THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th February, 1959.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS *(Speaker);* Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, *(Leader of the Opposition);* Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., *(Premier);* Hon. M. E. COX, *(Minister of Trade Industry and Labour);* His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., *(Deputy Speaker);* Hon. F. E. MILLER, *(Minister of Social Services);* Hon. Hon. D. D. GARNER, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries);* Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting held on the 10th February have been printed and circulated, and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

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

PAPERS LAID

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

An account of the transactions in Rum in the several Districts of the Island, for the quarter ended 31st December, 1958.

Barbados Statistical Service - Quarterly Digest of Statistics No. 8 - December, 1958.

Report of the Commission of Enquiry into certain aspects of the administration of the Vestry of St. Lucy.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Report on the activities of the Department of Science and Agriculture for the year 1958.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to place the sum of $45,761 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1958-59, No. 43, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of $454 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. 44 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of $15,050 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. 45, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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 to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER:

To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Water:-

How many standposts have been erected in each parish during each of the years 1957 and 1958 with sanction of the Waterworks Department?

Also,

To enquire of the Honourable Minister for Health:-

Whether a member of the Medical Staff of the General Hospital is required to be on duty in the Casualty Department twenty-four hours of each day?

2 Is the Minister aware that on occasions, on arrival at the said Casualty Department, patients may have to await for periods exceeding forty minutes before the Medical Officer allegedly on Casualty Duty puts in an appearance at that Department to examine waiting patients?

3 Will the Ministry take such steps as must ensure that the Medical Officer allegedly on duty at the Casualty Department is always at a moment's call, unless and until relieved by another Medical Officer?

Also,

To enquire of the Minister for Local Government:-

Whether the Minister is aware that grave confusion and consternation have arisen amongst recipients of "Notices of rateable value of hereditaments inserted on Draft List", issued from the Department of Inland Revenue:

2 Whether Government will forthwith instruct the said

Department to give the Public full and lucid explanation of the meaning and implications of the substance of the said notices of rateable value of hereditaments, with special emphasis on the relationship between the rateable value of hereditaments, as stated in such notices and the principles of taxation of such hereditaments by virtue of Local Government Act, 1954-51?

3 Will Government cause such instructions to be given over Barbados Rediffusion and published in every Newspaper of the Local Press without delay?

12.25 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER:

To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Health:-

Is it true that during this year there have been cases when at Barbados General Hospital, more than one patient has been allocated to the same bed at the same time?

2. If the answer to above is "yes", (a) on how many occasions has such occurred, (b) what is the maximum number of patients ever allocated to one bed, (c) is there a shortage of beds in this island?

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Mr. HOLDER APPOINTED TO ACT AS CHAIRMAN

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. James be appointed to act as Chairman during the temporary absence of the Chairman.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

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

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1958-59 No. 41

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, as hon. members will see from the Addendum, this amount of $130 to be voted for the extension of the runway has really been found necessary through a slight error in calculation by people who are supposed to be very accurate. As hon. members will see, this bit of land which was acquired was first calculated at 12.3 acres, but the more accurate calculation would be 12.36 acres. The amount of land which was acquired was 538,594 square feet. This amount at $2,160 per acre makes the purchase price $26,697.60 or a difference of $129.60 in favour of the owners. The amount was at first calculated at $25,568. I therefore, ask the House to vote this amount of $130 in this connection.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, there is no objection to the passing of this Resolution, but time and time again, I have to refer in this Chamber to Resolutions coming before us which mention the phrase "due to an oversight". Now, today, we have something slightly different and that is, that the amount should have been calculated more accurately.

Everybody can make mistakes, but too many mistakes seem to be made in the Government Headquarters. I am not referring now to mistakes of policy because this is not the time or place to refer to that. I mean mistakes of this sort. When there are so many people to do the job, certainly, it is unsatisfactory to refer to oversights and miscalculations. That is my only point.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59 No. 42

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of $7,473. It is an omnibus Resolution and I will deal with it Head by Head. The first Head is Head XIII - Legislature - Item 24, Reporting, for which the sum of $450 is required. I think hon. members will remember that the Reporter of the Other Place was due a slight adjustment in salary which was eventually agreed to and that amount had to be taken from the item for Reporting. In consequence of that, this amount which comes today before us for reporting is found necessary to carry on the work of the Legislature until the 31st March.

