that he did a good job.

As I have said, the hon. member should have gone before the Board. Of course, I have nothing to cry over.
4.05 p.m.

The hon. member was very caustic in criticising Mr. McKenzie. As I said earlier, I have no brief for Mr. McKenzie; he does not vote for me. If it were left to Mr. McKenzie and people like him, I could not even come up the stairs to peep into this House. I have always fought for the workers of this country and I have had the courage in the trying, wicked and dismal days when many people of very sound standing in the community refused to take chances, to take the chances. The workers have supported me and I am always relying on their support to get into this House to support them in turn. Therefore, there cannot be any question of my being opposed to the workers as the hon. member would have people to believe.

During the course of his speech, the hon. member referred to the Government of Barbados and he referred to it as a Government which is opposed to the working classes of this island; he linked up the members of this Government with the Conservative Government. No doubt, when the hon. member was on this side, he was very strong in defending the policy of this Government, in upholding its policy and in making it clear to the Opposition that this Government was truly representative of the working classes of this island. However, since he has got into bad company, he now decides that everything that we have

done is wrong and that automatically we have turned to be enemies of the working classes. I am sure that he cannot convince himself about that.

I have here a copy of the ORIT Magazine published at Christmas, 1958.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it Orit or CADORIT?

Hon. M. E. COX: It is CADORIT. This is a magazine which CADORIT publishes regularly and I would like to read from it because reference is always made to something about Labour; they tell you what Labour is doing and sometimes they tell you about the good relationship which exists between Trade Unions and the various Governments in the different areas. This is what is stated here:-

"The Trade Union Movement in the Caribbean presents a situation of paradox; it is very strong and at the same time it is extraordinarily weak.

In many areas of the world the main task of those who seek to establish democratic trade unionism is to battle continuous hostility of Government and the ruthless backward characters of the employers. In those places the employer whose only interest is to make as much profits as time will allow, take control of the Government and use instruments of the law to suppress every effort of the workers to unite in democratic leadership.

In the Caribbean that situation does not apply. It is true that individual employers by petty tricks and under-hand methods do at times seek to offset the effectiveness of the Trade Unions by refusing to negotiate with them on one pretext or the other. Sometimes they recognise the Unions but by petty subterfuges sow discord among the unwary rank and file of the Union membership.

By and large the Unions with some effort are in most of these cases able to overcome the difficulties and in all the territorial units the governments are in varying degrees sympathetic to the cause of Labour."

The hon. senior member for St. Peter is the Chairman of CADORIT and I presume that before he made the statement which he made in this House of Assembly on this particular issue, he had read or he was acquainted with at least some of the contents of this Magazine which is published by this Organisation. I know that the hon. member reads quite a lot and I presume that he has read this. I could not believe that the hon. member who, I repeat, is Chairman of this Organisation, would have failed to read this statement in CADORIT. It says:-

"By and large the Unions with some effort are in most of these cases able to overcome the difficulties and in all the territorial units the governments are in varying degrees sympathetic to the cause of Labour.

"Consequently, there are always some few persons to cushion the heavy blows which in such favourable circumstances would fall on the head of the workers.

This favourable situation is achieved because in the beginning of our constitutional advances many or most of the leaders who today are Ministers of Government and top political personalities, were at the time the battering rams of trade union pioneering in the area. The masses of the people at Election time prefer them because of their past services and also because in most cases they were the only ones who would face the viciousness of colonial fury. That is our strength. In the present circumstances the worst will never happen. We are for the time being and until the balance changes, saved from repressive legislation."

When you read what is written here and then sit down and listen to the type of speech which the hon. member has made attacking the Government and especially attacking me on this particular question, you will ask yourself, or rather you will be bound to conclude that something is wrong somewhere. It is largely because of the petty jealousy and spite and things of that sort that this situation arises today. The workers are being fooled; they are mis-

led into feeling and believing that we are not as strong on their side supporting them as we used to be. It is all because the hon. member was not made Minister of Trade Industry and Labour.
4.15 p.m.

I say that with authority. I was in on all the discussions and knew everything that transpired, and I knew that he was slated to be Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour in the first Ministerial Government, and it was only because of the fact that the then Premier felt on the advice of somebody else - and I would not call the name though the hon. member knows it well -

Mr. WALCOTT: Call the name! You have been going quite well; so why hold back?

Hon. M. E. COX: The member was not taken up to the Cabinet because the Premier felt that at the time that it was not the best thing that both he and the Union Secretary should leave the Union at the same time. I know for a fact and I have said it publicly and will say again that the Premier went to the extent of appealing to the member to remain at least for one year in the Union during the Ministerial infancy, if I may so put it, and after that year a man would be trained to take over and he would be taken into the Ministry then.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is of no interest to me.

Hon. M. E. COX: I appreciate that, but it will be of some interest because people should know at least some of the causes of all this confusion, attacks and things of that sort. Now, Sir, the hon. member says that the Government accepts without question.....

Mr. WALCOTT: I am coming for you on a fresh leaf.

Hon. M. E. COX: Some can give, but they cannot take.

Mr. WALCOTT: I can take it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I had everything organised when I was here on the last occasion, but it is a bit disorganised at present.

