
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th February, 1959.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock 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. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*);
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 and Mr. J. W. COREIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of the 3rd February, 1959, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause.*)

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

Mrs. Bourne entered the House and took her seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Barbados Regiment (Rates of Pay) (Amendment) Regulations, 1958."

Hon'ble R. G. MAPP: Resolution to place the sum of \$130 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part II Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1958-59, No. 41, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$7,473 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1958-59, No. 42, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A Bill further to amend the Rate of Interest Act, 1754.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of

Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Accountant General the Financial Report for the month of December last year.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. senior member for St. Lucy. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, may I, on behalf of my colleague give notice of that Resolution?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to give notice of a Resolution standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. (*After a pause.*) There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the Saint Patrick's Roman Catholic Day School is in want of financial support;

AND WHEREAS the pupils of this school, numbering nearly one thousand, could not attend school this term;

AND WHEREAS it is not in the public interest that these pupils should be deprived of their instruction;

AND WHEREAS it is in the public interest that the teaching staff of this school should receive regular remuneration;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House declares its willingness to assist the Managers of this School, and to this end requests the Minister of Education to undertake an urgent investigation of the problem, and to render immediate assistance with funds to be used for this purpose.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: Questions standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James whom I observe is not now in his place.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of those questions on behalf of my colleague.

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

Mr. SEARLES: The questions are as follows:-
To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Is Government aware that the road near Quaco Bob, Paynes Bay, in the Parish of Saint James is a hazard, both to Pedestrians and Motor traffic, because of its narrowness?

2. Will Government take steps to have the said road widened as soon as possible?

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Is Government aware that the road, Bay Woods, near Orange Hill, in the Parish of Saint James is a hazard both to Pedestrians and motor traffic, because of its narrowness?

2. Will Government take steps to have the said road widened as soon as possible?

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Will Government cause the installation of a Post Box at Thorpes Housing Scheme in the Parish of Saint James to serve the residents of the said Scheme, Halls Village, Hoytes Village, Waterman's Village and Holders Hill, all in the Parish of Saint James which are all at present in need of such a service?
12.25 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to ask a question on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to ask a question on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Peter:

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

Is the Government aware of the hardship encountered by hawkers in Speightstown through the lack of accommodation to sell their goods?

If the answer is in the affirmative, what steps does the Government propose to take to provide appropriate accommodation for these hawkers?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill further to amend the Rate of Interest Act, 1754, be now read a first time.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour: to move the House into Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59 No. 39

Head II - Secretariat was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, Head II deals with several sub-Heads. The first item is for Stationery and the note reads as follows:-

"Some Bills from the Crown Agents amounting to \$1,500 for supplies ordered last year were paid from this year's provision. This amount is required in order to replace this \$1,500 to purchase stationery for the Information Office, and to meet the cost of additional stencils and duplicating paper being used by the Financial Secretary in the preparation of the 1959-60 Estimates."

In short, Sir, this amount of \$1,500 has already been spent to pay the Crown Agents' bills which came too late to be included last year, and it was paid from the 1958-59 vote, and this amount is now required to purchase stationery for the Information Office and to meet the cost of additional stencils and duplicating paper used by the Financial Secretary.

The next item is for Travelling Expenses, and the note states that on account of the increase in the travelling rate, an additional \$250 is required. I think hon. members will remember that during the earlier part of this financial year there was an increase in travelling expenses, and therefore this amount is required.

The next item is for Incidentals and it is explained that in order to meet the cost of the electricity used by the air-conditioning unit installed during this financial year, and the increased demands for amenities in the additional offices, supplementary provision of \$500 is required.

The next item deals with Furniture and Office Equipment. This amount is a revote of funds which lapsed at the end of the last financial year and is to pay for certain items of furniture and office equipment ordered for the Cabinet Office, because the firm who supplied the furniture failed, due to an oversight, to cash vouchers before the end of March, 1958.

The next item which is new is for the purchase of a bicycle. This amount is to purchase another bicycle for use at Government Headquarters.

I beg to move that Head II - Secretariat, stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Premier would be good enough to tell us how many bicycles there will now be in use at Government House with this additional one. What is the present number? I take it that this is not to replace but to add to the number.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, the hon. member said "Government House;" does he mean Government House or Government Headquarters?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I mean Government Headquarters.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am informed that there is only one - I would not say I am sure - and this would make the second.

The question that Head II - Secretariat stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD III - ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Head III - Accountant General was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The first item is for Incidentals, and the note states that additional expenses have resulted consequent to increased office accommodation at the Treasury.

I think hon. members are aware that now that the Education Department has been removed from the Public Buildings to Bay Street, the upper floor which was previously occupied by that Department is now occupied by the Accountant General who was desperately in need of more staff, more room and more furniture. I think some hon. members might have visited that office and seen that additional space, furniture and staff were required. This amount is to meet the additional expenses which have resulted consequent on this accommodation at the Treasury.

In connection with the Stamp Act Expenses, there has been an increase in the number of cheques sent to the Treasury for embossing. As you know, Sir, there is a gentleman whose name I do not remember who does the embossing of these cheques and is paid for doing so, and as set out, an increased number of cheques has been sent to the Treasury for embossing; consequently more expenses.

The next item is for Books and Stationery. The Accountant General's Annual Report and the monthly financial reports are being cyclostyled instead of printed, and as a result there has been additional expenditure on duplicating paper, stencils, ink, etc.
12.35 p.m.

The Note further says as regards travelling expenses that apart from the transport of Treasury officers from Barclays Bank to draw cash to meet the requirements of the Department, officers have to pay visits to other Departments and to a Magistrate's Court to produce documents in evidence.

I think, Sir, that, on certain days when the Treasury is receiving cash from Barclays Bank, transport is used for safety's sake so as to bring the officers and the Clerks from the Bank to the Treasury. It also sets out here that officers have had to pay visits to other Departments and to a Magistrate's Court to produce documents in evidence.

I beg to move that Head III - stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, as regards Item 14 - Books and Stationery - in which case it is stated in the Note that the Accountant General's Annual Report and the monthly Financial Reports are being cyclostyled instead of being printed and as a result there has been additional expenditure on duplicating paper, stencils, ink and so on, I would like to know what is the reason for that. Is it cheaper to do it that way or is there so much work at the Printery that that Department is unable to do it on time? Can the Hon. Premier tell us the reason for the change? I ask because these things are happening so often. We prepare the Annual Estimates with amounts for these things, then when it comes to later in the year we have to find additional funds to buy more paper and so on. If it is because of the fault of the Printing Office, then all these things should be charged to the Printing Office. I ask the Premier to let us know the reason for the change.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I think it is done because it costs less. They do it this way, that is to say, they cyclostyle it instead of having it printed because it is cheaper to do so.

Mr. GODDARD: Even if it costs less, I do not think with the establishment of a Government Printery these important documents should be printed in the office of the Department concerned on a duplicating machine. We were told that with the establishment of the Government Printery, all Government Printing would be done

there. Now, we find that they are unable or need equipment to do it and these things are costing us more than what we know. Sir, unless we really enquire very carefully into this thing, it will run away with us; it would be like the buses. Government should really pay attention to it and if they need organisation, let it be done. We are too frequently being told that departments have to do their own printing. That is unsatisfactory. Very often a Department is out of stationery and forms which they use. Recently the Law Courts were out of special forms and there was a hold up. Only this year the Income Tax Commissioner was embarrassed because he could not advertise in time through the fact that there were no forms in his office. It was no fault of his; the Government Printery had let him down. The Government Printing Office should know in advance that these forms are required. As a matter of fact, these forms of which I have made mention do not change and they can print a three-year supply at one time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As regards the last point made by the hon. member, I was told about it recently. The Government Printing Office could only print the forms when it was made aware that they had to print them and the Department of Inland Revenue did not say that they required those forms until the last moment; therefore, the fault was not due to the Government Printing Office. The fault is due to somebody else's negligence.

Mr. DOWDING: I think the Hon. Premier should be able to tell us whose negligence it is. I think the Hon. Premier should pay more attention to his duties and give this House more information on the questions asked him. He should see to it that he has this information at his fingertips. I am getting to the point where I feel that the Hon. Premier's replies to our questions are out of the blue and more particularly in this case; therefore, I must at this juncture advise him that his work must of necessity be prepared better than it is at the moment.

The question that Head III stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD IV - AUDITOR GENERAL

Head IV - Auditor General - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As regards the Item - Travelling Expenses - under this Head, the amount provided in the Estimates, according to the Note, proved insufficient due to the increase in the rates of travelling which was approved retrospectively with effect from 1st January, 1958. As hon. members know, this sort of thing has been happening as a result of this increase in all Departments concerned. We have been having quite a number of these requests because of that fact.

I beg to move that Head IV stand part.

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

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

HEAD V - HARBOUR AND SHIPPING

Head V - Harbour and Shipping - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The sum of \$2,325 is required to supplement the amount voted under the Item. "Shipping Supply & Dredging etc." According to the Note the need for supplementary provision is due to the following reasons:-

(a) the amount of overtime paid to crews of Water Craft has exceeded the amount estimated due to frequent demands for water out of the official working hours.

(b) the cost of essential spares ordered during the previous financial year was met from the current year's provision.

With regard to the first reason, Sir, I am quite sure that the Committee does not object to the passing of an increased vote in order to supply water to ships in the harbour when it is asked for out of the official working hours, which necessitates that overtime rates have to be paid. As regards the second reason, it happens very often that the bills for these things do not come in until very late in the next year; consequently they have to be paid from the year's Estimates. That has happened in this case.

I beg to move that Head V stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: I am wondering if the Hon. Premier would be able to tell us with respect to this sum of \$2,325, how much of it is for the spares mentioned in (b) and accordingly, we would know the amount required for (a). I would also like to know if the Hon. Minister of Labour can tell this Committee what is the number of official working hours of members of the staff of the Government Water Craft. This is to provide for overtime payment for them and I certainly know in respect of Customs employees that there is grave dissatisfaction because of the number of hours which they have to work. 12.45 p.m.

The Water-Craft is right next door to the Customs. I would like an assurance from the Hon. Minister of Labour as to the number of working hours which are regarded as being official and also the consequential assurance that these people will be paid for overtime at least in accordance with the minimum rates of pay for overtime work in private employment.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The hon. member has asked for the amount of money which is due to these people and I will tell him that the amount is \$1,046.78

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the official hours, in so far as Government employees are concerned, do not exceed between 44 and 48 hours per week.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am grateful for that assurance. I can only wish that they were as accurate as the Hon. Leader of the House must believe them to be. I have no doubt that the Minister realises that Government employees include Police Constables and Customs Guards. I am sure that if he checks up on the number of working hours of Police Constables he will find that they are greatly in excess of 48 hours per week. I have asked a question in that respect and I have no doubt that a rigid examination will be carried out into this matter at the earliest possible moment.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member will realise that what I have mentioned will not apply in the case of Policemen because Policemen are always Policemen and that is also so in the case of Nurses. We are dealing with workers generally.

The question that Head V stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD VI - CUSTOMS

Head VI - Customs - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the amount in respect of this item "Draw backs, General" is asked for due to an increase in deliveries of kerosene oil to turbo-jet aircraft and in order to make provision for drawbacks on articles sold to tourists and exported. In other words, the turbo-jets are using more kerosene oil, and there is more provision needed for drawbacks on articles sold to tourists and exported. I beg to move that Head VI stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head VI stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD X - FIRE BRIGADE

Head X - Fire Brigade was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Head deals with the Fire Brigade. Provision has been made in the Current Estimates for the erection of two Fire Stations in rural areas. One is to be erected in Christ Church and the other is to be erected in the Northern area but the site of that other one has not yet been decided upon. The fire appliances have been received and it is hoped to commence building operations shortly. If we are going to have additional Fire Stations, then there is the necessity for additional staff. Proposals for this additional staff will soon be submitted. Along with the additional staff certain items for the Fire Brigade will have to be supplemented if the men are to be recruited and trained by the time that the Fire Stations have been completed. It is hoped to recruit these men so that when the Fire Stations are ready the men will be ready to work. As to these items, there is the item "Clothing." In this present financial year the sum of \$3,900 was voted for this item and now a supplementary amount of \$225.00 is required. As to "Equipment and appliances," the sum of \$13,000 was voted in the current estimates and there is a supplementary amount of \$859.00 required. As to "Cleaning, water and light," the sum of \$2,200.00 was voted and the supplementary amount required is \$40.00. As to "Incidentals" the amount provided was \$440.00 and the supplementary provision required is \$30.00. As to "Medical Treatment" the amount voted was \$60.00 and supplementary provision of \$8.00 is required. As to "Stationery," the amount voted was \$130.00 and the supplementary provision required is \$20.00. That makes a total of \$1,182.00.

In addition to that, a revote of the sum of \$224.00, which is a part of the unspent balance of \$312.00 which lapsed at the end of the financial year 1957-58 from the amount provided for the purchase and maintenance of equipment and appliances, is required to meet the cost of a machine which had been received but which had not been paid for by the end of that year. Therefore, there is a revote of a certain portion of that unspent amount and the rest of the money is required for the training and equipment of these Firemen when the Fire Stations are ready.

I beg to move that Head X stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. GODDARD: These two Fire Stations are to be erected during the year and the one for the northern area has not yet been sited. I take it that the Government has decided on the one in Christ Church which will be erected at Worthing View. I think that that is a suitable site but I would ask the Government to look into this matter at an early date. The Worthing View Road is very narrow indeed. There is, in the area where the theatre has been destroyed, a blind entrance; and if this Fire Station is to serve a useful purpose and no great hazards and accidents are to occur, because our firemen come out at a terrific speed, I suggest to the Government that they should acquire that strip of land in Worthing View from the site of the Fire Station down to the main road. Not only would that serve a useful purpose but it would improve that area. The strip of land is about ten to twelve feet wide from the St. Lawrence road down to the Fire Station; it has not been built upon, but it is just a strip of land and it should be acquired at a reasonable price by the Government. That Fire Station will require a wide road for the Firemen to get to the main road whence most of the calls will come. It is unlikely that most calls will come from the Golf Club area; most of them will come from the Hastings area and this would provide the opportunity for the Government to acquire that strip of land. Therefore let the Government

acquire it at an early date and widen the road there.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, while the Government is deciding on the site for the erection of the Fire Station on the northern side of the Island, I am suggesting that a site somewhere in the parish of St. James should be selected. I make that suggestion because the sea coast is developed and there is the possibility of hotels being erected along the Sandy Lane stretch and you have buildings erected practically from the Lazaretto down to Speightstown. If you select a site anywhere around that area, not only would it be useful to people along the sea coast but it would help the people of St. Joseph, St. Thomas, St. Andrew, St. Peter and St. Lucy. I am therefore suggesting that the Government should select a site for this Fire Station somewhere in St. James because it would be a central site in so far as the surrounding areas are concerned. 12.55 p.m.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, one thing strikes me forcibly in granting this money. There was a time when this Hon. House prided itself as being the guardian of the taxpayers, but nowadays these Supplementary Estimates do not seem to be budgeted for, and in this particular one the Fire Appliances have arrived, but we have got nothing to put them in. I would have thought that the process would have been the other way around that those whose responsibility it is—or it was—would have thought this matter out and decided on the method that was going to be adopted. Is it because there is a shortage of labour in this island that these buildings have not been erected to house these particular units up to now? Is it because legislation has not been brought to this Hon. House for the purpose of obtaining the necessary sanction? What is the reason that according to this Addendum we have the appliances but nowhere to put them?