Now, Sir, the hon. member referred to the recommendation made by Mr. McKenzie on the question of the differential in the rates paid to factory workers in relation to the rates paid to the canecutters, and stated that the Government was saying that the rates that were paid to the factory workers were too high. I want to say here and now that that has never crossed our minds. I deny that because I have heard it rumoured throughout this country that we as a Government were saying that the rates paid to factory workers were too high. I do not know if there are any rates in this island or wages or salaries paid to any worker which this Labour Government could regard as too high or even high. (Mr. WALCOTT: Ministers) The hon. member says "Ministers." The few dollars that the Ministers draw, I wonder if the hon. member knows that \$200 is taken out at the Treasury first. (Mr. WALCOTT: They cannot take it out of nothing.) When they run about and talk about this \$800, I do not know about that. I understand that it is \$720, and \$200 is taken out before you look at it. It is alright to run about and mislead people and puff up these things; but I would say quite frankly that if it were \$1,000 it would not be too much, and I know that the Leader of the Opposition would agree with me.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of explanation, from 1961 we propose reducing the Ministers' salaries.

Hon. M. E. COX: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, some members opposed payment of members of this House; but do you know what has been my experience? They knew very well that there was a safe majority and that it would pass, and therefore they could have afforded to oppose it. They counted the heads and then voted "no".

When this thing came into being and I went to the Treasury for the first time, I met two persons who had opposed the Bill to amend the salaries already in the Treasury being attended to. (Mr. WALCOTT: It was law then.)

When I passed a joke with them they said the Law said they must draw and they were complying with the Law. I said it did not say that; the Law said they may draw, so that if you did not want to draw you need not have drawn. In reply to the Leader of the Opposition I would like to say that I have heard some Opposition members say ...

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a very happy diversion, but we should get back to the Report.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was saying that none of us feels that anybody gets too much. As a matter of fact, our feeling has always been

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

I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have always felt that the rates paid to workers are insufficient even though they may sometimes appear to people to be high, because if you take for example lightermen - I refer to that because some members of the community usually say that the Labour Party has not done anything for them, it has done all for the waterfront people - Waterfront men may draw \$30 or \$40 this week, they decide that is a lot of money, but they do not realise that out of the fifty-two weeks in a year they may not even draw for as many as twenty weeks; so you take his annual earnings or take the lump sum he earns in a year and divide it by fifty-two weeks, it can drop to about \$10 or \$15 a week (Mr. WALCOTT: Why make them pay tax under the P.A.Y.E. system then?). You can see then, Sir, what our position is. It has always been to see that better wages are paid and we could never have said that.
4.25 p.m.

I want this to be carefully noted. Despite the fact that the hon. member claimed that he was not negotiating on the basis of the McKenzie Report, yet from the agreements reached this year, one can easily see that the agreements were based on the recommendations made by Mr. McKenzie. Mr. Speaker, why do I say that? The Union got an increase for the agricultural workers. I do not remember the exact figure now, but it was an increase on the basic wages of agricultural workers and cane cutters. When it came to the question of wage rates for workers in factories, the Union agreed to a bonus on a sliding scale which was by far less than what was given to these agricultural labourers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being half past four o'clock, we return to Government Business.

STATEMENT BY Hon. R. G. MAPP *re* DIVERSION OF PUBLIC HIGHWAY AT SANDY LANE TO RENDER POSSIBLE HOTEL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to lay a Statement which His Honour the Speaker is aware of and he has given me permission to lay it at this time.

This Statement reads as follows:-

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND HOUSING IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ON 21ST APRIL, 1959.

I would inform the House that after careful consideration the Government has agreed in principle to the diversion of the public highway in the Sandy Lane area to render possible a major hotel development project to be carried out there. This agreement is subject -

- (a) to the provision of an alternative highway built to an alignment, gradient and specification to be approved by the Government;
- (b) to the provision of public access to the beach; and
- (c) to the approval by the Government of a Development Plan for the whole area. This Development Plan will clearly show -
 - (a) the line, road reserve, pavement, and carriage-way width of the proposed diversion of Highway

1, together with details of any proposed access to Highway 1 where it runs through the development site. These proposals will be worked out in collaboration with the Town and Country Planning Officer and the Department of Highways and Transport;

- (b) the approximate location of the Hotel and ancillary buildings, any other proposed buildings, and land which it is proposed to use for other purposes, e.g. golf course; sale or lease for building development, residential and otherwise;
- (c) the broad lines of any landscaping proposals, e.g. changes in ground level, diversion of water and drainage courses, clearance of wooded areas, or planting of new trees, and generally any major landscaping proposals affecting the existing amenity of the area generally, and visibility from the new line of Highway 1 in particular;
- (d) the location and extent of any public right of way granted by the developers through the development site from Highway 1 to the beach;

2. In arriving at its decision the Government has given special consideration to the benefits likely to accrue to the economy of the Island, with special reference to the tourist industry. Among the benefits are improved opportunities for all-the-year-round employment of personnel presently employed on agricultural land, which will form a part of the project. Indeed, it is envisaged that the Project will offer direct employment to some 500 people when it is completed.

3. I wish to assure the House that in granting permission for the diversion of the highway, adequate safeguards have been laid down in the public interest.