I have said in this House already and I will say again that there is absolutely no doubt that the work done by the Director of Public Works is good work, but there is also no doubt in my mind that numerous masons, carpenters and contractors in this island are capable of producing just as good work. If it is a matter, Sir, that this programme cannot be undertaken because of the fact that the Public Works Department is unable to undertake any more, I feel it is time that those persons in this island perfectly capable of constructing buildings of this sort were given an opportunity so to do. I would really like to know, Sir, if it is possible to find out, why this equipment has arrived and where it is at the moment stationed. Is any use going to be made of it at the moment or are we going to wait until the buildings are constructed, and if so, when? What is the exact position? This is money spent and it would mean in my opinion that some one should be accountable. Unfortunately in these days, very few people seem to be made accountable to their superiors in their work, but it would be very unfortunate if this equipment is available to the taxpayers of this island but it is not put to use because someone has not foreseen that it would take a garage to put it in. I would be grateful, Sir, for some comments and some information on that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: To answer the hon. member Sir, first of all the equipment is being housed at the Fire Headquarters.

Secondly, I think that the delivery was ahead of schedule, that is, the British are now able to deliver orders earlier than they did heretofore, and this arrived ahead of schedule.

The question that Head X — Fire Brigade stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XX — EDUCATION

Head XX — Education was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, again the increase in travelling rates which has been in effect from the 1st January, 1958, is reflected in this vote; that

is, in consequence of the increase in the rate of travelling allowances, it is necessary to increase the amount paid to officers.

In connection with the next item, the sum of \$783 was provided in the Current Estimates under this item, but since the Department's transfer to its new offices at Bay Street, there has been an increase in commitments on the Vote owing to an increase in the number of lights, the need for illuminating the premises at night, the housing of the Mobile Cinemas and Visual Aids Unit on the premises, increased floor space resulting in added cost for scrubbing and for office cleaning, etc. The total supplementary provision required is \$576.

There is also a new item and the note states that by Resolution No. 17/1958 of the 11th March, 1958, supplementary provision of \$353.85 (non-recurrent) was approved to meet the cost of two electric units for a refrigerator and a stove respectively at the House Craft Centre. Money was voted to acquire two electric units, but by some oversight it was credited to the wrong Head and was paid, and this vote is now to correct that error. The money that is under the other Head will remain in the Treasury.

I beg to move that Head XX — Education, stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, it is taken for granted that we know why the lights in the Education Department have to be left on. As a matter of fact, that has been drawn to my attention and I was to ask the appropriate Minister about it. I passed there in the early hours of the morning and saw all the lights blazing. What have they to protect in there that these lights have to be left on? That is the first question which the Premier may be able to answer. As a matter of fact, it is more illuminated than the Government Buildings. There must be a reason, and I am only asking why.

The next question I would like to ask concerns the electric stove. I would have imagined that they would have had a gas stove. We have more gas stoves in Barbados than electric stoves. 1.05 pm.

Everybody knows that cooking by electricity is a most expensive form of cooking in Barbados because of the high rate. I think that you should train these people on something which is more commonly used than on something which is only used occasionally. You may say that cooking on gas or an electric stove is not much difference but there must be another reason why gas has not been installed there.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The hon. member ought to know that the supply of gas is not so widely distributed all over the island. (Mr. Goddard: It runs along Bay Street.) Yes, it runs along Bay Street. However, the Housecraft Centre is doing a good job in this Island by training people, not only those who are remaining in the Island, but it is also training people who are going abroad and taking up positions. For those who go abroad, they will find that the people with whom they are employed use more electricity. For those who go abroad, it is necessary that you should equip and train them in every possible thing including fuel use. I suppose cooking by coal stoves is out of use and sometimes gas is not available. As a matter of fact, gas does not run along my area and I have to use electricity. However, I would like to tell the hon. member that it is well that our girls be trained in every branch of domestic science.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has not answered my first question as regards why is it that the Department of Education is lighted up all night. Now that he has mentioned that cooking by electricity is mainly for the training of those who go abroad I wish to say that that is a fallacy. It is well that we should train for home consumption also. We all want our people to go abroad, but the training should be done for home consumption as well. The training should be of a nature for girls who want to settle a home for themselves and it must be borne

in mind that we use gas here more than electricity. As I have said, it is more economical to use gas; I am not decrying the use of electricity. Gas is obtained at a third of the cost of electricity, and therefore, it can be seen that if you use electricity for cooking, you would be using a considerable amount. I use gas in my home. Of course, we do not have to quarrel over it. Let me remind the Hon. Premier that he has not answered my question as to the reason why the Department of Education is lighted up all night to that extent instead of in one room.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the hon. member did not hear me when I said that students at the Domestic Centre are trained to improve their knowledge in domestic science for use at home as well as for abroad. As far as the lighting of the Department of Education at night is concerned, I, myself, noticed it and found that it was more than necessary and on my questioning it, the information I got was that there was a lot of valuable equipment all over the place. There is the Visual Aids Department which has valuable equipment; there are films there for the Mobile Cinemas as well as other things of that sort which must be protected. Consequently, there is need for proper and adequate lighting at night. As I have said, I, myself, noticed it and asked a question about it.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Premier can tell us whether this equipment is adequately insured.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am not in a position to answer that at the moment, but I take it that it is insured.

The question that Head XX stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXVI - PENSIONS

Head XXVI - Pensions - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The first Item for which the sum of \$40,000 is required is for Police and Fire Brigade Pensions and Gratuities. The Note says that on the basis of the present rate of expenditure additional provision is necessary. By that, it means that probably more people are resigning from these services than was done formerly, therefore, they have to make provision for the Pensions and Gratuities of these people by getting an additional amount. As regards the next Item - Allowance, Gratuities and Pensions to B.W.I. Soldiers and their Dependants, - the sum of \$400 is required. The Note says that it is estimated that \$2,056 will be expended under this vote in the current financial year.

The amount which was voted in the estimates was \$1,656; hence, this supplementary request for \$400. As regards the next Item - Widows and Orphans Pensions - the sum of \$1,150 is required to supplement the amount voted to the Item. As can be seen from the Note, the number of persons who receive Widows and Orphans' pensions has been increased and the amount originally provided will prove insufficient.

I beg to move that Head XXVI stand part.

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

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

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The sum of \$1,600 is required to supplement Item 3 - Refund of Contributions under the Widows and Orphans Pension Act 1928. It is estimated that additional provision is necessary in order to meet refunds to the end of the financial year.

As regards the next Item - Crown Agents Commission, etc., - the sum of \$4,600 is required to sup-

plement the amount voted under the present Head. According to the Note, expenditure in respect of commission on stores and marine insurance has risen due to a larger volume of stores being supplied and an increase in prices in some instances.

The next Item is Expenses of Motion Picture Production for which the sum of \$1,268 is required. This is due to the fact that the production and completion of the films "A Nation is Born" and "Visit of the Governor General to Barbados" have entailed much higher expenditure than could at first be envisaged. As a result of this it is necessary to supplement Head XXIX, Item 9 by \$1,268 to meet outstanding commitments on the vote.

I think it was impossible at such an early stage to say exactly just how much it will cost to produce these films, but now the work has been completed, it is found that an additional amount of \$1,268 is necessary to meet the outstanding commitments.

In connection with the Item Telegrams, the Note states that the amount of \$400 is needed in order to meet the cost of telegrams which have increased in volume since the Federal Government has been established. That is to say, more telegrams have been passing between the Federal Government and the Unit Government, hence the need for this money.

1.15 p.m.

As regards the next Item, it is estimated that this additional amount will be required to meet the cost of overseas accounts and the increase in advertising Liquor Licences occasioned by the provisions of the new Liquor Licences Act.

In connection with Item 48, "Clerical Assistance," the sum of \$3,000 is required to meet the expenses for additional typing staff in the offices of the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Inland Revenue and also to maintain the assistance given to other Departments. In these two Departments, especially in the Department of Inland Revenue, since additional work has been taken over by the Inland Revenue Department, we know that there has been an increased amount of typing to be done and consequently more staff is required. Item 51 deals with "Acting Allowances, payment of Substitutes," The note says that the amount which would be reasonably voted under this Item is inadequate to meet the estimated expenditure for the remainder of the financial year and owing to the large number of substitutes called upon to act for officers on training courses, sick or vacation leave, supplementary provision of \$35,000 is required. Finally, there is a new Item "Central Government Elections" and the supplementary provision required is \$2,700.00. This amount is required to cover the estimated cost of the bye-election held on the 18th December, 1958, in the constituency of St. Andrew to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Mr. F. G. Smith as a member of the House of Assembly. I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: As to the Item "Clerical Assistance", the note says that this amount of \$3,000 is required to meet the expenses for additional typing staff required in the offices of the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Inland Revenue and to maintain the assistance given to other Departments. I would like to say this; certainly in the Department of the Courts it is not enough merely to maintain the assistance, but to increase it. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the number of typists provided for the Courts is entirely inadequate. At District "A" in the constituency which you represent, you would bemoan the fact that there is only one typist to do the work of three very busy Courts. As a result, the typing work is very much behindhand, although the young lady is doing very efficient work within the time during which she has to work. I am suggesting that we should give immediate consideration to the question of increasing the assistance of that Department and I can certainly mention that particular department of which I have first-hand knowledge.

The same thing applies to the country courts, Districts "B" and "C" where there is only one typist employed. I am wondering if the Government is finding difficulty in getting suitable typists. I will say that there is a case which came within my experience recently. A typist who has lately been taken on is very far below the standard at which one would expect a typist to be, particularly for doing public work. I do not know if the appointment was a political one or not, but I am merely saying that in this particular case there is no indication at all of any adequate knowledge of typing. I know that the Clerks have had to do over the work which was done by the typist and you can therefore see what the situation is. The Clerks have had to do the same work which had been done too badly for presentation to the public. I would urge that in the provision of this additional staff, great care be taken to ensure that the person appointed is really capable and that the Government give consideration to making more appointments. Certainly there must be any number of efficient, unemployed typists in this Island; and there is certainly work for some of them to do in the Government Departments. A parsimonious policy in such an important thing like typing nowadays is a policy which cannot commend itself to anybody. I hope that additional typists will be provided in whatever department there is need for them, and that we be assured that only efficient typists are employed in the future.

Mr. WALCOTT: Item 71 deals with "Central Government Elections" and the note states that an amount of \$2,700.00 is required to cover the estimated cost of the bye-election held on the 18th December, 1958, in the constituency of St. Andrew to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Mr. F. G. Smith as a member of the House of Assembly. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take the opportunity now to point out that in this vote which we are making here involving election expenses, something is at present going on which is very peculiar to me, and the Government should see about having this matter straightened out. The Government pays Election Officers, Registering Officers, people in various districts, but unfortunately, the people of Barbados cannot exercise their right, although we are paying this money to register people, to vote. You only do it once a year and we have Registering Officers and other people whom we are paying. Why is it that you have to register in January and then you cannot vote until July? That is to say, if a person registers to vote and the Election is going to take place in April or May, he cannot vote in April or May; he cannot vote before next July, which is a strange thing.

The other serious thing about the matter is this; the month of January is one of twelve months and you have Registering Officers for twelve months in all the parishes. The Registering Officers are in the parishes and yet no person who reaches the age of twenty-one can go to these people and become eligible as electors until the succeeding year. I do not think that the money which we are spending is worth what the community is getting from it, because thousands of people will not be able to register. You have 31 days in the month of January and in the rural districts people are more interested in looking for work during the crop than they are interested in looking to get registered. I am saying that the opportunity should be given to the citizen to be able to register at least once every three months or even once a month.

1.25 p.m.

Why are we paying out money and cannot get better facilities for the community? I do consider that this is something you should look at, because it is not fair. You are going to find thousands of people are there who should be registered and cannot be registered, and I do hope that some serious consideration will be given to that, because as I have stated, I do not believe that the sponsors of this meant that you should have these people all the year round because you cannot make use of them all the year round.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I expected the Hon.

Premier to answer, particularly in the light of the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. Sir, if there is someone in the service of this Government who is inefficient, the taxpayers should not be paying for him, and it is not the duty in the case of the hon. member who knows where this inefficiency is to get up in this House and say that he does not know whether or not it is a political appointment. Frankly, if I was sitting on that side of the Table, I would have to object, and sitting on this side of the Table, I object. I object that the Hon. Premier has not taken the slightest notice of the indication given by the hon. member of inefficiency which is costing the taxpayers money.

Mr. BRANCKER: May I just say this now, Mr. Chairman? Typing is an art which one can acquire within a reasonably short period of time. When the particular person whom I have in mind began to operate, certainly the work was very far below the low average standard. Now after three or four months, there is that reasonable improvement which would justify the continuance of the person in the post, but one can never understand in the first instance if the appointment was made as a result of testimonials and not as a result of the proof of the pudding being in the eating and when it comes to the appointment of a typist, having the person type in the presence of the person making the appointment. The only way to prove whether a person can type or count money is to make that person type or count money.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I am not a typist and I do not know anything about efficiency or speed with regard to typists. If the hon. member knows that there is someone who is inefficient as a typist, he should come out and say that such and such a person is inefficient. As regards the appointment, I leave that to the hon. member who spoke on it to find out. The hon. member knows very well how appointments are made in the Civil Service.

The question that Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXXI - LABOUR

Head XXXI - Labour was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, like all those other requests for increased travelling, this is due to the rates having been increased last year. This amount is required to meet the increase in expenditure resulting from higher travelling allowance rates and intensification of programmes of inspection in the light of obligations under various International Labour Conventions.

I beg to move that Head XXXI - Labour stand part.

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

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

HEAD XL - WATERWORKS

Head XL - Waterworks was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The note sets out, Sir, that the need for supplementary provision under this Item is due to the steady increase in the volume of water pumped for the following reasons:-

- (a) the installation of new services to residences;
- (b) the erection of 31 new standposts;
- (c) the laying of additional 12 miles of 3" and 4" mains;
- (d) the annual increase in the population by about 5,000; and
- (e) the period of drought in the early months of the current financial year.

The Minister on my immediate left some time ago said that he was prepared to flood Barbados with water.

He did not have the opportunity to do it, but it seems as though his successor is carrying out that promise.

I beg to move that XL - Waterworks stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Perhaps the Hon. Minister or the Minister for Water would give us some information as to the location of the 31 new standposts per parish. How many, Mr. Chairman, I am asking, are for each parish? How many for St. Michael and how many for each and which of the rural parishes? I am sure that information would be readily available, and I have no doubt that the Hon. Leader of the House can tell you without reference to anything how many of these went to St. Michael.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on this question of the Waterworks, I was a member of this House when Mr. Garrod came here, and it was stated that the salary that was being paid then was being paid to a man who was a Specialist, and the salary paid to him was paid in those circumstances and for him only. I read in the newspaper that Mr. Garrod has relinquished his post and I see that this successor is the same person who was in Barbados when Mr. Garrod was being appointed. I would like to know now, Mr. Chairman, what is the particular justification that the post which was created for Mr. Garrod at such a salary for a specialist can now be given to the same person who lived in Barbados prior to Mr. Garrod's coming here and that that person is to be appointed at the salary that was created for Mr. Garrod? I would like to know where the matter of principle now comes to be broken down. He came here to reorganise the water service and put it on a good plane, and it was stated that after he had done that work anybody else could carry on; but you did not take him at the same salary because you were making a special provision at that time; his salary was higher than the Chief Justice and several Heads of Departments, and lower only than the Head of the Administration.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that the hon. member's remarks are directed to the salary of the Chief Engineer. May I ask if that is what you are dealing with?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with the pumping expenses for the Waterworks Department, and I do not think that the salary of the Chief Engineer should be brought into this Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: The salary for nobody should be brought into this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Resolution is for pumping expenses and the Addendum sets out that due to the steady increase in the volume of water, etc..... Therefore the salary of the Chief Engineer, Mr. Garrod, and the salary of the one who is succeeding him does not apply in these circumstances, and I would suggest, though you have already made the point, that you leave it over until a more appropriate occasion.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you think a more appropriate occasion will arise?
1.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This vote is dealing merely with the instance of the installation of new services to residences. No where can I see anything as regards the salary of the Engineer or of his successor.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sometimes I have to contain myself in here. You suggested to me that I wait until the Annual Estimates come up to speak on this matter. These are Supplementary Estimates with which we are dealing. This is a supplementary vote to the vote in the Annual Estimates. Are you asking me to wait until March? If I can wait until then, according to your statement, then I can deal with this matter now we are dealing with the Supplementary Estimates.