I may say that some fears have been expressed that this may be a project such as that established in Antigua. Let me say that we have not rushed into this; we have given it very careful consideration and we have taken every measure to safeguard the interest of the people of this Island on a whole. With a view to the importance of this matter and its interference with a major highway that was in existence for many years, I feel that I should make this statement.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you allow the Hon. Minister to do more than make a statement and to make a comment, I take this opportunity of expressing my intention to move the adjournment of this House to discuss the contents of this Statement in connection with the diversion of Highway No.1.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, everything which I have just said forms part of my statement. Of course, it does not preclude any discussion by the House. I need not have brought it here. The hon. member this morning gave notice that he intended to debate the statement which was made by the Hon. Premier a few weeks ago. I did not make a statement and then a comment; I made a statement.

HOUSE RESUMED DEBATE ON CUSTOMS TARIFF (AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) BILL, 1959.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just before the suspension of the House, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was speaking on the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was discussing ----

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What did you say?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I said that just before the suspension of the sitting of the House, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was speaking.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Oh yes. I thank you.

Mr. BRANCKER: Do I gather that the Hon. Premier is trying to restrict members on this side from speaking on this Bill?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am surprised to hear the member say that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not speaking on a point of order; I am continuing my speech on the second reading of the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.
4.35 p.m.

When the Minister of Finance was foreshadowing this increase in the duty, it will be recalled that he put it in this way; that in his view the duty on beer has always been very low, that we have been the lowest in the area and that we had increased the duty on gin and whisky, and maintained a lower rate on beer. To offset the difference caused by less consumption of rum and the increased consumption of beer, the new duties would come into force on a particular date. He expressed the opinion that the price of beer would be increased by five or six cents per bottle. An hon. member has observed a Minister paying sixty cents for a bottle of beer at one of the high class places which the Ministers frequent; but in many of the rum shops in this island the price of beer has gone from thirty cents to thirty-eight cents. Certainly that puts the price of beer at a figure which is entirely beyond the reach of the average working man outside of the reaping season. It does look as if you are refusing the average working man the opportunity of indulging in a drink which he regards as being superior to rum and which is better for him, and that when he has reached the stage of drinking beer you want to return him to the stage of drinking rum. We mingle with those people and we know that their drink is not rum but beer. The price of beer is now absolutely beyond their means. On principle, I am opposed to the increase in the price of this commodity at all; it cannot but have the appearance that because people have been drinking beer because of their raised standard, you want to put that commodity at a price which is beyond their reach entirely, so that they will go back to drinking rum and not be allowed to drink stout, beer, ale and porter as they have been doing in recent years.

Even if they were in a position to justify an increase, there cannot be any serious attempt to justify this abnormal increase which is in effect at the present time and to which this Bill proposes to give absolute legislative sanction.

As the Objects and Reasons of the Bill states:-

"The object of this Bill is to amend the Customs Tariff Act 1921, so as to increase the Preferential and General rates of duty on beer, ale, stout and porter imported into the island from 28 cents and 35 cents per gallon to \$1.13 and \$1.20 per gallon respectively. That is an absolutely colossal and an unprecedented increase and it has shown itself in the price of a bottle of this liquid which is three gills or whatever quantity the bottles contain now. People now have to pay this increased price. It may well be that so long as the crop season lasts the sale of these four liquids, particularly beer and stout, may continue; but there cannot be any doubt about it that as soon as the reaping season is over, the sale of these liquids will drop and one cannot see the benefit which will accrue to the Government. I ask; will the Government derive any satisfaction from that? Or do they feel that there will be any increase in the sale of rum to people in the higher classes? that will not happen; the people who are accustomed to drinking beer will continue to do so, but I do not see any justification for perpetuating this increase by the passing of this Bill, not even to give this Bill its second reading with a view to amending it so as to make the increase considerably less than what is proposed here. It is not fair to that class of person who, in the past, could not drink beer at all and who has recently been able to enjoy an occasional bottle over the weekend during the reaping season when money is circulating, at one blow to increase the duty on beer, ale, stout and porter imported in this island from 28 cents and 35 cents per gallon

to \$1.13 and \$1.20 respectively particularly beer, with the consequential increase in the retail price of this commodity.

This Bill has no virtue in it. Money can be raised by other means which will not affect the poorest class of person, as this Bill does, because this is the only class of person which this Bill affects. What is the primary reason in the minds of the Government for this extravagant increase? Is it to help the British Guiana Banks Beer to get a foothold on the market? I understand the Hon. Minister to say that the locally-brewed beer will not cost more than 25 cents a bottle but the local item must be as good as the imported one. If Barbados rum was not the best rum is it expected to be drunk because it is made in this island? A competition I gather has arisen between the Trinidad brewery and the British Guiana brewery and we are to brew a beer at 25 cents per bottle. The opinion I have heard expressed from people in B.G. is that their brand is considered as one of the best on this side of the Atlantic. This Bill meets with our disfavour on this side of the House and we object to it on the principle of raising money by this means when there are obviously other means of raising money, which will not affect the poorest class of person.

4.45 p.m.