You have heard the Hon. Premier say that the member on his immediate left promised to flood this island with water, but of course, it has happened that he has not been able to do that. I am saying now that the reason why he promised to flood this island with water was on the basis that we had a man here of Mr. Garrod's calibre who was able to flood the island with water, and I do not think that the Hon. Premier meant that the Hon. Minister himself was able to do that. He meant that the re-organisation of the Waterworks was put on such a basis that everybody in the island would have water and that implied that it was due to the appointment of Mr. Garrod.

Now, I take the liberty to say that we had appointed Mr. Garrod so that we would have been able to flood the island with water, according to the Minister's statement; but now Mr. Garrod is gone it does appear that you no longer require a man of his calibre from what we have noticed; therefore, we want to know why you have appointed as his successor a man who could not do the job when Mr. Garrod was called upon to do it. I am asking: are these things in the public's interest?

Mr. BRANCKER: The Hon. Minister who is now in charge of the water services knows very well the policy which was pursued by his predecessor and I will put this to him. What is the principle which he follows in respect of the approval of sites for standposts? Does he slavishly follow the entirely wrong principle followed by his predecessor which was the siting of a standpost where there is a lot of houses or on the basis of population so to speak? As the Hon. Minister of Works represents a rural constituency, does he not appreciate the necessity, certainly outside of the Metropolitan parish, to erect new standposts in any district where there are houses and the closest standpost already existing is not within a reasonable distance of those houses even though those houses may be only one or two? All over the rural districts, you can see a small group of houses which are very great distances from a standpost but simply because it is a district where there are not fifty or one hundred houses, you consider that is sufficient reason for not equipping that small village with the necessary convenience of a standpost. It is not good enough to say that there are not enough houses or enough population in that district to warrant a standpost, just because there may be only six or eight houses in that district. After all the occupants of six or eight houses are about thirty or forty people. Why should they be called on to travel more than one quarter of a mile to the nearest standpost? The policy of siting a standpost on the basis of population which the Hon. Leader of the House seems to follow so slavishly may well be applicable to the City of Bridgetown and St. Michael, but certainly is not a principle which should be followed in respect of the rural parishes where it is a question of small scattered villages and the nearest standpipe is some distance away.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this, before the Hon. Minister under whose portfolio this matter stands replies. When I was dealing with this portfolio I made it clear that standposts are not sited on a population basis at all, but are fixed on the present need of the area at the time; so to speak, they are fixed on a priority basis. I have made that clear. Yet the hon. junior member for St. Lucy still persists, even now that I do not hold the portfolio, to make the point that they are fixed on the basis of population although he knows that point is misleading.

From a statistical point of view, I went into this question of supply of water thoroughly and in order to answer questions that may have come from members from time to time. I was able to present statistics to show that on a population basis certain areas had more standposts than others; in other words, rural areas that were more thickly populated had a larger number of standposts per thousand than in the Metropolitan area, but never have I stated that I was laying down standposts according to a population basis. I have made that clear in the House on many occasions, but the Hon. member

persists in raising that point whenever a question of water comes up in this Chamber. Again, I say that from the point of view of giving the House as much statistics as I could on this matter, I got these figures to show how many pipes per thousand people were laid down in the various districts, but not on the basis of supplying the Island with standpipes.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, that is the reason why all the more would I welcome the statistical information as to the siting of these thirty-one new standposts.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, as far as I know these standposts are sited all over the Island including the constituency of the hon. member. I hope that I can assure him on that point that his constituency is being well served and that not a stone is left unturned to carry water to all parts of the Island, including the parish of St. Lucy. I would imagine from the number of occasions which the hon. member has heard the previous Minister who was holding this portfolio say that St. Michael is already attended to that he would think that none of these new standposts would be for St. Michael but that all are distributed outside of the metropolitan area. I do not see what the hon. member is worrying about. As he knows, we act in concert and in full cooperation with the parochial authorities in this matter. Of course, as the hon. member knows, sometimes these things are not done due to the lack of funds but, nevertheless, political reasons do not influence us to give priority to the laying down of standposts in one district or another. The applications for the laying down of these new standposts come in from the Commissioners of Health of the various Vestries.
1.45 p.m.

Applications come in from the Commissioners of Health and the Vestries communicate with us; sometimes they come to us directly and we cooperate with the Commissioners of Health in the various parishes; the matter is done on a fair and equitable basis. Therefore, I do not see the need for any worry at all.

Mr. Chairman, you have ruled out of order the question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and if you rule that out of order, I will stick to it. The reply is so straightforward that I am quite willing to give the information. I shall be pleased to supply the hon. member with the information on another occasion when you rule it appropriate.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I fail to see why a simple question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy cannot be answered. What has the Minister told us? He has told us that as far as he knows standpipes have been sited all over the island and, as far as Ding Ding knows, standpipes are sited all over the island; but surely the Hon. Minister's file or his knowledge should be such that he should know where the standpipes have been sited in the eleven parishes of the island. Surely it is not asking too much of the Minister to say where the standpipes have been sited. Mr. Chairman, I fail to see why a simple, honest answer cannot be given to a simple, honest question.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I would not worry to object to the implication that there is dishonesty on this side but I would just like to tell the hon. member that I do not have the information presently, but the information can be given to the Committee next week.

Mr. DOWDING: I thank the Hon. Minister for saying what he could have said at the beginning instead of beating around the bush. I did not imply any dishonesty with regard to this matter; I said that a simple, honest answer could have been given to a simple, honest question. I am not casting any aspersions against any member on that side of the House at all during this Session.

The question that Head XL stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XLI - SOCIAL WELFARE

Head XLI - Social Welfare - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with the Item "Incidentals" under this Head, the note states that during the year extraordinary expenditure has been necessary for scrubbing and cleaning on account of the several alterations which have been made to provide additional office accommodation, and also expenditure on postage of correspondence to Barbadian emigrants in the United Kingdom has considerably increased. Supplementary provision is therefore required to meet a short fall in the vote as a result of these unforeseen demands. I know that there has been a lot of correspondence going on between this Department and the Barbadian emigrants to the United Kingdom especially in order to recover money from husbands and others who have gone abroad, so as to satisfy the requirements of the law in making provision for their children. I beg to move that Head XLI stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head XLI stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

I- ANNEXED ESTIMATES - POST OFFICE

I - Annexed Estimates - Post Office was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The note to this Item "Auxiliary Postmen" states that there has been a steady increase in the number of postal packets delivered from house to house mainly as a result of the growth in emigration. This has made it necessary to employ a number of Auxiliary Postmen for the greater part of the year. The sum of \$3,700 provided in the current estimates has proved to be inadequate and a further sum of \$1,500 is needed to meet anticipated expenditure to the end of the financial year. In short, this money is needed because of the increased number of postal packets which are coming to this island from Barbadians abroad. I beg to move that Head I - Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that the Government has taken cognizance of the necessity for employing auxiliary postmen and I hope that that will remind them again of the point which I have been very frequently making, namely, that they should provide better transport facilities for postmen and that those who have to work in the hilly districts should be provided with motor transport, motor cycles or some other means whereby they can get more quickly and less uncomfortably up and down the hills in areas such as Boscobelle, Grave Yard and various other districts where Postmen have to trudge or push bicycles uphill. With this auxiliary amount, I trust that the Government will also ensure that an adequate number of these men will be employed. After all, we have the personnel available and there is no reason why, because of a shortage of postmen, some people in certain districts of this Island cannot get their mail until seven or eight o'clock p.m. and it also means that the poor Postman is kept from his home until after eight o'clock and he cannot get his meals, he not being in a position to complete his rounds before then. That is due to the lack of facilities for the postmen to travel; the necessity for a Resolution such as this proves the necessity for increasing the number of postmen and providing them with adequate travelling facilities.

The question that Head I - Annexed Estimates - Post Office stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$153,733.00 do now pass.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is an Order Paper and it would be making a nonsense of Parliament if the Government is not prepared to go on because the time is nearly up. I think it is Your Honour's duty to call the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made to report progress, and therefore no other Order can be called.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, during this lull, may I draw Your Honour's attention once again to the manner in which these now voluminous Supplementary Estimates are prepared? We have changed the old method in which we had the previous Estimates. It is distracting and not conducive to study to find on one side one thing and on the other side, another thing. I thank you, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

On resumption:

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum, and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question time was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no questions for replies.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day under Private Members' Business standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has not yet been advertised.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter to move the passing of a Resolution re Report on the Sugar Industry by Mr. A. F. McKenzie.

RESOLUTION RE REPORT ON THE SUGAR INDUSTRY BY MR. A. F. MCKENZIE

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution that I propose to deal with is a Resolution in connection with a Report of an investigation carried out by Mr. A. F. McKenzie who investigated the Sugar Industry of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, it would necessitate going into the past in this matter, and I intend to read some papers connected with this inquiry to give the background of this matter. I was not in the House when the debate started on this inquiry, but running through those debates I noticed that my name was mentioned both by Government members and by members on the other side. It is necessary to deal with this matter with its background in order that the public can have a full understanding of this very important matter.

On reading the debates that led up to this inquiry, Mr. Speaker, all of the Ministers stated that they had discussions with the Sugar Producers Association in connection with the dispute in the Sugar Industry last year, and they said that they were attempting to get the sugar people to concede something. Unfortunately at that stage the Workers' Union knew nothing about these private negotiations that were conducted by the Government on behalf of the industry in this dispute.
2.35 p.m.

Following this dispute a Board of Enquiry was set up and even from what the Hon. Minister has said, you can see that they wanted to set up a Board of Enquiry at the beginning with terms of reference similar to what the employers had told them. I will read it out so that it will coincide with the statements made in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I am also glad of the opportunity to discuss this matter because some of the younger members of the House, some who were not members of the House at that time, made statements following that which tend to give the impression that they knew more about the industry than the people who really have something to do with it. If I may refresh hon. members of this House, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture in the last debate when the Government was asking for this Commission of Enquiry to be set up said that it was not his intention to enter the debate but what caused him to enter the debate was statements made by certain members who had spoken, particularly the hon. senior member for St. Philip. Well, it is understandable that a statement by the hon. senior member for St. Philip would have of necessity evoked the ire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. As I have said, I was not in the Chamber at the time; therefore, I could not defend the position of the Workers Union nor my own position. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture, said on that occasion: "Mr. Chairman, I really had no intention of joining in this debate but because of certain remarks which the last speaker made against the Government." (The last speaker was the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.) "He is playing to the gallery, hoping to get political recognition, hoping that the agricultural workers are so gullible as not to know their friends and he is trying to do the thing which another organisation had done in the past and failed miserably. We have all agreed that there is need in the sugar industry for investigation into the economics of the industry. We thought that it would have come before from the side of the Union."

I do not know what he means by that. He said that he thought that it would have come before from the side of the Union. I do not know if he means that the Union can institute a public investigation into the sugar industry of Barbados but, be that as it may, the impression given in this debate was that the Government was attempting to set up something for the workers and was setting up something for the workers which should have come from the Union.

He continued:-

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

He continued:-

"What are the facts? When these negotiations were going on and the Hon. Minister of Labour was told by the Labour Commissioner that there was likely to be a deadlock in these negotiations and there was likely to be a breakdown, the Minister of Labour and myself as Minister of Agriculture, although I had no business really in the business of the workers because it was a labour question and not an agricultural question coming under my portfolio but because I was interested in the matter and the workers, met the members of the Sugar Producers Association along with members of the Labour Office and we discussed this matter most amicably."

I am giving this as a background so that the public can understand what happened when the Government undertook to set up this Board of Enquiry. Let me say at once that before Government set up this Board of Enquiry it had discussions with one side of the industry - not both. You can see that from what the Hon. Minister says here:-

"We asked the members of the Sugar Producers Association to try and settle this thing at once and fairly and squarely. They are all alive. They were anxious to do so but they asked pertinent questions. This is what they said. 'The Head of the Union who is the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union made an agreement with us. It was a three - year agreement and this is now tantamount to blackmail that he refuses to recognise that agreement.' They went on to say that 'it is not the money which we have to pay out about which we are worried; we are worried about the principle because if we settle it today in this manner the same thing may arise tomorrow. They were about to give in when we asked them not to do anything which would harm the industry, but they insisted on the three-year agreement which they argued existed.'"

The Minister was then making a statement in the House which was supposed to be a statement made to him prior to the setting up of this Board of Enquiry, but if I may put these facts in their perspective, I must point out that the Workers' Union was never consulted on this matter. When the Government was writing the Union for a meeting with the employers, they wrote the Union with the understanding that the Union must accept the agreement and what was arrived at at that time: which means that they were satisfied when they met the employers that the situation was such that they need not have met the Union. It is so patent that that was their belief that after the Hon. Minister wrote the Union and the Board of Enquiry was set up, the Hon. Minister of Labour together with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture had a meeting at Four Roads, St. John, at which they made a public statement before the Board of Enquiry had sat to the effect that there was an agreement between the two parties and because of that the workers could not get any more money.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do wish that the hon. member give the House the facts. I am listening to him, rambling and misleading as he is. After all, let him give the House the facts. I would like the facts put before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister taking exception to the remarks of the hon. member?

Hon. M. E. COX: I want him to give the House the facts. That is all I want.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if a point of interruption is a point of order.. Just fancy the Hon. Minister has got up on a point of order just to say that he is asking me to give the facts and that I am rambling. I am not here to challenge the right of anybody. It is for the Speaker to say whether the Hon. Minister is right.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of misleading the House is not a matter for me.

Mr. WALCOTT: I know that certain other matters are going to be matters for you. If anybody can be misleading, nobody can be as misleading as he. Misleading would be a very polite term.
2.45 p.m.

A Board of Enquiry was set up after the Minister of Labour had asked that such Board of Enquiry be set up to investigate the dispute, and the same Minister said that they had met these people and after meeting the sugar people, then they wrote to the Union saying that they would set up a Board of Enquiry with such terms

of reference. They said that they had already met the employers and they wanted the Union to agree to the terms of reference and after the Board of Enquiry was set up the same Minister of Labour spoke in St. John saying that there was a three-year Agreement before the Board of Enquiry had sat. I took the matter to the Head of the Administration and let the Head of the Administration understand quite clearly that we were not countenancing that type of conduct. You set up a Board of Enquiry and before the Board of Enquiry meets, you are the same person to speak at a political meeting condemning one side of the dispute saying that one side is right and the other side is wrong. Well, any one who understands Parliamentary Government can see that that was a disgraceful state of affairs by any stretch of the imagination and we had to straighten up that matter. The Board of Enquiry met and made its report. This Report is now history and the Union made its stand on the Report of the Board.

The stand made by the Union was, and it stated it quite clearly and unequivocally, that the terms that were set out were terms in respect of which factors other than the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement should be taken into consideration when you are negotiating wages. That was stated in a letter to the Sugar Producers in 1957 and therefore the Union was not in any doubt as to its real intentions. Before the investigation of Mr. Shepherd began a letter was written to the Union and in this letter the Government stated this: "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 negotiations and a settlement on the wages and conditions of employment to be adopted in the industry after 1958. We are also to enquire whether you have any suggestions as to the person or persons by whom the enquiry should be conducted."