Just when they have started to increase their standard of living in respect of their food and their drink and refreshment and have come to like beer, you have done this. And some doctors recommend beer highly; I would not say whether they are the best or the worst or whether they have shares in breweries - just as I understand some doctors have shares in Undertaking Companies - but medical men recommend beer as a beverage which if used in reasonable quantities is beneficial and has almost a medicinal value. I noticed that the Minister for Finance was careful not to commit himself on the medicinal value of rum. We know that it has an appetising effect; we know that an occasional one or two before dinner helps the appetite; but when it comes to beer which the poorer of the population in this country drinks, I do not see that we are justified in supporting any increase in the price of that commodity unless other sources of increasing the revenue have been exhausted which in my submission has not been the case.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to endorse the suggestion for non-support of this Bill. The Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition is invariably well informed on these matters, and I do not know how right in fact is his allegation that the decision to increase the price of beer now is related to the fact that the crop is on. If there is any relation in the minds of the Government, I should like to say that they should twist the matter around. During the crop people do not drink beer, they drink cane juice; so therefore the price should be lower after the crop and high during the crop. The hon. member seems to suggest that the price has been increased now because the crop is on and they have no money to spend, but my submission is that the high price that applies out of the crop should apply in crop, and the lower price out of crop.

I may say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am not at all convinced in my mind that one or two of the statements made by my hon. colleague are correct. If Banks Beer is going to be inferior in quality to imported beer, then they should not come here to open a factory at all. Generally speaking, the beer sold in this country, especially the English beer, is of the poorest quality, and I know that several English beers on sale in the West Indian market could not be sold at all in England. If you sold one pail of some of the English beer sold on the West Indian market in England, you would be prosecuted under the Food Act, because in England they have got to conform to a certain recognised standard by law. But they push anything on the outside market, and that is why so many bottles of beer on the outside market are labelled "for export only", because any water can be called beer for the export market; but for the domestic market at the point of manufacture it must conform to certain recognised standards. If we are going to get a West Indian beer inferior in quality to the English beer, God help us.

My main contention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that if the Government is claiming that they can afford to increase

the duty on imported beer because of the possibility of manufacturing beer locally, well then this increase should only apply after the beer had been manufactured locally. The Government claims that the price of the locally manufactured beer would be 25¢ a bottle, but we have not started to manufacture it yet. Until we do get it, we have to pay for beer at the increased price of 38¢ a bottle which, as the hon. member for St. Lucy says, and I agree with him, is putting the price of beer beyond the pocket of the average man or woman in the country. The Government would have been far more sensible towards this matter if it had postponed this increase until such time as beer was being manufactured locally, and then there could have been no claim that they were interfering with the possibility of people of small incomes buying a bottle of beer occasionally, because you would have had on the spot locally manufactured beer at the cheaper rate of 25¢ a bottle; but of course we know the reason, at least one of the reasons, why the tax has been increased as of now. They claim that it has been done because of the decrease in the consumption of rum.

Most of what I had to say on this matter I said on the Budget debate. I pointed out then and I will remind the House now that the Government should have welcomed the decrease in the consumption of rum and not regarded it as a matter to be deplored, neither should they regard the taxation as an indispensable source of revenue that the moment it begins to show a decrease, steps must be taken to offset it. In the introductory Speech to the Budget, it was pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that although the volume of rum sold in Barbados had shown a decline, there had been an increase in the export market. We were told that in 1957 the rum exported was 779,962 gallons and the F.O.B. value was \$2,084,059, and in 1958 the volume increased to 835,644 gallons with an F.O. B. value of \$2,249,048. In other words, there was an increase in the export market of over 50,000 gallons. Obviously, if the Government wanted to increase its revenue from rum, what should have been considered was an additional levy on the exported rum.

I can appreciate the desire of Government to do nothing to hamper the export trade of rum in view of the harsh competition with which we are faced elsewhere in the area, especially Puerto Rico, Cuba and Jamaica; but, be that as it may, there is no reason why in order to offset the loss of revenue from the decrease in local rum consumption we should penalise beer drinkers to the point we are doing in the Bill before us, and I for one have the greatest pleasure in expressing my opposition to the measure, because there are other sources apart from rum or beer and apart from alcoholic beverages from which the Government can recoup the small loss of revenue.

4.55 p.m.

Certainly, Sir, that can be no justification for using as an excuse the fact that locally produced beer would be sold at twenty-five cents when it may take another year or two before the locally produced beer becomes available.

On this question of beer, especially in view of the fact that there is to be this attempt to manufacture beer locally, I think Government will be well advised to lay down standards of quality for beer sold locally, whether it is made here or imported. There is no reason why we should pay 25 cents or 35 cents for a bottle of beer and get bilge water. Almost all brands of beer sold in these parts are but little more than bilge water. If you enjoyed a bottle of beer in the U.S.A. or elsewhere, sometimes you have to wonder if the same commodity which we call beer comes under the same name as beer in those countries. You get a better quality at a very much cheaper price in those parts than what you pay here for a commodity with the same label. In this as in many other instances, there is urgent necessity for Government instituting proper food standards to which these products should conform and to see that the makers of them conform more in the fact than in the breach to the proper standard.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I too, like my colleagues, am opposed to the principle of this Bill which has as its objects the increasing of the rates of duty on beer, ale and stout. I feel that these increases are too enormous and entirely out of proportion, and in so doing

you would do any amount of harm to the underprivileged class of this island who in recent years have turned to beer and are consuming less rum. If it is as the Hon. Premier has said in his budget speech that there has been a decrease or fall in revenue on rum and this is a step whereby an attempt is being made to recoup the loss of revenue by causing the working class generally to do more drinking of rum and less beer, I think that is a clumsy way of going about it. It seems to me merely to be protecting Banks Beer or whatever brewery is going to establish a plant here. As I have said, Sir, I regard this as a very clumsy way of doing it.