A reply was made on the 21st April and in that Reply we said that we were directed to inform the Minister that paragraph two of the letter will be the subject of immediate consideration, that they will go into the question of the enquiry into the economic state of the industry at a later date. On the 26th April again we informed the Permanent Secretary that the Union at this stage could not make any statement as to the enquiry to be instituted but would give this matter further consideration. The Union was in agreement with the proposal to set up this enquiry with such terms of reference to cover the industry in its wide aspect. No reply to that letter was received by the Union until the 8th September. The months of May, June, July and August passed and on the 8th September, the Permanent Secretary wrote saying: "I am directed by the Minister to inform you that the Government proposes to institute an enquiry into the sugar industry of the island with the following terms of reference:-

To enquire into the economic state of the industry of the island and to make recommendations as to (1) the method of remuneration and the wage structure in the industry for (a) field workers, and (b) factory workers; (2) (a) the establishment of a provident fund for field and factory workers in the industry and (b) the payment of severance pay in appropriate cases; (3) the price to be paid to the grower for sugar cane.

I would be glad to receive as soon as possible, and in any event not later than the 18th September, any comments which the Union may care to make on the proposed terms of reference." On the 12th September the Union replied and the substance of the Union's letter was to the effect that it is the opinion of the Union that any investigation into the sugar industry should be conducted on the highest level and on a broader basis than that of a one-man enquiry. The issues to be considered and followed would require a proper representation to be made of the interests involved and for those reasons a three-man enquiry is preferable to the Union. The terms of reference should have been discussed between the parties concerned in order to as-

certain what are the main differences existing between them before the publication which has been made. For example, the proposed terms of reference, as mentioned, state that recommendations are to be made as to "the method of remuneration and the wage structure in the industry for (a) field workers and (b) factory workers." That is an important part of the industrial negotiations between the Trade Union and the employers and before any enquiry is instituted to deal with such matters, it should be agreed upon on both sides in order to avoid any misunderstanding.

Then we spoke about the question of the establishment of a Provident Fund for field and factory workers in the industry. I do not intend in this debate to deal specifically with the Provident Fund as it is mentioned in this Report, because the Barbados Workers' Union has to meet the Minister tomorrow to discuss this question of the Report.

2.55 p.m.

We have stated our views on that, so I need not reiterate them here and they arise out of this Report.

Now I would not reply to the Minister who talked about statements being misleading. I am attempting to show that the Report of this inquiry was unsatisfactory. I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not here because I intend to read things which he said both in this debate and before. When this money was voted in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, it was considered that we were dealing with a public matter and not with a private matter, and for such reasons as have been stated here in our letter to the Ministry, not only were we objecting to a one-man inquiry and stated that it should be a three-man inquiry, but we were also objecting to the terms of reference that had been given to us and asked that these terms of reference be modified. The terms of reference were modified slightly; very little change had been taken and the modification eventually came out to inquire into the economic state of the Sugar Industry of the island and to make recommendations as to:-

- (a) the method of remuneration for the Sugar Industry;
- (b) the payment of severance pay in appropriate cases and methods to implement the agreement for the Provident Fund for sugar.

The terms of reference made by the Government were to inquire into the economic state of the industry and to make recommendations as to -

- (1) the method of remuneration and the wage structure in the industry for (a) field workers, and (b) factory workers;
- (2) (a) A provident Fund for field and factory workers in the industry, and (b) The Payment of severance pay in appropriate cases;
- (3) the price to be paid to the grower for sugar cane.

It was stated that Mr. McKenzie was invited to undertake this inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to read that so that we clear the background as to this matter which I intend to put to this House in relation to our objection to this Report. It is now known, Sir, that the Report was made in about four or five weeks, and anyone with the slightest knowledge of the Sugar Industry in Barbados with the terms of reference to inquire into the economic state of the Sugar Industry would tell you that the very compilation of the figures alone and its information would take you about four weeks. What is clear to all of us is that this was not an investigation into the economic state of the Sugar Industry, but an investigation into the Reports that have been made on the Sugar Industry and into the figures submitted by Sir Archibald Cuke to Mr. McKenzie, because at the end of the Report Sir Archibald Cuke was singled out for praise for the information he had supplied. It is clear, Sir, that from all that was stated in this Report prior to Mr. McKenzie's coming here, it was Government's intention that this was to be a public matter. It came through the Legislature and had big headlines in the Press. When Mr. McKenzie came to the island, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of courtesy

I met him and we submitted a memorandum, but we also expected that with such an inquiry dealing with the only and biggest industry in Barbados - the most valuable industry - after the dispute in 1958 and after the Board of Inquiry which was a public Board of Inquiry, one would see as night follows day, a wider Report into the economic state, because in this House the Minister of Communications, answering the hon. senior member for St. Philip, said that this Inquiry was to do something even bigger than what the Lewis Report had done, because it was going into the economic state of the whole industry. Could you expect, Mr. Speaker, after making these statements and then having the Inquirer come here, that when you informed him that you intended to give evidence on the basis that the public could examine what you said that the Inquirer would say that he was not taking evidence in public? That was strengthened by the Minister. The Secretary was continually getting after me asking whether I was going to meet Mr. McKenzie. I told him that I was not going to meet him in private but in a public hearing. He said that Mr. McKenzie did not believe it should be so and the Minister agreed. I do not know who that Minister is because I did not inquire. (A VOICE: The Minister of Trade.) It is immaterial to me; he would do something worse than that because he has done it already. He asked how we could meet a man to discuss this matter when the Union is not a Union as it was in 1945 when it did not have sugar workers and such numbers.

When Professor Shephard came here there was a disturbance in the Sugar Industry on the basis of cutting canes. What was the situation in those days? The Barbados Workers' Union was not then what could be regarded as an Agricultural Workers' Union in the sense that it represented the agricultural workers, because the workers were free and unorganised. Today there is a different situation. The Barbados Workers' Union today speaks for the sugar workers on a comprehensive basis. In any report or in any investigation to be made in the Sugar Industry, you would have to take into account the views of this Organisation; but what is patent is that the authority that sets up these Boards and Commissions of Inquiry sets out at the beginning to find out what is taking place in the minds of the sugar people or the employers, then to have an adjustment made in accordance with such views as they have heard, may be with a view not only of discrediting the Organisation of workers, but in an attempt to discredit one of the leaders of the Organisation. That has been going on for the last five years. Fortunately for the Union, in spite of the attempts to discredit one of the leaders, the Organisation has gone from strength to strength and today it is stronger in every respect than it ever was.

Now when you examine this Report, Mr. Speaker, you will see that it is a very neat Report which contains twenty-eight pages, and I am going through this Report to read some of the statements in it so that you might examine them and see what is the true position. What is more serious - and I say this quite sincerely - is that the person who conducted this Inquiry could dare attempt to refuse a public hearing from the biggest Organisation, that is to say, the Workers' Organisation. We are larger than the Employers' Organisation, but the Inquirer was keeping his ears to the ground, and as the Minister was not in favour of this, and the employers themselves did not want a public hearing - it did not matter to them, because for a number of years the employers in the Sugar Industry have always objected to these public investigations.

3.05 p.m.

By that I do not mean that they were afraid to meet the Workers' Union, but there are certain facts and information in the Sugar Industry which the industry is very reluctant to bring forward. May I say that the first time in the history of our negotiations with the sugar people that they have vouchsafed to give out some sort of information - not in full - is on the last occasion when this present agreement was reached. Nothing I say should be taken to infer that the negotiating personnel have not been men who have shown a willingness to appreciate industrial relations procedure, and that they do

not do all in their power to bring about an amicable settlement, not only now but in the past. On the other hand, it should not be taken that when there are differences which are irreconcilable between them and ourselves we should not resort to other means for settlement. What is regrettable in an age like this is that throughout the world where there is a spirit of social consciousness arising and people are turning to give greater benefits to the underprivileged, you find that this Government is insisting on these reactionary methods when we come to deal with such matters, and it is preventing the widest publicity being given to matters of public importance.

What else can you investigate in Barbados which is of greater importance than the sugar industry? Can there be anything which is of greater importance than this? Can you imagine that the Workers Union which represents thousands of workers asked that this Board of Enquiry be given a public hearing and that wish was not acceded to by the Government? If the majority views can be accepted for both sides, then this enquiry should be made public. The employers did not have the majority view; they had the minority view in this investigation.

In 1945, Professor Shephard did not have the views when he made his investigation into the sugar Industry of Barbados of any single, focal organisation like the Workers Union. I believe the Hon. Minister of Agriculture had a lot to say on that occasion. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture said in the House on that occasion before he went in the wilderness for a temporary sojourn:-

"The factories in the past years have made enormous profits. You can look around and see it."

I wonder now when he and the hon. senior member for St. George seem to be the same strange bed-fellows in their economic outlook what the Hon. Minister is going to say about this. Sir, you can well remember when I read the address of the hon. Minister for Trade on peaceful picketing when the matter was first brought up in this House of Assembly how interesting it was to see the political metamorphosis that took place in his life on that matter. His was a brazen look and smile at the beginning of every sentence I read but when I came to the end of each sentence which carried the sting, that smile on his face was wiped off.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture went on to say on that occasion:-

"They have become so arrogant that they are beginning now to create monopolies and if this thing is allowed to go on, I do not know how far they will go. Some of them are buying everything that is for sale at the expense of the peasants and I am sure that if the peasants came here today they would all agree with me that it is time the factory owners be checked. The factory owners do not suffer any hardship. The peasants have to pay for their manure just as the factories do, and yet when the peasant sends his canes in he gets a much lower price for them than the average plantation owner."

He went on further to say at a subsequent meeting on the same question:-

"It seems to me that the peasants are at a great disadvantage; they are in a very difficult position. It also seems to me that we have reached a point in connection with this Bill when we cannot understand one another. I am getting so confused as a result of the arguments - pro and con- that I feel if it were in my power I would create a socialistic system of government as far as the sugar industry is concerned."

He has power now. He said then that he would create a socialistic system of government as far as the sugar industry is concerned. By that he meant that he would buy all the sugar factories, nationalise and run them for the people. In some respects, it would appear as if that is going to be the net result of what this Enquiry has taken.

I think I have given some background to the matter leading up to this Enquiry into the economic state of

the Sugar Industry. I have given some of the basic reasons for my objecting to the Report of the Enquiry and the methods of the holding of the Enquiry and I have done so because the Workers Union as such is too vital and important in Barbados for that Enquiry to be conducted in the way which the employers felt it should be conducted and not in the way in which the vast masses of the people felt it should be conducted. I may say that I have no doubt in my mind that I have the vast masses of workers behind me in this matter. The workers feel that it should have been conducted on a public basis. We keep a public business; we give the widest publicity to all our activities and all our books are kept in a manner which any one can examine. Here, I would like to say that in so far as meeting employers are concerned, we meet all types of employers and I may say that employers are willing to recognise the rights of the Union. I think the large number of grievances which we settle in Barbados is an indication of that. I am quite sure that during the last week or so the Union has effected many agreements, and the agreements which we effect if measured by the day will represent an agreement for every day. Therefore, when I am speaking on behalf of the Workers Union, one can see that I am not speaking of a moribund organisation or a motley collection of individuals but am speaking on behalf of an organisation which from the top to the bottom has the right to initiate and to improve on all matters which they feel is inimical to their welfare. 3.15 p.m.

This question is one that affects the lives of the greatest number of people in Barbados and from this Report - Mr. Speaker, I hope you have read the Report, I believe you have read it; and if there is any question of misleading the House on this Report you can stop me and say that those things are not true. But in this Report, the substance of it is that the economic state of the sugar industry of Barbados is such that it is in such a derelict and poor situation that it cannot even make a reasonable return on the money invested, and therefore the hope for any increase in wages is something which you have to think of as being in the far and dim future. In this same Report, Mr. Speaker, Mr. McKenzie says that the cane grower, and we do not know whom he means by cane grower, is well off, but the cane grower is not always in a good position.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will bear with me so that I can deal with the part of the Report where Mr. McKenzie has gone on that point. He says this on page 21 of the Report: "In view of the fact that the cane grower obtains such a favourable price for his cane I do not propose to make any recommendation which would alter the present position." Now the Minister of Agriculture, who has now taken his seat, has said that he would socialise the sugar industry; he said that in 1945. He was associated with this matter but one of the Ministers said: "Do not have a public enquiry, let it be done in private." The Trade Union is not big enough to demand a public hearing but Mr. McKenzie says in one breath "In view of the fact that the cane grower obtains such a favourable price for his cane I do not propose to make any recommendation which would alter the present position." Then in paragraph 31 Under the Head "Capital Investment in the Industry," he says this: "There are no records or statistical material from which the capital investment in the sugar industry can be assessed. Various attempts have been made to estimate what this may be; Shephard in 1947 was of the opinion that the pre-war valuation of land would be about £36 (\$172.80) per arable acre" and so forth. There are no reliable records or statistical material in respect of the capital investment, but he comes down and says, with none of this material or information to go by, that the sugar industry in Barbados is an industry which cannot even make a 5% dividend. I have gathered some material - and it is necessary, when you are dealing with these matters, to seek all the sources that can be of use to you and be helpful to you in making this type of representation. I will give this House some information as to the Commonwealth situation or the situation in relation to Barbados as compared with other Commonwealth territories. Now let us deal with tons of sugar produced per acre in Barbados in comparison

because another person is closing down and I am going to have a monopoly. When you take the analysis of these figures, Mr. Speaker, and see that Barbados is efficient, we could only be efficient in growing our sugar-cane and manufacturing sugar when you read these returns which I have read, and it is very revealing that for the last five years the tons per acre were higher than any of the other territories, that is, higher than Antigua, Jamaica, Trinidad or British Guiana. As a matter of fact, it was the highest in the British Caribbean.

3.35 p.m.

What is the situation? You get a report on the Sugar Industry stating that they are not making five percent or in effect that they are only making five percent and that is a small percentage to make on their investment.

Mr. Speaker, it would be nearer to a factual situation if this gentleman had come here and investigated the sugar industry and stated that the position of the factory as against the position of the plantation is one where one was better than the other. I am sure I am not telling any secret when I say that on an occasion when the Minister of Agriculture was going to a conference, he met me at the Airport and what he told me on that occasion was what the hon. member on my left - the hon. senior member for St. George - has also told me. He said that the factory workers were getting too much money and because of that I should try and get something settled for the workers.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sir, again I must interrupt the hon. member. What I said then to the hon. member was that the disparity between the factory workers and the field workers was too great and that they should try and get a sort of compromise between the two. I never said that anybody was getting too much money because I like to see people get money.

Mr. WALCOTT: What does he know of the disparity between these workers?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: What do you know?

Mr. DOWDING: I was never asked by the hon. member anything as to what, where, when and how of the Sugar Industry. He has said that I said that the workers get too much money. I never said so.

Mr. WALCOTT: Both of them said so. The hon. senior member for St. George said so while sitting down here around this table. I cannot remember when, but it was on an occasion when he was sitting in the House of Assembly.

What is the disparity in the Sugar Industry that the Hon. Minister is talking about? What is the rates of pay and conditions of work of the factory workers? This gentleman, Mr. McKenzie, made a report similar to the words which the Hon. Minister used. I do not know why the Hon. Minister of Agriculture keeps getting up. You all have the opportunity to reply and I am not afraid of your reply. I want you to reply. Do not think I am saying something to which you cannot reply.

What they are saying now is that the factories are not making money but that the workers can get money out of the factories. How can the workers get money out of the factories if the factories are not making the money? This Report by Mr. McKenzie could only be made in Barbados where they have a Government which can get up and say what the Hon. Minister said. I think I will deal with the Hon. Minister's statement a little later. Both of those hon. members said to me that the factory workers were getting too much money. The Hon. Minister now talks of disparity in wages. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: Do not give me cause to repeat what you said.) You can repeat anything I told you, because I have never spoken anything to any member of the Barbados Labour Party within the last five years which anybody in God's world could not hear of. Neither one of you and I are such good friends, neither am I one of those curious ones who want to hear what you do or plan.

The Union itself submitted proposals prior to the investigation last year before there was a breakdown on the basis of giving a higher increase to field workers

as against the factory workers, but it was not based on the fact that one set of workers was getting more than the other, but on the basis of wages negotiations, we felt that all were entitled to the same rates of increase; that is to say, if we felt that they were entitled to an increase of \$10.00 and the rates of increase are different rates, in order to give each a raise of \$10.00 therefore, it meant that a percentage difference of increase must exist.

As I have said, in this Report we find that the Sugar Industry cannot make 5% profit. What do you mean? Are you suggesting that these plantations are operating on less than a 5% profit? I challenge the hon. member on my left to come forward and say that for the last ten years all that he has got on the operating of his sugar factory is only 5% profit. That could never be true unless he had all rab land. What we are asked to accommodate? We are asked to accommodate a situation in which the sugar industry, which is a marginal industry, must work on the basis of buying a new factory every twenty years. What in effect you are saying is that you cannot build a new factory on what you are making as profit, therefore, what you are now doing is not profitable. Do you want a more fantastic statement than that to be made? If that is the way that you run your business then you would be only buying other people's industries. If you consider that your profit margin is not a reasonable profit for you to make, it is open to you to get a better industry if you can.

Sir, we went to the Ministry of Agriculture and met the Hon. Minister and we made it clear to him that we did not regard this gentleman, Mr. McKenzie, as a wage fixing body because we felt that the people who are concerned in the industry must sit down around a table and work that out. Mr. Speaker, there is something very serious which is written in this Report. If you turn to page 16 paragraph 58, this is what you read:-

"One factor however is of importance. The factory worker during the crop period works for longer hours than the field worker. They work on a basis of twenty-four out of forty-eight, either by shifts of eight hours on and eight hours off, or by twelve-hour shifts each day. This practice has been in force since the times of the old windmill factories, and is based on custom and usage. It is also true, that the factory worker is on call at all hours, seven days of the week during the crop. This does not in fact justify higher wage rates and earnings."

Only a fool can write that.

3.45 p.m.

Could you expect an intelligent man to say that longer working hours do not justify higher earnings? What kind of fool could write that? If more work does not justify more earnings, what then would justify them? Shorter working hours? I have never heard that harder work and more work does not justify more earnings. He has set up his own premises and arrived at his own conclusions. The Report goes on:-

"Nevertheless it is surprising in these days of labour regulations and agreements that such a system should continue. It imposes a strain on the workers and after some weeks of continuous working efficiency is bound to fall considerably."

He has set up the premises to create something else now. He goes on: "It is also surprising that in an island noted for underemployment this should continue to be tolerated." He has set out all of these things and he goes on to say this: "The system has been tolerated for so long that entrenched interests are difficult to move. I am given to understand that a three shift system would be welcomed but understand that any reduction in average take home pay of the factory workers would be resisted." That is a lie. He goes on further:- "Under these circumstances factories find it impossible to institute such a change." That is a bigger lie. There is a factory owner on my left. When did the Barbados

Workers' Union discuss for one second the question of having a three shift system in factories? There is not one single iota of truth in that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. Is the hon. member quoting from paragraph 58 of this Report?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am quoting from paragraph 58.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Did the hon. member read "that the factory worker is on call at all hours, seven days of the week during the crop. This does not in fact justify higher wage rates and earnings?"

Mr. WALCOTT: I will repeat what I read. "The factory worker during the crop period works for longer hours than the field worker. They work on a basis of twenty-four out of forty-eight, either by shift of eight hours on and eight hours off, or by twelve hour shifts each day. This practice has been in force since the time of the old wind mill factories and is based on custom and usage. It is also true, that the factory worker is on call at all hours, seven days of the week during the crop. This does (MEMBERS: This does) I am sorry Mr. Speaker "this does in fact justify higher wage rates and earnings" I correct that. (MEMBERS: That is very far from what you said.) I am willing to say it now. I am not like you, to say something at one time and then say that you never said it.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. When did I say something and then say that I did not say it (Mr. WALCOTT: Peaceful picketing.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Under Rule 26 of the Standing Orders of this Chamber, if the hon. member remembers that Rule, he is not likely to say anything which may be construed as being offensive of any other hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should still like to ask the hon. member when I have ever said anything and denied it on a future occasion? I still want to ask the hon. member that question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that this is the place for such an explanation. If the hon. member challenges that statement he can do that, but to require an answer to that question would lead to acrimonious debate. I am well aware of that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry that I made that mistake but it was not done to mislead anybody. (ASIDES) A type like him -----

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to desist from mentioning the words "a type like him". I think the hon. member has not used those words in any favourable sense.

Mr. WALCOTT: As to the type of person who is laughing when you are making an explanation in good faith - what are you going to do with him? I withdraw the statement I made in that context which means that I did not intend to read into the Report something which was not there. I go on to read from there. The Report says: "Nevertheless it is surprising in these days of labour regulations and agreements that such a system should continue. It imposes a strain on the workers, and after some weeks of continuous working efficiency is bound to fall considerably. It is also surprising that in an island noted for underemployment that this should continue to be tolerated. The system has been tolerated for so long that entrenched interests are difficult to move. I am given to understand that a three shift system would be welcomed but understand that any reduction in average take home pay of the factory workers would be resisted. Under these circumstances factories find it impossible to institute such a change."

That means that the factories are willing to institute a three shift system. I am saying that that is not true (Mr. SEARLES: What is not true?) You are an idiot, man.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member to desist from making such references in asides. I distinctly heard asides which I know are heard from the gallery. The last aside I heard is one which I should not have heard.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think that you should allow me to speak without interruption.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no excuse whatever. I am very keen that no asides should be heard. I have heard one which should not have been uttered and which was heard from the gallery.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if I am not protected from the asides which are being heard the whole thing will be broken up. You can hear asides and nothing is said ----

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will sit. The type of aside which I have heard, when an hon. member refers to another hon. member as an idiot, is certainly one which I must control with all that rests in my power. Any debate on an aside uttered by any hon. member on any side will at once meet with my displeasure. That kind of aside must not be made in here. It must not be uttered; and no hon. member either from this side or from that side could ever say that I have been other than impartial in trying to control order and discipline in this House unless he is talking as he should not talk. 3.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, that happens whenever I begin to speak in this Chamber. I believe it is so patent that I should not make any reference to it, but there is one thing I want to say before I proceed. Like other members, I have been elected to come here, and I expect the same democratic freedom in debate as any other member; and the day I cannot have it, I will walk out and come back only when the people send me back here. With the exception of the Premier, every single member on that side make repeated asides when I am speaking, but not a word is said to them. When I sit here and make asides I am warned that they can be heard. Some Rule was drawn to my attention that when a member is speaking no other member should speak, but it seems to me that it is all right for him to be speaking. I know I am fairly loud and it takes a lot to talk me down, but if hon. members make asides which I can hear and I make back an aside like that, Your Honour should allow that to pass as fair. All is fair in love and war. If they make an aside and I cut back, let us leave it at that. You need no referee, because if everybody is fouling everybody the referee can allow it to pass. Mr. Speaker, it is no discredit to you but there is no person who is more guilty of that offence than the Minister of Trade. Sometimes I sit here and see the Premier telling him not to do it, but it is part of his nature; so if he fires something at me and I cut back at him, let it end there.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and bow to your ruling that sometimes my sotto voce remarks might be a bit too strong for the hearing of the Chair, but that is what you would have to take in these things.

Sir, I was making the point, and this is where the Ministers were arguing with me, that there is a statement in this Report which gives the impression that the factory people were willing to institute a three-shift system means of work, but resistance has come from the Union. No such matter was ever the subject of discussion between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation. This is what the Report says:-

"It is further complicated by the problem of enlarging factories which come about by the closing of

uneconomic units, and the general reduction in the number of working factories in the island. The suggestion that if a factory is enlarged the rate per ton of sugar should be reduced to a level which would give the worker no less than before, but based on the new expanded output, has been resisted." Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is in their statement, the Barbados Workers' Union has met factories that have improved their production capacity and has agreed to lower the rate per ton in those factories. Now he said that has been resisted.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The gentleman never said that it had been resisted. He said he understood it will be resisted, if the hon. member is reading from the 1958 Report.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you can understand English. If you are writing a Report in which you set up a premise and then say from this premise that you understand this is being resisted by me, are you not suggesting to the reader that this would be in operation, but owing to my resistance it is not in operation? He is writing a Report and not something for a Sunday School class. This is what the Report states:-

"The suggestion that if a factory is enlarged the rate per ton of sugar would be reduced to a level which would give the worker no less than before, but based on the new expanded output, has been resisted." That is, they come along and say they are going to build a factory to increase output, but the Union says it is not having it. (Hon. M. E. COX: That happened at Haggatts Factory.) Mr. Speaker, that is the type of man we have as a Minister of Labour. If I could do otherwise than meet him tomorrow, I would do it, but I have to represent too many people. I believe you know the facts. The Union had agreed to a reduction at Haggatts Factory, but here it is he is saying that it happened at Haggatts Factory. What do you know about computations? How does he know that the whole amount was not 100 and we reduced the amount? The facts are that Haggatts Factory wanted a reduction the equivalent of 20%, but we said we were not going to have a reduction the equivalent of 20% but a reduction the equivalent of 12, 1/2%; that is to say, reduce the quantum. The hon. senior member for St. George would understand what I mean. You are paying X dollars per ton for wages; the factory comes along and says it is going to manufacture 400 tons of sugar per week instead of 200 tons; these are the present rates based on the 200 ton factory and we propose to institute a system in which these will be the new rates. The net result, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to protect the worker, because if the production capacity of the factory increases, the net returns to the person who owns the factory will eventually increase, because if you were only getting 200 tons per week with the capital and whatever depreciation you put in to puff the things up, it would be to the benefit of the owner to have a factory that could produce 400 tons. We say that if that is of benefit to you as an entity, that the man who works for you must also benefit. It is not only a question of lower production or more money, because those who know of wages negotiations know that whenever productivity increases, wages should not fall or you should not get the same wages. Higher productivity means lower overhead, lower overhead means higher profits and higher profits should be reflected in higher wages. That is where I say the Minister of Trade made the statement and now he is telling us that it happened at Haggatts. The truth is that we had agreed to a reduction at Haggatts. If lying was an art, he would beat Ananias. 4.05 p.m.

As I have said in this House, the hon. member who is a Minister would do anything short of murder. He now says that it happened at Haggatts,

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder what is your internal reaction to these matters. Mr. McKenzie goes on to say:-

"This is an illogical stand to take, particularly when the actual amount of work or effort on the part of the worker is not changed. It seems even more illogical when it is realised that records show that some factory workers are now in a position of earning as much or more per week in crop period than an estate or factory manager."

Now, Mr. Speaker, you get a man coming here and writing such a Report. I think you will remember when the Commissioners wrote the Report on the capital site of the Federation, they went out of their way to indict the Indians and all that it did was to land the capital in Trinidad instead of Barbados or Jamaica which they recommended. According to this Report, it says that records show that some factory workers are now in a position of earning as much or more per week in crop period than an estate or factory manager. That is a serious indictment. Do you believe that a factory worker, working at Moncrieffe or down at Haggatts would be working for more than a factory manager? It is a known fact that a factory manager gets a higher salary than an estate manager. (Mr. DOWDING: It depends on the size of the estate.) The hon. member on my left says that it depends on the size of the estate. When such a statement is made in this sort of thing I am reading, it must give the public the idea that a factory worker gets more money than a factory manager. On top of that, you get the Government defending this report written by Mr. McKenzie. How can you ask me to agree to this report written as it is? The differential which the Hon. Minister spoke of is a differential which would take place in any trade or in any industry. The factory workers work on a production basis. They work on the basis of so much per ton. Lots of people do not realise that if a factory broke down for a week and did not work that week a factory worker will not get a cent. Even now, if anything takes place at a factory to cause it to stop grinding, apart from those workers who are actually working on the repairs, the other workers have to go home; therefore, they get no wages. A factory manager is somebody who gets a weekly wage or a salary.

As I have said, what is more serious is that we said that we were not dealing with the report as a question of fixing wages, but without giving facts or stating reasons, Mr. McKenzie said that the differential you get between the earnings of field workers and factory workers was the cause of considerable disquietude in the industry and that it is so large as to cause considerable bitterness in the industry. Then in another breath he says that these wages must be based on the basis of the cost of living index. I am sure, Sir, that your knowledge of industrial matters would lead you to believe that no Trade Union in 1958 would accept to have wages tied to a cost of living index. That in effect means that all a worker can afford to get out of the industry at any time is what he now gets, because wages would be only adjusted to the cost of living index. That is to say, if a worker can only afford a paid of shoes now, he will never be able to get more than that.

Now, Sir, the figures which I have here of the output of sugar per ton of canes are higher than that in Trinidad. Imagine, you have here a production rate per acre which is higher than even that of Australia. When you look at these figures, which of these territories would come out better than this territory? Looking at these figures, when our production was 4.4 tons per acre, it was 2.8 in the Leeward Islands. Multiply that by the number of acres we have here. When you bring marginal lands like that of the Spa or you bring a factory which is likely to close down and take that as a comparison, it is like bringing a racehorse which will soon die and say that you are likely to get a Derby winner out of him. Of course, the Ministers are busy people. They do not have the time to read reports. So far as they are concerned, reading is something of the past. However, it is a pity when the Union has to meet, that it has to meet a Minister of that calibre. You get all this morass of ignorance expressed by him. He must go there with a prejudiced mind. Sir, how can we expect any sort of

fairplay in these matters? That is why I said that we were not asking the Minister for any money. This is money out of the sugar industry. When I have to meet a Minister like the Minister of Trade around a table, my regret is that I have to lead the organisation. When you can get on the floor of the House and say things inimical of the Union and not only that, but lie on us. --

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I object strongly to that. I never said it on my feet or in my seat.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, on the broad question of meeting, we have to meet the same Minister tomorrow on the question of provision of a Provident Fund. 4.15 p.m.

Look at the Report and you will see that it is vague. What does it say? Imagine a man suggesting that if a person is 32 years of age he is not entitled to a Provident Fund! A man goes into a sugar factory at the age of 15 or 16 years and he works for 16 years; could you not have a stroke at the age of 16 years? There was a time at the Hospital when you used to hand out bed pans by the hour; there was a time when the usefulness of such things had passed and you had to wait until the next hour comes. It all means that is a man is 32 years of age he is not eligible for the benefits of Provident Fund. This man only makes provision for funeral benefits but not for your dependents; this is just as if you are in a twelve-cents Lodge and when you die they give you something with which to bury you.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to point out is that this Report could not have been made in four weeks. I was in London and I made it my business to go and see someone who knows something about the sugar industry in Barbados and in the West Indies, and that person to whom I spoke said that no man could come to Barbados and make a Report on the economic state of the sugar industry in four weeks; it would take him about four months. If you are going to analyse the reports made by other people as to the sugar industry, then that is a different matter. Professor Shephard never investigated the economic state of the industry; his terms of reference were to investigate a dispute on the basis of cutting canes and what rate should be paid for cutting canes. When Professor Shephard came out here he was asked to investigate what should be paid to cane cutters but he was not asked to investigate the economic state of the sugar industry. You can now understand that behind that background there were those who resisted the idea of having a public enquiry. The Minister of Agriculture came in line too and he said that if he had the power he would socialise the Sugar Industry. He said this: "I feel if it were in my power I would create a socialistic system of Government as far as the sugar industry is concerned." Furthermore this is what he said: "If it is not a fact that the factory owners are making big profits, why can't they show us their books and let us see the loss they are making."