I feel that this Bill is inequitable and unfair. The average man should not be told what he should drink and to compel certain people to drink a certain drink is wrong in the extreme.

Sir, I agree with the reasons adduced by my colleagues. I feel that this legislation is repressive, wrong and inequitable on the face of it and such legislation should not spring from a Labour Government. What is better than to see the working class people and the underprivileged having the privilege of enjoying beer rather than rum? Why should the Labour Government bring down legislation to compel people to drink rum rather than beer? I am not in favour of it and I will vote against it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this question was discussed at length during the debate on the Annual Estimates and I think the Hon Premier made clear on that occasion that the reason for doing this was that we wanted revenue and in addition to that the consumption of rum had been reduced considerably.

There is only one point which I would like to make and it is this. All along, the Opposition has accused this Government of doing nothing to industrialise this country but, as I mentioned on the last occasion when I had a Bill before the House to grant certain concessions to industry, as soon as we attempt to fall in line with other territories that offer similar concessions to industrialists, the Opposition gets up and attacks us from a different line.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order, I do not see how the remark of the hon. member applies. No where has the House been told that the Government is doing this as a concession to a new industry. They say that they are doing it to offset the decrease in the revenue of rum. That is what they said.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am saying exactly what the hon. member said. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to this prospective beer factory and the hon. senior member for St. Philip also referred to the manufacture of local beer and I am replying on that line.

I am going to say here and now that in order to encourage a brewery in this country, this is one of the things which is required to be done.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the hon. member suggesting that any member from this side said that you should not give a special protection to any locally manufactured beer? We never said so. What I said was this: if you want to protect a proposed local industry, protect it when it starts. In other words, you should give protection to a prospective manufacturer of an article when he starts to manufacture that article. In this case, you should increase your price of imported beer when he starts to manufacture beer locally, but do not start before he is ready.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am one who felt long ago that we could get a bit more revenue from beer this year but it was a question of GATT preventing the Government from coming down before with it.

5.05 p.m.

One of the things which brought the matter to a head is the fact that there will be established in Barbados a Brewery for the manufacture of beer; that is known to all of the members of the community by now. What I am saying is that these tariff rates are not even as they exist in British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica. (Mr. CRAWFORD: They are

having beer factories.) We are having one too. You cannot tell the Government when we must raise the rates in order to get revenue; all we are saying at this stage is that this is the time, not only to provide further revenue for Barbados, but also to lay down the standards so as to encourage industry to come in and to establish this Brewery. That is what we are saying in no uncertain manner. If you want to get industries established in this country - I cannot too often repeat that every now and again the Prime Minister of the West Indies used to be attacked by the members on that side of the House for not doing anything to encourage industries in Barbados. I think that many of them are glad that he is gone, and now that we are making every effort to see that industries are established here, I repeat.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Is the hon. member confessing that the present Prime Minister of the West Indies was a stumbling-block and now that he has gone we are getting something done? A little confession is good for the soul.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is just what he needs. (Mr. CRAWFORD: I confess to my priest, not to you.) All I am saying is that we are falling into line with other West Indian Islands in having industries among which the brewing of beer is one. In one case the rate is \$2.00 per gallon and in others it is still \$1.20. They had to do that in order to safeguard their industry. I am sorry that I have not got the file here so that I could quote figures to show the increase in the consumption of local beer in Trinidad after the duty was raised and to show the protective duties which are given to British Guiana as well as to Trinidad in order that those industries might thrive.

While I am on that subject, I think I should say that it is only a few weeks ago, when I read that in Canada the Manufacturers' Association made it clear that the contribution of \$1 million by the Canadian people was not too great a price to pay for the protection of their industries; that was released through the Chairman of that Association. All we are saying today is that we should increase the price of beer and we have every reason to feel that when this plant is established in this island, the people of this country will not only find - at least some of them - employment but beer will be at a price of anything between 21¢ and 22¢ per bottle and it will be of a quality equivalent to what is now imported into this colony. While it is true that the increase might cause or might appear to create a little hardship on people, although I do not agree with that, at the same time the object in view is to establish a Brewery in Barbados so as to get people trained and employed in that Brewery with a view, not only to supply the needs of Barbados, but also to supply the needs of some of the other islands where beer is concerned. I have every reason to believe that this Brewery will be a successful undertaking and that it will redound to the benefit of Barbados. Now that I have explained that part of the matter to hon. members, I think they will appreciate that it is a question not only of getting revenue but of making the position comfortable so that a Brewery can be established in Barbados in the very near future.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say this: When this matter as to the increase in the duty on beer was discussed, I was assured by people whom I have every reason to trust, that the price of beer would not be increased by more than 5 cents per bottle in some brands and 6 cents per bottle in others. As to the figures which I have heard quoted from hon. members on the other side of the House, I will institute an enquiry and if those figures are correct, I say here and now that I intend to apply controls on the price of beer. I will make enquiry as from tomorrow and if the figures quoted by members on the other side are correct, I intend to institute price control for the sale of beer. (Cheers.)