All we ask is that they should have a public enquiry and not a private one. You send a man to investigate the economic state of the sugar industry and he is not to have a public enquiry because you feel you have the millions in the Ministry and anybody who challenges you shows you up. There is a popular idea that you must be a University student so as to be able to talk anything about a University; but I should like to say that the University is made for the benefit of people who have not been to a University. They forget that University people come out and give some knowledge to those who have not been to the University and if you are wise enough and willing to absorb anything you will get some knowledge. We have an international organisation from which we collect material and we ask them to examine the reports and give us some information which will help and guide us. Mr. Morgan from the London School of Economics prepared this statement for us. We cannot have an organisation nowadays unless we are prepared to have this sort of thing and I may say that it is the intention of the Union in any case in collaboration

with other colleagues to say that we cannot accept this Report. As long as I have anything to do with the Barbados Workers' Union it will not be any cap-in-hand Organisation asking the Government for any favours. We are not asking the Government for any favours. We are not going to be any organisation which is dependent upon any hand-outs in order that we can succeed in the representation which we require.

You can quite clearly see that when a man writes that a worker cannot get any more than six cents an hour that the rate will be six cents an hour. If I say that the rate should be eight cents an hour they will ask me: "What do you know about it?" But they who have been blessed with all the knowledge know everything about it!

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for me to close my remarks at this stage and I think I would welcome the voice of the hon. senior member for St. George on this matter, because I will say that I still respect the points of view of the employers, although I do not always agree with them. They have met us this year with a different frame of mind and the negotiations which were conducted were conducted on a basis different from that on which they have been conducted in the past years. We would not accept the Commonwealth figure as the same basis for maintaining the position in Barbados. It was our bounden duty to let the public know these things so that when we have somebody in here and he is not going to have anything to do with the Union, he can have his matters discussed at home. If the employers want to do what you said last year, then they will have to go and cut the canes themselves, and you too. If you are willing to meet us, you will meet us on the basis of the public enquiry. Let them keep this in their pipes and smoke it; at any time when there is an industrial dispute I have very little use for any Board of Enquiry as long as that Government is in power. It is an open secret that when the last Board of Enquiry was set up to deal with a dispute, one of the leaders of that Party invited the members of the Commission to lunch and warned the Chairman not to make a recommendation which would be favourable to the workers. That is, as I say, an open secret. There are lots of things more that I could say but I do not like to involve people. I am a believer in service. An hon. member has said that you live longer in eternity than you live here; this lease of life which you have here is not too long. I repeat that it is an open secret that two members of the Commission were invited to lunch and the Chairman was persuaded to make an adverse report so that it would reflect on me.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. The hon. member is making a very wild statement. (Mr. WALCOTT: Wild statement?) I would like him to be specific. Many of us are in Government positions and we may be implicated; therefore I would be glad if the hon. member would be more specific. 4.25 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not afraid to call names. Do you want me to call them? Those of you who invited the two members of the Commission to lunch and did not invite the Trade Unionists are the persons who told them to make an adverse report. You thought that the release of the Report at the time would have been more favourable to you in the bye-election. Do you want to know who said so? All I say is that as long as you occupy those benches you can take it from me that you will get the minimum respect which you should get for the position you occupy. You think that when you deal with the Union you are dealing with me. The workers put me here and

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order, the hon. member is making a very serious accusation in this House which could be a scandal on somebody in this Party that we invited the Chairman to lunch and persuaded him against the workers of this colony. That is something you cannot pass over lightly.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is not desirous

of calling the names, nobody can make him do so.

Mr. WALCOTT: This is not the first time that statement was made either. What I want to say, Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 4.30 p.m. but I will give the hon. member five more minutes if he so desires to finish.

Mr. WALCOTT: I was making the point that the reason why I did not favour the institution of the Board of Inquiry in labour matters by Government is because the present Minister of Labour spoke on a matter before it was submitted to the Board. Their attitude in such matters is to meet the employers before the Union is met and set up Boards of Inquiry on the basis that they can write something against me or something like that. They will get the minimum of respect from me which they deserve from the occupation of their offices. The hon. member cannot tell me what to do; let him go for other people and tell them what to do. If the hon. member thinks that he can push the workers around in Barbados, he can try. That is why we have these reactionary Reports coming here from time to time when we have these investigations, because behind all these things the investigators think they have them to please. The employers on this occasion had more sense and did not take a six for a nine. If they believe that the workers are going to do what they say, they have another thought coming. This Organisation represents the workers, and if we stated that we wanted a public inquiry, nobody in Barbados should have gone against it. I only tried to accommodate them, Mr. Speaker, but the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour told us when we met that they had already asked Mr. McKenzie to undertake this inquiry and could not go back on their word.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. It was not a question of our deciding something and could not go back on our word.

Mr. WALCOTT: There were more people present but I do not have to bring anybody into it. In a letter written on 12th September, 1958, we stated that "it is the opinion of the Union that an investigation into the Sugar Industry should be conducted on the highest level and on a broader basis than that of a one-man inquiry. The issues to be considered are varied and require the broadest representation to meet all of the interests involved. For this reason a three-man inquiry is preferable to the Union."

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.35 p.m., the House will now resume Government Business.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1958-59 No. 40

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, as members will see from the Addendum to this Resolution, the purpose is to extend the building at Seawell to house this equipment which Messrs. International Aeradio (Caribbean) Ltd. are responsible for operating. This company, Mr. Chairman, is responsible for all aeronautical telecommunications at the Airport and would like this building extended so as to instal additional equipment. We are going to construct it on the understanding that the Company will pay an increased rental for the use of the building. That simply is the purpose of the Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

4.35 p.m.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)(AMENDMENT)(No. 25) ORDER, 1958

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No.2 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.25) Order, 1958.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Resolution seeks to approve the Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment) (No.25) Order, 1958, the purpose of which is to increase the staff of the X-Ray Department of the General Hospital by two X-Ray Assistants. I think hon. members are well acquainted with the fact that the work has increased tremendously in the X-Ray Department, first of all, because of the usual everyday work and, secondly, as a result of the demands of modern medicine and litigants who require examination pending court action which continue to put an increased pressure on the services of the staff. Then again, trained personnel is not often easy to get hold of and very often they have to be sent overseas for training which also leaves a short staff. Taking all these things into consideration, it has been decided to increase the number working in that Department by the addition of two X-Ray Assistants.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, of course, everyone sympathises with the terms as well as with the text of this Resolution, although there is something about it which is not very clear and I do not think the Hon. Premier has made it very clear in his speech either. As I understand from him, the increased work which patients and litigants having to attend the Law Courts make on the demand of the time and services of the staff of the X-Ray Department now makes it necessary for some increase in staff to be considered. But what I am wondering is this:

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If the hon. member gives way, I would just like to say that I also said in addition to the usual day to day work.

Mr. TUDOR: That is slightly clearer but the main difficulty remains. As one understands it, in the Hospital itself, the X-Ray Department works as it should to full capacity although there have been complaints by people of having to get X-Rayed and then having to wait longer periods than were absolutely convenient after such examination. Putting that aside, there is this point. If you have Clinics, there is no reason why if the expansion of the X-Ray services is to be carried out, it should not be carried out through the clinics.

We appreciate that the efficiency of the General Hospital should be at its highest - and no one would oppose any offer for staff there to cope with what goes on there - but if anybody gets a fractured rib in a fight and X-Ray evidence is necessary to form part of the evidence of the Courts, why should the Hospital be burdened with that and not the clinic? I think there are X-Ray services at Enmore; I am not sure if there are such services at the St. Philip or the Speightstown Health Centre, but if such services are not there, Government should think

of making those facilities there. Why should there be this idea of overburdening the General Hospital with extra work, because of possible litigation? As we are told it is the work of the courts which makes these increased demands on the staff of the X-Ray Department. The people who go to the Hospital, whether as out-patients or in-patients have a right to the X-Ray services there as promptly and conveniently as possible. If the services have to be expanded to meet this need, well, it is all right; but this extra service which is needed only for the purpose of the Court and which is now to be thrown on the Hospital is something which needs justifying. I would prefer to have this service done through the clinics and there should be provision for that facility at the clinics. 4.45 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish that the Premier would be a little more careful when he comes into this House and reads explanations which obviously have been drafted by enthusiastic but misinformed Civil Servants. The Addendum to the Resolution, which is to approve amendment No. 25 to the Civil Establishment Order reads that the Order provides for the creation of two additional posts of X-ray Assistant (\$960 - 2,016) for the General Hospital. That is the first relevant paragraph. The second paragraph goes on in a completely nonsensical way, that "the demands of modern science and litigants". - and there is no punctuation, I suppose they mean modern litigants - "who require examination pending court action, continue to put increasing pressure on the services of the staff as statistics from the Department show 12,032 cases in 1951 rising to 19,368 in 1957." Then the third paragraph, which is also nonsensical, states this: "The nature of the work requires the service of trained technical personnel and therefore, as an officer goes overseas for training the Department becomes short staffed". That paragraph has been thrown in to show that there is some kind of international approval. The Addendum continues: "This is further aggravated during leave periods. The International Protection Committee has recommended that an X-ray technician should be employed for no more than seven working hours a day and not more than five working days a week in the interest of good health, but with the present complement of staff these recommendations cannot be complied with."

That statement is in itself, in my opinion, sufficient justification for anyone who is interested in the welfare of workers and the conditions of work to come to this House and ask for an increase of two or more members of the technical staff of the X-ray Department. I should like to give the lie to the slander on the Law Courts and the practitioners, to which I have the honour to belong, and on the litigants of Barbados. I do not know of a single case within the last nine years in this island in which an X-ray photograph has formed either a part of the litigation or has been a necessary or unnecessary exhibit in the case. I should like to say that the courts are interested in the diagnosis of the Doctor or the Radiographer or Radiologist who may come to give the necessary evidence; but I have never known of any increase in the number of X-rays demanded either by litigants or by the Law Courts. It is quite true that there may have been an increase in the number of people attending the Casualty Department at the General Hospital; there may have been an increase in the number of fractures as distinct in Barbados from breaks, because in Barbados people come into the Court and tell the Judge that the doctor said that the arm was fractured and not really broken. If there is a rapprochement of the fracture and the break, if they mean the same thing - the Premier may be reconciled to the idea that they are one and the same thing in keeping with the appropriate trend in Barbados, and the X-ray Department may now be taking cognizance of fractures when it only took notice of breaks before. I am not in a position to say that people are not getting their limbs broken more frequently or that as a result of the B.C.G. Campaign and the Tuberculosis Campaign jointly there was this increase of numbers of the ordinary public especially when they had been removed to the X-ray Department of the General Hospital to have their bodies X-rayed; but this has nothing to do with the Courts

whatsoever. If there were 12,000 cases in 1951 rising to 19,000 in 1957, if there are 12,000 X-rays taken annually and recently the volume has been increasing it may be 60% or 70% to the figure which has been quoted in the Addendum, the number of X-rays taken bears no relationship to the number of cases in the Courts because there are no cases in the Courts involving X-rays. I want to make that point abundantly clear.

Since the Hon. Premier happens to be a member of the Medical profession and since he himself should at least be au fait with the jargon of the profession and the relative matters pertaining to the profession, perhaps he would explain to this House what that second paragraph of the Addendum to this Resolution distinctly means. Perhaps he would explain the demands of modern medicine as distinct from surgery and also what litigants have to do with medicine and X-rays. I am completely at sea, and, it may be, Your Honour as well, because I do not see any connection between them at all. Perhaps the Civil Servant who prepared the Addendum to this Resolution had another Resolution before him and that paragraph happened to creep in like the uninvited guest to the wedding - the second day wedding. (Laughter) It appears to me that this second paragraph of this Addendum has crept in here like the uninvited guest, I repeat. This paragraph has nothing to do with the increase in the volume of work in the Department. The Hon. Premier or the Minister of Social Services have to say that the work has increased because more cases are being dealt with now than before. I want to say that neither the Law Courts nor the litigants have anything to do with the imposition on the Treasury in this way. Special measures relating to the Hospital whether they are introduced by the Hon. Minister of Social Services or by any other member of the Government Party should be concerned with what is going to be done for the people.

Another thing which has struck me in the Addendum to this Resolution - and I might say that what the Premier has done is just to read in his usual immaculate fashion, the Addendum which has been circulated and submitted to hon. members, I have to rely entirely on what has been written here and on his immaculate reading of what has been written and printed, even if I have not read it before. But what I am particularly concerned about is this; if they import into the Addendum the consideration that there is some convention by an International Body which recommends that X-ray assistants, because of the hazardous nature of their work should not be exposed more than a given period per day, it seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they should not have the audacity to say that the technicians should work during these periods now because it means that they were contributing perhaps to the ill health of these technicians before. If you have to make a choice between impairing the health of the people who are carrying on work of a hazardous nature and refusing X-ray facilities to minor cases which may not necessarily need X-ray diagnosis especially as there are cases in which litigants fool the Hospital authorities that they need these X-rays to go to Court, then you should choose the lesser of the two evils and turn back these people who want X-ray pictures to go to Court. You should also circulate the members of the medical profession explaining that if they send unnecessary cases to the X-ray Department they will be exposing the Hospital personnel to unknown dangers. I do not know anything about medicine; my knowledge is limited from case to case to a particular point and purely for a specific purpose.

4.55 p.m.

What I do know is that the disease which is attendant on every exposure to these conditions is no less a disease than cancer, and if the International Protection Committee has said that you are running a risk by employing people over this period - this is a 1957 Report - why have you waited until 1959 to warn the House that they are short-staffed, and that if they continue to impose these long working hours on the staff operating the X-ray equipment at the present moment, they will be probably contributing to the early death, maybe, if not severe ill health of these people who are trying to perform their duties? It seems to

me to be an extreme case of negligence on the part of the Government that they did not come to this House before. The Addendum is unsatisfactory, but is also revealing; it has said too much and too little. I am very alarmed that this state of affairs which the hon. member assured us of by his reading of the Addendum has prevailed at least from 1957 and that they have waited until this late hour to say that they need more X-ray assistants.

You do not have to tell members of this House that the work is of a technical nature; even taking a photograph with a camera which is not a deadly instrument is technical in its own way, far more using an instrument which can be lethal if not properly manipulated. It is a very serious matter and I hope as from tomorrow the Hon. Premier will issue instructions that forthwith the technicians at the Hospital must not work longer hours than those which have been prescribed by the International Protection Committee, and that he will ask the Doctors to cooperate and use their hands a little more as the old doctors had to do. The old bone-setters, if you feel like calling them that, fifty years ago did not have the benefit of X-ray, and had to set bones entirely by the skill of the touch of their fingers, and I am sure there must be a lot of cases going unnecessarily before the X-ray Department which need not go there at all. To give you an example, Mr. Speaker, in 1956 during the election campaign, I happened to sprain my ankle. I am not a doctor but I could tell that I did not have a bone broken and yet I had to undergo the ordeal of having at least five X-ray pictures taken of my ankle on the recommendation of somebody whom I cannot remember, but he certainly must have been a member of the medical profession. I am not criticising the doctor for sending me there; he probably thought the equipment is there and you might as well make sure, but a case like mine I thought was not a proper subject for X-ray examination because it was merely a sprain, and from the nature by which the injury was sustained, it was evident that there could be no bone

injury to the foot. If you suddenly twist your ankle, it is pretty clear that the nature of the impact must be different from when somebody hits you with a crowbar on it. There you have an illustration in which an X-ray is not completely useless but probably next to useless and certainly an imposition on the members of the staff of the Barbados General Hospital. Anybody who is in the financial position and can afford it every time he gets the slightest kind of injury would necessarily want to have an X-ray because there is no harm; but certainly there must be a large range of cases while we are faced with this crisis in which doctors should exercise their discretion as to whether they should impose an additional burden on the already overtaxed services within the Barbados General Hospital, and I hope that they will, without waiting until April to get the additional personnel, impose restrictions in the working hours of the people who are exposed to radiation from the equipment at the Barbados General Hospital.