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

AYES: Mr. SEARLES, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, Mr. STRAUGHN and Mrs. BOURNE - 7.

NOES: Messrs. TALMA, CRAWFORD and BRANCKER-3

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SEARLES being in the Chair.

5.15 p.m.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:-

"2. The First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1921 is hereby amended by deleting items 112-03.1, 112-03.2, 112-03.3 and 112-03.4 and all the words and figures appearing opposite thereto in the columns respectively headed "Item", "Unit" and "Rate of Duty" and by substituting respectively therefor the following:-

"ITEM"	UNIT		RATE OF DUTY	
	For Classification	For Duty	Preference	General
112-03.1 Beer and Ale in Bottle	gal.	gal.	\$1.13	\$1.20
112-03.2 Beer and Ale in Wood	gal.	gal.	\$1.13	\$1.20
112-03.3 Stout and Porter in Bottle	gal.	gal.	\$1.13	\$1.20
112-03.4 Stout and Porter in Wood	gal.	gal.	\$1.13	\$1.20"

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should like to express the gratification of the Opposition over the statement by the Premier that he intends to institute controls over the price of beer; but you are aware yourself, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you are not a defaulter in that respect, but even in your own district - I am not suggesting that you would exploit, and even if you did we know that your association with beer is confined to giving it away at election time - you know that there are people who are charging 38¢ for a bottle of beer; that is common with many retailers throughout the country, and what the Premier should also do when he is investigating whether or not the distributors have broken faith with the Government in this matter is to investigate the allegation made during the Budget Speech with regard to a leakage in this matter, the statement being that people got wind of the fact that the price of beer would have been increased and were known to have hoarded large amounts of beer at the pre-Budget price. Both matters should be investigated and in any case I am sure that the public will welcome regulations in the price to conform with the pledge made to the Government, even although like ourselves a large section of the population feels that this increase should await the establishment of the local factory.

There is one more point, Mr. Chairman, and it is this: I hope that the Minister who is responsible for this matter is not deluding himself that because somebody came here and approached the Government asking for concessions to establish a brewery, we feel that the Government is exercising itself in the matter of industrial development. He claims quite rightly that the Opposition is always contending that the Government has taken no active steps

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, it is never our intention to stifle any debate, but surely the hon. member

is making a second reading speech and not speaking on Clause 2 of this Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, throughout all my years in this House I have seen the practice followed of permitting the Opposition speakers to reply to extraneous points raised by the Government during the introduction of matters. When the Minister was speaking on this matter, he diverted to talk about whether or not Government was in favour of industrial development. I said nothing at all about Government's habitual policy of not taking steps to encourage development. What I said was that at no stage had we been told during the Budget that this increase in the price of beer was in any way related to the proposal for bringing a brewery here. The memorandum to the Estimates stated that you did it because you wanted to raise duty. (Hon. M. E. COX: You talked about the quality.) Yes, but that is not general policy of industrial development. This, Mr. Chairman, as you might inform the Committee, is really the core of the Bill, and I am saying that the hon. member is being clever enough now to endeavour to coat this Bill for local consumption by claiming it at this late stage as a sort of palliative, and he knows that there is wide-spread resentment in this matter. He knows that the proper step to be taken was to await the establishment of this brewery; but to sugarcoat the Bill, he says we are doing this to encourage Banks beer to come here. (Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say that at all.) You said you were doing that to give encouragement to a local brewery, and I say that that is a new departure. In other words, the question of offering encouragement to a new industry was secondary as far as they were concerned as always. If that were the main original and motivating cause of this Bill, they would have said so in the memorandum to the Estimates; if it were in their minds the Premier would have said so in the Budget Speech; but this is to sugarcoat the Bill and make it go down a little easier.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, if the hon. member says that I did not mention Banks Beer in my speech, that is not so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I never said so.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am sorry.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that neither in the Premier's Speech not in the memorandum to the Estimates was the likelihood of the establishment of a local brewery given as an excuse or as the main reason for this increase in the price of beer. The emphasis was on getting revenue which was due to the consumption of rum having decreased, which is clear and simple. There is no question about this at all and therefore it is much too late for them to come here now to regard this as some devious method introduced by themselves as a matter for encouraging local industry. They had it thrust upon them. Where Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana have been going out and pulling new industries into the country, we sit here and wait for somebody to ask us to do something. Banks beer came here and thrust themselves upon the Government; so the Opposition is still on good ground for accusing them even now for not taking more active steps to develop the country industrially.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member not to make a second reading speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do appreciate that, Mr. Chairman; but I still feel that I do not care how eager Banks beer is for protection, I do not care how rightly the most ardent protectionist feels on this matter, any potential investor coming to this country would be satisfied if he is given the assurance by the Government that the moment he begins to operate we are going to protect his industry by raising the tariff on the imported commodity; but all you are doing now is penalising the public by increasing the price of beer.
5.25 p.m.

I cannot imagine people so purblind. I said that the minute Banks Brewery starts to operate here, you should bring this Bill into effect so that you would not penalise the people and it is not too late for hon. members on the

other side to see the point. Whether it is three months or one year, you cannot put down a brewery in three weeks; and I am willing to wager a bet that Banks Brewery cannot begin to operate in this country before next year and they cannot produce a bottle of beer manufactured locally before next year. First of all, there are no places available for them to set up a factory at once; they have to build one.