I would like to say that I hope the Premier will—since he is a member of the medical profession, since he has been a member of the Hospital Board, since he has been in charge of this Department as Minister of Social Services, and since from his long association with medicine he must be a little more *au fait* with the goings on at the Barbados General Hospital than we the benighted labourers happen to be—give to the members of the House a more definite explanation of the words of the Addendum placed before us.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I think it is my duty to say something on this matter. Now I was at pains to listen to the Premier presenting this Resolution to the Assembly today, and quite honestly I do not know that there is anything further which he could have said in an attempt to make out a case for the additional staff. Apart from the discussion from two members—and I know it is even at this stage necessary to give information which is so obvious—though one would imagine we are certainly wasting time in Parliament, I would like to reply to the questions put by the hon. member for St. Lucy. He was at pains to point out the facilities offered at the Clinic where there is an X-ray service and the question of shifting some of the load of the Court cases there. I am surprised and alarmed that

after all that has been said of the hospital in recent years that the member for St. Lucy is still dabbling in any way with the functions of the Clinic. The Clinic, as you will appreciate and understand is more or less a preventive service and not a hospital service by any means; the X-ray equipment used at that institution is used for B.C.G. tests and heart conditions. To send a paying patient for that matter to the Enmore Health Centre would be violating the policy, principle and everything of the functions of that institution, and I am at a loss to learn why the hon. member for St. Lucy would elect to use that in discussion today. As you will appreciate, we have a paying service with the X-ray Department and apart from that, even with the out-patients' Department, we have an officer who would more or less do the screening. I do not know exactly what to say, but it is a sort of means test Department where one tries to find out whether a person can pay for the X-ray service, and more often than not, you will find that police cases are among these. The police are particularly anxious to have the necessary confirmation from the Doctors in charge and sometimes there is need for an X-ray.

The hon. junior member for St. John said he has never seen an X-ray in Court. This again was obvious. I am wondering in the name of heaven why he attempted to introduce such a thing knowing that the Court would not accept an X-ray; you can take an X-ray of Jack or Jill and print on it the name of Mary, Jane or Bernadette, so in these things you need the support of some authority at the Hospital. The difference between the Radiologist and the Radiographer is that the Radiographer is the person in that institution who handles the mechanism of that particular Department.

5.05 p.m.

It may be necessary in a particular case to have an X-ray of a person but that request would have to be made either by the doctor or by the Police; but the person is expected to pay for it and then it is on the part of the Radiologist to present the X-ray picture to the magistrate or the lawyer; therefore, there is no argument there at all. What the Hon. Premier did say, and it was correct to say, is that the demands of modern medicine and litigants who require examination pending court action continue to put increasing pressure on the services of the staff. You must bear in mind the growth in medical science. It may be difficult for a doctor to determine whether a patient is suffering from a particular disease or not and to make sure that his diagnosis is correct, he will refer the case to the Radiologist for an X-ray photograph. As can be seen from the statistics, there has been an increase from 12,032 cases in 1951 to 19,368 in 1957. It is true to say that during that period we have had an increase in the staff. Apart from the trained technicians we have a couple of ladies who serve in the X-ray Department but they have never had the opportunity of training and it is necessary that they should have some training.

I want to tell this Assembly now that in the near future we will have to come back here for two more assistants if you are thinking in terms of establishment of a new Hospital. Hon. members ought to understand that we would need at least two more of these assistants. If the training of these personnel would take a period of two years, I think hon. members ought to appreciate that for the next year or two, you will need another two assistants. I do not think I need say anything more on this matter, but I must repeat that I did not think it was necessary to have all this talk about this matter. However, I would like to assure hon. members that I would be happy to answer any other questions which any one asks.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 26) ORDER, 1958

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution:—
Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Estab-

Surely, you cannot have a post created in the Service and yet you have one man who has to act in two posts. It could not happen in any other territory than Barbados. I do feel that we should be able to get a reply from the Hon. Premier as to why is it that these things are left undone and if the Hon. Minister is not satisfied with them, we should be told by him that he is not satisfied and he is taking steps or has taken steps to remedy them.

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

THE CUSTOMS TARIFF (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a simple one. It seeks to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, so as to allow machinery for the purpose of manufacturing confectionery to come into the Island duty free. This principle has been adopted ever since we have had the confectionery people coming here. As hon. members will remember, when the Barbados Food Products was established in St. John, they applied for and were granted pioneer status. At the end of the life of the Pioneer Industries Act, it would mean that all machinery brought into the Island for this purpose would have to be paid for and as a result, the people who have taken over that firm have represented to us the necessity for allowing them to bring in such machinery duty free and that has been agreed to by the Government.

As you will see from the Objects and Reasons, the duty free concessions only extend to items bought from preferential sources. On those items which are bought from foreign sources the people will have to pay the difference between the duty free concessions which they would get if they had imported them from preferential sources and what they would pay as the general tariff; that is to say, the difference between the preferential and the general tariff.

Perhaps hon. members may be interested in a few figures. From the time in 1954 that these concessions were granted until 1956, the amount of machinery allowed in duty free cost us \$84,817. In other words, the duty which would have been collected on that machinery would have been \$84,817, but we are satisfied with that allowance because quite a lot of this manufactured stuff was exported. In 1952, the total exports were \$398,441; in 1953, they were \$2,252,857; in 1954, \$1,466,288. In 1955, it started to decline rapidly and it only amounted to \$846,281 and it dwindled from then on until 1957 when it only came to \$373,945. Of course, the reason for that is obvious because as soon as free sugar became available in larger supplies the necessity for the manufacture of these items in this country no longer existed to that extent. Sugar was easily obtainable in England and other parts of the world and manufacturers were able to manufacture these products from that end instead of Barbados.

I have mentioned that because everybody will remember the Wakefield business which really employed a large number of people here and which did a considerable amount of business. That was largely due to the fact that it was very difficult to get sugar at the time in those parts of the world, as I have mentioned. As soon as sugar became free, that factory has literally closed; therefore, the exports have reduced considerably.

I hardly think there is anything more which I can say at this stage, but if hon. members want to know of anything which I have in my possession as regards this matter I would be glad to answer.

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. Deputy Speaker, I think the time has come in view of these swift changes which have been taking place in trade and the emphasis which has been placed on these important matters that the Government should see the wisdom of setting up a Committee to examine such matters.

It has been drawn to my attention, and I think it has been drawn to the Government's attention too, that these things have an impact on employment. I will give you an example, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This week I am negotiating on behalf of people who work at the two foundries - the Barbados and the Central Foundry. Between the two of them, employ something like 250 people, but the serious state of affairs that exists is that you have workmen who have to pass an apprenticeship period approximating five years; and after that five years training, these men are placed in a labour market in the sense that when the sugar crop starts many of these people have to go home for long periods. Last year, some of these people were home an average of 29 weeks. This is a serious thing viewed from a long term basis. It may not appeal to the Ministers because these things do not affect them; but if you educate people in a trade, they should be able to earn their living by that trade. You send your son to learn a trade, and you find that after he has learnt it, it cannot give him the facilities of a proper living. It cannot give him the facilities as if he were a mason or a carpenter. What you are doing is preventing your young men from learning a trade. If I had a boy to send to learn a trade I would think twice before I sent him to something which would not give him permanent employment.

I think the Government should examine whether these people who are running the foundries are doing the work which they once had and whether they are doing work which they never did before. I understand that some of them are now manufacturing rollers which they use in the manufacture of sugar; and if they are doing a job which is likely to give employment to our people then you should examine it in the light of what type of concession you should give them. I think you should give them some sort of reward for doing these sort of things rather than to have men unemployed.
5.45 p.m.

The difficulty is that they cannot get the volume of work and many people import materials and say that they can get them at a cheaper rate. A junior workman at a Foundry starts off after five years at 35 cents an hour and the rate is 74 cents per hour at the top. I am of the opinion that trained workmen should not get less than 50 cents an hour after their training. If they have that as a problem to put before us, if you have them saying that they should get some concessions from the Government so as to make things easier for them, then that is something which you should examine. In Barbados we have to see that we have all the scope for all the pioneers and if there is anybody who will lose employment you will have to help him. I see that in Trinidad the Government has put capital in the business when it was known that the Angustura Company was going to operate in Bermuda. Trinidad has had trouble with the Telephone Company and now today I read in connection with the B.W.I.A., the matter of redundancy has attracted the attention of the Federal Government. We give our people subsidies and income tax concessions so as to keep them going.

I do not think you could say that a hotel is on a pioneer basis. I want to say, with all due deference to the hotel industry, that it has not got down to paying good wages. At Eastry House they can give an employee \$9 a week and say that people get tips. You can make lots of people and those who run the hotels get rich and the local people are not considered at all because they have not got any tips to give. The whole service in Barbados is relegated to the question as to how big a tip can be; but when you come to a workman who is working with his hands you should

investigate matters. As I understand it, that is a sort of difficult service all over the world, even in the United States of America. The hotel people have trouble in Miami. (ASIDES) If the people did not carry away some of the food here, I do not know what they would do. (Laughter). I would like the Government to investigate these things; a request has been made and I do not think you should give a deaf ear to that request.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the object of this Bill, according to the "Objects and Reasons", is to amend the First Schedule of the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, so as to remove the import duties on machinery for the manufacture of sugar confectionery imported from preferential sources and to reduce such duties under the general tariff from 20% to 10%. Now Mr. Deputy Speaker, I always thought that the purpose of an "Objects and Reasons" Clause in a Bill was to tell you the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill. What they have set out here is what is going to be the result of the passing of this bit of legislation. When we remove the duty on machinery for the manufacture of sugar confectionery, that will tell you that people will not have to pay any duties again. That is abundantly clear, but what we want to know is this: Does this not amount to an imposition on the taxpayers of this island? Every time some captain of industry manages to overwhelm the Government by his blandishments to reduce the duty on capital used goods such as machinery, it seems that the taxation has to be increased in some other department to some extent. Since this particular Government has been operating the finances of this country, we have had raid after raid depleting the sources of revenue under the guise of amendments to this Act. Never once had this House been treated to a statistical analysis of the effect of the importation of such capital used goods as machinery for the production of sweets or some other manufacture. We have never been treated to an analysis of the effect of this dispensation on the general unemployment level of this country. I say that they are purposely refraining from doing so because the only tangible effect of such a dispensation or granting of exemption from Customs duty is to leave money in the pockets of people out of this island, people who already have a lot of money, and relieve them of the responsibility of the economic financing of their projects. I want to make that abundantly clear. I am sure that you cannot recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a single occasion on which the real reason for adding to the steadily growing list of items which are exempted from Customs duty, has been advanced by a Minister of the Government on the floor of this House. There is one little word of three letters which will cover everything and that is the word "why". We want to know why do you want to do this. The "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill do not state anything more than could be logically argued in favour of the abolition of all customs duties and make Barbados a free port, as it were.

5.55 p.m.

This does not advance one single thing in respect of this particular industry which elevates it to a level of economic principle and which makes it over and above a special case for exemption. If you want free trade and if you do not want custom duties, abolish customs duties; but customs duties account for approximately 50% of our annual revenue, and if you go on whittling away from our customs revenue without the public being given any real reasonable explanation or any explanation at all as to why you are coming week after week into the House of Assembly and asking members to vote for a measure such as the one which is now before us, you cannot avoid the general public getting the feeling that this is personal legislation to assist not an industry, not employment, but a particular individual.

Now I would like to ask a couple of questions of the members of the Government. At whose instigation and by whose promptings was this measure introduced? Is there such a thing in the island as a confectionery industry? Is it an established or pioneer industry? Those are questions I would like to ask. Is there some entrepreneur going into this particular field of industrial activity? If he is going into this particular field, how does his potential increase in the gainfully occupied population in this island compare with the numbers who are already employed in that particular industry? When he establishes this particular

manufacturing concern, is it going to result in a diminution in the numbers employed in the other concerns, because competition is going to set in? Those are the kind of considerations we would like put before us.

Let me tell you what I know of the past history of the confectionery factory. A few years ago in the parish I have the honour to represent, in an abandoned sugar factory at Wakefield, there was established a confectionery industry called "Wakefield Products Limited". I happened to be a member of the Sugar Production and Export Control Board. Well, the purpose of establishing that particular industry in the parish of St. John was to export sugar in a diluted form out of Barbados to beat the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement and the importation by the Ministry of Food into the United Kingdom and the Rationing System in the United Kingdom. A lot of people in this island in the Legislative Council knew it and a lot of Barbadians knowing it decided to keep quiet, because what we were immediately concerned with was the fact that over 200 Barbadians, boys and girls in the rural districts, were going to be gainfully occupied and receive remuneration therefor. That was the paramount consideration in an island like Barbados where unemployment is the order of the day. Having successfully carried on that undertaking for a number of years, without any warning at all the employers folded up their tents and folded up their operations like the Arabs and silently stole away carrying everything with them which they could lay their hands on. The result is that in St. John 200 people were thrown into the open market to join the steadily growing industrial army of unemployment.

When you encourage people to set up an industry, you must have a certain amount of control. You are giving people exemption from Income Tax, exemption from customs duty and exemption from the importation of machinery; you are doing all these things. What guarantees and safeguards do we have on the other side that these particular ventures - I believe this particular undertaking was situated near a place called Venture in St. John - are not of mushroom growth and will disappear like mushrooms overnight, once the main object of the people setting them up have been accomplished? What safeguards does the Government have from the person or persons who now want us to deplete our annual revenue by perhaps a considerable amount by asking for exemption from the payment of customs duties, that they are going to establish an industry which will be lasting and which will employ a reasonably sized labour force? If you are going to allow a man to import machinery into this island to make sweets - to use the Barbadian term - which, far from being labour-demanding will be labour-saving, what good are you doing the country? You are depriving the Treasury of revenue, two or three people may be employed, but the overall effect on the economy of the island is tenebrious rather than salutary. Those are the things we are worried about. I do not think it is fair to the public to say that the object of this Bill is to exempt machinery from customs duty; that could never be the object of the Bill. The object of the Bill must be either to help somebody set up an industry to provide employment or to help somebody set up an industry to make a profit because they can be in this particular field of development. Who was behind this? Has Government got a systematic programme like Mr. Huskinson in the middle of the Eighteenth Century? In 1830 after the Reformation, Mr. Huskinson when at the head of the England Revenue Department had a systematic programme of free tariff based on the will of the electorate of England that England should have free trade. Is this one of the items exempted from customs tariff because we are adopting a free-trade policy in Barbados? If that were so, there would be no need for explanation, because it would be a question of which is next on the list. In one year Mr. Huskinson reduced by 139 the commodities in England; he knew what he was doing because it was demanded by the people and the Government put him there to do that, because England was over-producing as a result of the economic effect upon industrial revolution. All that is past history; all about the Cornwallis is past history; but we have no such programme in Barbados. As a matter of fact, we have to try, in view of the increasing cost of the Federal Government, by every strategy

that we can, to increase customs duty, because a certain part of these customs duties - I do not mean the rate, I mean the volume of customs duty - will be raked off by the Federal Government. So far from whittling down on customs duties we should be trying to increase, looking for loopholes and sealing them off and trying to stop the drain out of the Treasury.