Sir, I am very strong in my contention that this Bill should never have been brought before the House at this time. If the manufacturers of Banks Beer have no confidence in the Government, then they should ask Government to put what they expect them to do in black and white and see to it as soon as they start to operate that the Government pass the necessary Bill immediately. I cannot imagine any West Indian firm being so suspicious as not to accept the word of the present Government. I am saying that all during this time when the manufacturer of Banks Beer is continuing his negotiations and plans are made to establish the factory, we should let the people enjoy beer at the old price. Let the average worker go on to get his beer at twenty-eight cents per bottle, and the very moment that you can fill the shelves of the retailers throughout the island with your locally produced beer, clap on a protective tariff for it. That to my mind is the manner in which you should approach this thing. I have never heard of any Government in any part of the world starting to offer a protective tariff to an industry before it starts to operate. I doubt there is a single member who has paid more attention to protective tariff than I, and I cannot think of a single example in any part of the world in which you give protection to something like this before it starts to operate. You are offering protection to Banks Beer.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, during my budget speech, I never said that this was a measure to protect Banks Beer.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You did not say so then but you are saying that now.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to you to see that there is nothing as regards Banks Beer in this Clause. The hon. member has spoken at length on the second reading of the Bill and all the points he is raising now are points of principle. The principle has already been accepted by this House and, I repeat, there is no question of Banks Beer being offered protection in this Clause. All Section 2 says is that the First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, is hereby amended by deleting certain items and figures and substituting therefor the following items against which the preferential rate of duty should be \$1.13 per gallon for beer and ale in bottles and the general rate of duty should be \$1.20 per gallon. That rate of duty also applied to beer and ale in wood, stout and porter in bottles and stout and porter in wood. There is not one word of "Banks" or anything like that in this Clause. I am appealing to Your Honour to see that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Section 2 is the operative clause of the Bill. The mere fact that we go into Committee is for the purpose of permitting further discussion on the Bill before the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Oh no, Sir.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This section is the Bill. The hon. senior member for St. Michael is the person who began talking about Banks Beer.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order. I did not mention Banks Beer in my introductory remarks. I go further and say that when I mentioned that I was replying to the second reading speeches. As I have said, the principle has already been accepted and the arguments adduced by the hon. member are arguments on principle but not on this section.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, apparently for some reason or other, the Hon. Minister does not like the word "Banks". He said a brewery. Mr. Chairman, I am saying that I am opposed to the section because the Government proposes

to put this Section into operation now in order to protect some envisaged brewery coming here. If the Hon. Minister or anybody else can give me one single reason why we should penalise the public to pay more for beer now in favour of an industry which is not in operation yet, I would give up my seat. I cannot see why it should be done. I am willing to say this in a general way.

In order to get people to come here from anywhere to set up new industries, I am willing to offer them relief by giving them protective legislation.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise again on a point of order. If the hon. member wants to deal with section 2 and he feels that the rates are too high, then it is the duty of the hon. member to move that the rates be reduced. Again, I repeat that the hon. member is discussing the principle of the Bill and that is not before us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask the hon. senior member for St. Philip to keep within certain bounds. You must either deal with an increase or a decrease in the duty. We need not submit any further argument as that on the second reading.

Mr. CRAWFORD: These simple remarks may be of advice to you but not to me. If I thought I was waiting on the hon. senior member for St. Michael to give me advice as to what I should do in here, I would stand up on my head. This is a debating Chamber. This is not a Chamber for him to come in here and tell me what to do. I have told the House what to do and I voted against the second reading. Now that the Bill is before the Committee and we are discussing the operative section of the Bill, I am telling the Committee why it should not vote for this Section. 5.35 p.m.

Even although the majority have voted for the second reading of the Bill, we are legally entitled to fight every single Section of this Bill, Section by Section and line by line.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Each and everyone of us in this Committee realises that, but the hon. member must keep within the particular Section under discussion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, for your own information I would ask you not to allow yourself to be misled by the misinformation from the other side of the House. I am not saying that I agree with some increase in the taxation on beer; if I did agree with that, I would suggest that we change one of the figures in the Section which is before us. I would have voted in that case for the second reading of the Bill and in Committee I would make a motion as to the figure I wanted inserted; but I am against the principle of the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The second reading of the Bill has been passed and we are now in Committee dealing with Clause 2.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, even although I am assigned the task which you think is beyond my capacity, nevertheless I am doing my duty. You are taking it for granted that the members over there are impervious to reason; you feel that they are beyond redemption, but I do not feel that way. I feel that even occasionally amongst them there are those who will allow good sense to operate and who will turn from their evil ways. (Laughter).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think I have given the hon. member full scope.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not think that I have been encroaching on your prerogative nor have I been taking for granted things which I ought not to have taken for granted. I am merely saying that, at this stage, we should not pass this Section for the very good reason which has been enunciated by the Government themselves. I cannot think of any better reason why we should not pass this Section than the one which has been given today by the Hon. Minister who introduced the Bill himself. The Hon. Minister told us that it was a question of having this Bill passed so as to raise revenue and that we must have the tariff rates increased

as an encouragement to outside investors. We will encourage them to the point of operation and therefore I do feel that the Committee is justified in not supporting the Section which is at present before us. I therefore am not going to vote in favour of the passing of this Section.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. SMITH, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. L. S. A. THORNE, Mrs. BOURNE, Hon. F. E. MILLER and Mr. STRAUGHN - 8.

NOES: Messrs. TALMA; CRAWFORD and BRANCKER - 3.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BANK HOLIDAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:- To move the Second Reading of a Bill to further amend the Bank Holidays (Amendment) Act, 1959.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a very simple one. It has for its object the deletion of the 24th May from the Schedule of the Bank Holidays Act and to insert in its place the 1st day of May. It also seeks to provide that the 23rd day of February, which is Federation Day, be included in the Schedule of the Act. This Bill is as simple as that. I think I should say that the Barbados Workers' Union has made an appeal to the Government to declare the 1st day of May, which is called May Day, as a Bank Holiday.

There is only a small correction which I want to make when we go into Committee and that is in the Schedule of the Bill which is at the end of Clause 2. I mention that now before we go into Committee. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that, 5.45 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, we are not opposing the second reading of this Bill because we agree that the 1st May should be a public holiday. Many years ago I raised that matter in this Chamber that the 1st May, May Day, should be a public holiday, and I gather that it is because the first Premier of Barbados is no longer Premier of Barbados, whether or not he thinks so, that the Government has come to this Legislature with this Bill to amend the Bank Holidays Act, making the 1st May a public holiday in this island. We entirely favour that and we are supporting the second reading; but we do not see the necessity to interfere with the 24th May; in other words, to give the people that richly deserved Bank Holiday on 1st May but at the same time take away from them their long established holiday, the 24th May, Queen Victoria's Day.

Objection, Mr. Speaker, may well be taken to the name Empire Day; objection was taken of that famous and venerable British Society, the Royal Empire Society which name was changed to the Royal Commonwealth Society. We may well resent - and we do resent just as we resent being called Members of Colonial Parliament instead of Members of the House of Assembly - Empire Day, because of what that represented under the old conception of the Empire; but as to Commonwealth Day, as we are members of the Commonwealth, I do not see any reason for resenting the term Commonwealth Day, and we as Barbadians certainly do not dislike a Bank Holiday.

I do not know if it is proposed to bring this into force this year because it would work a great hardship on many people if it were to come into effect within a few weeks from now. I happen to know, Mr. Speaker, of excursions and dances which have been arranged, tickets which have been printed and sold for functions on the 24th May, which if that day no longer is a Bank Holiday, would be worthless and new tickets would have to be printed; and the type of people who have these functions cannot afford to print one set of tickets today and another set tomorrow for the same function, and other arrangements would have to be made for the holding of these excursions and spees which they have planned to have on the Bank Holiday, May 24th. As you know, Sir, it would be too soon, having made arrangements for something on 24th May, to bring this forward some three weeks to the 1st May next month. Even if the Government is going to use the devoted capacity of its backbenchers to take away from the people of this island the 24th May which they have always enjoyed as a holiday by whatever name it is called, Empire Day, Commonwealth Day, Independence Day or Barbados Day, in a tropical climate we need an adequate amount of public holidays. It may well be that Ministers do not work or have to work or do not do a full day's work, but they are an insignificant minority of the people of this island.

The people who appreciate a Bank Holiday are the people who would be grieved particularly at this late hour in respect of this year's 24th May to be deprived of the Empire Day holiday, and those who have made arrangements and have in some cases, I know, put themselves to expense. The number of Bank Holidays in this island is not too many, considering it is a tropical climate, considering how hard the majority of us work and considering the need for such relaxation as can only be obtained on a public holiday. Under the previous Premier, there was no concession as to May Day being a public holiday, but we are making the concession by making it a public holiday only by taking away the 24th May which has for so long been observed. If the taking away of that day is because of the desire to remove the bond of Imperialism, as I said, it is so easy to rename it as Commonwealth Day. We have always looked forward to 24th May being a public holiday in this country, and I do not see any justification for its removal from the schedule of Bank Holidays. For that reason, whilst we support the second reading because we enthusiastically approve 1st May as a public holiday, we disapprove the taking away of 24th May from the list of public holidays in this island.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I could say a little in connection with what my hon. friend, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, had to say on this matter. If it is based on time, I believe the hon. member would appreciate that the same thing would apply to Church and Voluntary Organisations which run annual fairs, excursions and dances every year even if the decision was taken 9 or 10 months ago. Take for instance the Girls'

Industrial Union, which since time began was operating that little fair in Queen's Park on 24th May, Empire Day. That also applies to a number of other Church Organisations. If the hon. member is inquiring about two Bank Holidays in the same month, it is an entirely different matter, but he is in agreement with May Day being 1st May.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER; Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. SEARLES being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, as I hinted earlier when we were discussing the second reading, the Schedule should form part of Clause 2.

With that correction, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill into Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER; the Bill was read a third time and passed.
5.55 p.m.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX fixed the Order Paper for Government Business.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, under Private Members' Business, I should like Order No. 10 to be placed as Order No. 1.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 28th April, 1959, at 12 o'clock (noon).

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
5.58 p.m.