6.05. p.m.

Every time you exempt somebody from customs duty you make him a gift of that amount of money. I know a little more of industry than some members of Government. I will challenge any industrialist to come and argue with me if he is setting up an industry, say, one in which the capital equipment is going to cost \$100,000, if he is really concerned and is so optimistic of this industry that he is going to invest that amount to amortize over a period of seven years, that is to say, that his capital is written off in that period by his profits so to speak, to say that he is really concerned about your giving him 10% duty allowance on that equipment, because anybody who is thinking in terms of these figures would know that this allowance could not make much difference. Of course, some industries take a lot more capital investment than that amount. A good cement factory would take a capital investment of something like \$14 million. Do you want to tell me that people who are thinking in terms of capital investment of that magnitude are really concerned, except for personal acquisitiveness - that is to say, they would be glad to grab every cent they can get away with - as to be so critical over whether they should get a marginal differential of \$10,000 on that machinery, and that would mean the difference in their setting up of the industry? The duty is 10%. Let us call it 12%. You pay 10% and then 10% of that 10%, that is, for people who are importing machinery outside of the Imperial Tariff area. I want you to consider seriously whether you think a capitalist, that is to say, a man who has money to invest, although he may not have subscribed all the money himself, is really concerned when he is setting up a business of that magnitude that this concession would make a difference as to whether he should establish it or not.

The sugar industry was established as well as all of the other industries in this colony without the consideration of this marginal difference of 10%. Do you think that they would consider this as something vital to success or disaster? When you pull this whole thing down, what does it mean? It means that certain people feel that they can get away with murder; therefore, if they can persuade the Government that they should not pay any duty at all, certainly, they would do so and get away with it. In the capitalists' society it is a fact that the profit motive is part of the consideration. Some of these people who now profess to be friends of members of the Government under the pretence that they are interested in employment in Barbados tell them that they are milking themselves and are going into risky enterprises so as to make employment for the people; but in effect, they are going into it so as to make a profit for themselves and the question of employment of the people has nothing to do with it. Nobody can say that 10% is something extravagant when you are thinking in terms of \$100,000. Suppose you were not thinking in terms of \$100,000, suppose it is a small business man, in whose name so many sins are committed. He has only \$5,000 to invest and he can get the machinery for \$5,000. Ten percent of \$5,000 is \$500 and 10% of \$500 is \$50. If the small businessman is the person in whose name this sin is to be perpetrated, do you think that this \$550 is going to mean to him either survival or extinction? Two swallows do not make a summer and one man does not make an industry. In Barbados, we have already established a confectionery factory. That factory has been operating for some number of years. Since we are only now amending the Customs Tariff Act to give them this exemption, it shows that there were people who were able to establish a factory without asking the Government to deplete the Treasury resources of customs duty. As soon as you start making this type of concession to capitalists and you are not allowing them to run on a basis of competition, they will always want this concession. They always talk of free enterprise, but what they mean by free enterprise is that they must be free to pay the lowest possible wages. But when it comes to guiding their business, they do not want that kind of freedom; they want the Government to use its special

legislative powers to put them in position. You take the market as it is and the existing laws as they are and you trade. That is what is meant by free enterprise.

What these people have decided to do is this: they say that due to the growth of the constitutional powers of the Government and the enlargement of the franchise they can no longer do what the Government can do; therefore, they say: "Let us now agree with a certain level of social services, but at the same time wrest certain concessions from them." They say: "Let them have the simple office of Government and all the tacklings attached to it; but let us wrest something from them under the name of employment and then we would be in just as good a position as we were before because the Government can do things under that guise which we could not do if we were in control of the destinies of this Island." If you examine the history of the Governments which control the Legislature and the economy of this Island before the coming into the office of the present Government, you will find that there are very few, if any, Bills of this kind on the Statute Book because if they dared to do what this Government is doing in this respect, they would be accused of corruption and feathering their own nest. You can see the argument. You make the poor taxpayers pay for the equipping of their industries and they still are not paying proper wages. When you have a minimum wage rate for Clerks of \$7.50 a week, that is ridiculous. The minimum becomes the maximum wage. What I am saying is that they are wresting concession after concession from the Government under the name of employment. They say that they want to employ people.

6.15 p.m.

They are never called upon to provide statistics to show how many people they are going to employ or how it will affect the revenue and if we get Bill after Bill of that nature brought down, we must be on our guard. The volume of employment provided directly or indirectly by that concession being made, justifies the granting of the concession; but to come into this Chamber and say merely that the object of the Bill is to remove the customs duty, you are insulting the intelligence of members of this House and that of the electorate. That is not the object of the Bill at all. How then can you criticise us for getting extremely suspicious as to the *bona fides* of a Measure of this kind? If you are afraid to say that you have been approached by overseas or local investors who have assured you that they are going to provide work for our people - Wakefield Factory has just thrown 200 people out of employment by its being closed down - and if this particular firm will take up in the slack in employment and fill in the vacuum created by the departure of the St. John Sweet Factory, that is an explanation; but you merely say that the object of the Bill is to remove the customs duty. What are they concealing?

Mr. Chairman - I am sorry - Mr. Deputy Speaker. You sit in the Chair so composedly that I keep referring to you as Mr. Chairman. (Laughter) Anyway, I will not tax your restraint for much longer, but I do say this, that if we go on like this, accepting amendments to the Customs Tariff Act without any fuller explanation than the one which has been given us today, it means that we will have surrendered our sacred duty and right to watch with care the finances of this island. Every such concession is a new burden on you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and on me and also on the taxpayers of this island. If we make this concession and increase the taxation on cigarettes, beer, matches, rum or whatever it might be, by halfpenny, it seems that we are over-taxing the people. That is the logic of the situation as far as I can see it; it means that we are collecting too much taxation.

At this stage, I will refrain from saying anything more because we are completely in the dark; I will give the members of the Government or the Minister of Trade an opportunity to develop his argument in favour of this Bill, and not merely to criticise the Opposition and say that we always do this and we always do that. I will always get up and open my mouth every time that something like this comes before this Chamber unless I am satisfied that it is a *bona fide* case. The danger is that once we start granting concessions in this or in that branch of industry, how can we reasonably refuse anybody who is importing any kind of machinery into Barbados even if he is only employing

himself to operate that machinery? The next thing is that we will be getting jack planes and compass saws and scrubbing brushes and so on coming in free because the definition will be so elastic that there would be no one commodity coming into Barbados which would be subject to Customs duty except, perhaps, gifts for the poor. That may come to pass. I am suggesting that with every exemption of this kind a special case must be made out; you must put the material facts to the members of the House and to the Public. It is not good enough to say that the object of the Bill is to remove the customs duty.

I sincerely hope that the Hon. Minister of Trade will tell us a little more, if he knows anything more, about the case because if I cannot get a satisfactory explanation or sufficient statistical information from the members of the Government, I am very much afraid that I cannot support this Bill. If I can have that information and I am satisfied about it, then the Bill can have my support. Perhaps they will say that they do not need my support, but if they have sufficient numbers, let them get it through. No attention might be paid to what I have said but I have sufficient in me to stick to my principles in legislation of this nature.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Government spokesman would let us know if the Government gave any consideration, before bringing forward this legislation, to the question of removing the import duties on equipment for Science Laboratories in non-profit making schools. I understand that certain applications have been made for the importation of equipment for the Science Laboratories of such institutions which are definitely non-profit-making institutions like the Ursuline Convent, the St. Gabriel's School, the Presentation College, the Seventh Day Adventist Schools and so on. These schools function for the benefit of the children and the import duty which they have to pay for their equipment sometimes makes it impossible for them to import all the equipment they require for the teaching of science subjects for which they have teachers qualified to teach.

6.25 p.m.

If Government in dealing with a business enterprise like this, a purely commercial undertaking, decided to seek the sanction of the legislature to remove import duty on machinery for the manufacture of confectionery, one would certainly expect them to give consideration before whereby they would relieve and exempt from such duties matters for educational use such as various items of laboratory equipment and apparatus which is absolutely imperative in order that the Science Laboratories could be adequately equipped and the various science subjects could be properly taught in these schools which do not make a profit. They are not Government aided schools, but strictly non-profit-making schools and have no great source of income. Of course, in this case relief is being proposed for a manufacturer of sugar confectionery who is a businessman, and I would see no reason, if you gave him relief, why you did not come for the case of schools which are running without a profit and which are the businesses of the people who founded and run them. Among those schools which I mentioned before, we know there are institutions purely running without making a profit; they lead a hard hand to mouth existence all the time and are only functioning to take people's children for whom there would not be room for that type of education with the very limited number of secondary schools which this Government has provided.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to reply to the first point made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter relative to the laying off of persons employed at the Foundries. I think he said in the course of his remarks that some of these people were laid off for so long as 29 weeks in a year, and of course, he suggested that something could be done by way of allowing these Foundries to bring in some material duty free from which they could make certain articles which would keep those employed in the work maybe throughout the year. He claims to represent the workers. (Mr. WALCOTT: Claims? It is a fact.) I am yet to be convinced of that. He claims to be representing the workers and if that is so, I am sure he knows very well indeed that that is not the cause. The cause is largely due to the fact that the majority of these

factories today which hitherto used to get work done by the Foundries have established their own machinery and plant for doing certain repairs and things of that sort. That is why in the near future, quite a considerable number of these people will be laid off, because, as I said, the work is done at the factories which have established machinery and plant for carrying out their necessary repairs and also for making parts. I am sure that this Government will give favourable consideration to anything which tends to produce employment for people in this island. As a matter of fact, we are now abused in this Bill for doing exactly what we are often accused of not doing. Whenever some of the members on the other side get up to speak about industrialisation, they accuse Barbados for not pushing ahead with industrialisation, they accuse Barbados for lagging behind the times and allowing Trinidad, Jamaica and even British Guiana to get ahead, and they accuse us for not bringing our legislation up-to-date so far as pioneer industry is concerned, and also legislation similar to this to provide duty free machinery and things of that sort which exist in these other territories to attract capital there. The very thing for which we are criticised at times is exactly what we have been doing in the past and what we are doing today only on a larger scale.

Only recently, Sir, we passed a Hotel Aids Act and also a Pioneer Industries Act and in that Pioneer Industries Act we tried to bring it as up-to-date as those existing in Trinidad and Jamaica, and I am sure that in so far as the Hotel Aids Act is concerned, members will have seen that despite what caused quite a lot of confusion here, quite recently in a sister territory, Trinidad, a Bill was passed to increase the number of years for Income Tax exemption from seven years to ten years. Now I only mentioned that by the way to show how they are looking out and encouraging capital in the island in order to provide employment.

Now, Sir, if we take a good look at concessions which were granted in so far as duty free items are concerned, you will see for example machinery for manufacturing sugar; that has always been allowed to come into the island duty free, and I think that industry is well established; the principle has not changed. We have allowed and hope ever to allow this machinery to come in for the sugar industry free. I would like to know the difference between the sugar industry and a bye-product of sugar which is "sweets". In addition, Sir, you have rum, another bye-product. We have always allowed machinery to come in duty free for the manufacture of rum. We have something which is not a bye-product of sugar, but which appears to be very useful to many people - not to me, of course especially in these later days - and that is tobacco; that comes in duty free. Machinery for manufacturing ice comes in duty free; products derived from copra come in duty free; all these things are duty free so far as the industries are concerned.

6.35 p.m.

Now we get to the public utilities. The Electric Company has a franchise which has been extended to it from the time of its establishment. It has been allowed to bring in free of duty all its equipment, machinery and everything for the manufacturing and the carrying on of the company. As I have pointed out when I was introducing the Bill, the confectionery plants had pioneer status. The Pioneer Industries Act died in 1954, but even if it had not died at that time, the time for duty free concessions would be passed by now and all this Bill seeks to do is to allow machinery - not material - to come into the island duty free. That is the policy of the Government.

Now, these things are asked for, it automatically reduces the revenue and in order to make up that revenue the taxpayers are asked to pay more money. That not only is the height of ignorance but it is also misleading and silly because if you do not allow these items to come in duty free you are not going to have any of these industries established. You will not get these industries established; you will not get the products produced not the people employed. You either grant these concessions or no plants will be established. The plant to which we made reference is one which I think is being resurrected. It came into this island and it had

all these things brought in duty free. The plant at Edgehill also had duty free concessions and that is still producing sweets today. I am saying that were it not for these duty concessions, these plants would not have been established in Barbados; because if we fail to give these concessions, industrialists would leave us out and go to Trinidad or British Guiana where they can get them; so the only means of encouraging industries in this colony is to grant them concessions similar to those granted in the other countries and I will say that in some instances it may even be necessary to go further in order to get them to come into this island.

But, Sir, I am accustomed to hearing the hon. junior member for St. John. No doubt, whenever he opens his mouth, he tries to measure everything by his yardstick. He always has the most uncharitable imputations to make, particularly to members on this side, but I can assure him that anything nasty which he says, as he does regularly..

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I object to the Hon. Minister inferring to my statements as nasty. There is not a single occasion on which the hon. member gets up that he does not get down to the gutter. If he can see anything nasty in that, then there must be something itchy in what he is doing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is objecting to the remark "nasty".

Hon. M. E. COX: I withdraw the word, Sir. I like to be parliamentary. What did he say? He said that we get requests by the blandishments of certain people. What does he mean by that? (Mr. BARROW: You do not know; you do not know the King's English so well.) I know as much as to make you look foolish and silly and to embarrass you at any time you bring a case against me. Mr. Speaker, every time the hon. member opens his mouth he accuses this Government of dishonesty, of corruption and offering bribes. Tonight he insinuates that we are doing this for a particular person and for a particular object. This principle to which we are adhering in this Bill is one which has been carried out all along, not only in Barbados, but throughout the area so as to allow certain machinery and plant to come into the various countries duty free. As a matter of fact, we have been trying to maintain the preference; that is to say, the person who imports his machinery from a foreign source will have to pay the difference between the preferential tariff and the general tariff. In some countries, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these items are imported free whether they are from a general or a preferential source. However, we are still maintaining our preference and our position with Canada and the United Kingdom because we say that we will allow them to bring in items from preferential sources duty free; but if they want to go outside and import them from foreign sources they must pay the difference between the general and the preferential sources. We are accused because we have done this. It is the very thing that they have criticised us from time to time of not doing.

They got on platforms and shouted to high heaven saying: "Look! We have all these unemployed people here and we would not industrialise." Now that we are doing something to encourage industrialists to come here and establish industries and not only to establish them but also with a view to employing people and to training our people so that they can go abroad and get jobs and work shoulder to shoulder with people who are skilled, we are accused.

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

Sir, can I or anybody ever satisfy the hon. junior member for St. John? I will not attempt to because he is insatiable.

However, Sir, I think I have explained the position. We are doing exactly what has been done already and what has always been the principle, that is to encourage industries in this country. This is not for any particular individual. This is of general application and it is immaterial to me whether the hon. junior member for St. John votes for it or not. That is his business.

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 on the Bill. Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

The two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in fixing the Order Paper

Mr. WALCOTT: There is another Bill on the Order Paper.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Government is not prepared to do any more business tonight.

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 17th February, 1959 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 17th February, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.55 p.m.