I beg to move that Head XIII - stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, there is no general objection to paying the Reporters for the work they have to do, but there is public objection that the reporting in the Legislature is such that you have to wait months and months, almost years and years, before you can get copies of the Report which has been done for this Legislature.

I have been in here long enough to know that we have made changes and these changes were made with a view to speeding up and making the work of getting a Hansard more efficient. Apart from having the records for history, members who are at present engaged in the Legislature would like to see the Debates and they should be printed and given to us at a time when we can draw to the Speaker's attention obvious errors. As a matter of fact, I have drawn an error to his attention in which was reported under my name the whole speech of another member. But the fact remains that it had happened so long before it had come out into print that there was no use making a correction then. That is an instance of the sort of unsatisfactory state of affairs which we have.

What is a sad reflection is this: you have a so-called Labour Government in power. You have men in here of a different political complexion and in some other instances of another pigmentation. That can only make people believe that the people in here cannot run business or do things well because hitherto these things were done well.

12.35 p.m.

Hitherto, the debates were done in a more efficient manner. The reporting was much better - I do not mean the reporting in the context of the quality of the reporting, but I mean the reporting in the sense that the debates were given to hon. members more quickly than how we are getting them today. Today when I have to go into a constituency I should like to quote what somebody has said in this Chamber as evidence of what he said. I like to take speeches and read them word for word so that anything I say a person can have as a verbatim report from the Hansard of this House. I feel that the time has come when we shall have to voice our dissatisfaction in this matter. There are lots of other things about which I could speak which do not apply to the Reporters; but you have this business being dealt with in a slipshod manner and it seems to be all right. However, as long as I am a member of this Chamber such things cannot pass in the interest of the public.

I should like to see the day come when I make a speech and at least I have it in my possession in a month's time. Which hon. member can dispute with any accuracy anything which he says in a debate which has taken place last year or two years ago? These reports will soon be meaningless if they are submitted to the Chamber long after some of us are dead and in our graves, and people will be quoting you about something which you will not be in a position to contradict. The whole system should be made up-to-date so that you can have what you are paying Reporters to do. There is no need to have these Reporters taking verbatim

notes if you are going to have the debates six years after they have taken place; you may as well have notes taken and given to hon. members for them to read next day. If an hon. member sees the report of his speech taken last year he cannot say that it is a correct report. It is not always the fault of the Reporter; the Reporter must have reported me when I made that speech but when it was printed it appeared under the name of the hon. senior member for St. Philip instead of under my name. If you are doing things from the point of view of business, they should be done in such a way that it would be a model for anybody in the community to follow.

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

HEAD XXIV - BARBADOS REGIMENT

Head XXIV – Barbados Regiment – was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, in consequence of adjustments made in the rates paid to volunteers and instructors attending parades, from 60 cents to $1.00 in the case of volunteers, and from $1.00 to $1.40 in the case of instructors for each parade attended - these rates come into effect from the 1st April, 1958 - the total sum asked for under this Head is $7,023.00 in order to give effect to this change. Lower down in the note reference is made to the Rates of Pay (Amendment) Regulations, 1958. I think that that is the next Order on the Order Paper with which we will deal in a few minutes.

Another matter is that formerly volunteers were asked to attend a certain number of parades in order to qualify for a fee, and it is intended under these new rates that that requirement be removed and that the volunteers be paid for each parade they attend.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what is meant by the words "in consequence" or if the Hon. Premier means what he has said. You are passing a Resolution to increase something for which you do not have a Resolution to increase. "In conseqüence of that" would mean that you have passed the Resolution. The position now is that you are passing this Resolution; they have put money in this Resolution before they agree to pass the other Resolution. We now have a Resolution with money and the Premier says that this is in consequence of something which is to come. It is true that the Premier is never very careful about language and it does not make any difference to him. We understand what he means but we would like him to say precisely what he intends to say.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am not responsible for the hearing of hon. members. I said that in consequence of the increased rates proposed to be paid to volunteers.....

Mr. WALCOTT: We have not passed any increased rates; we have a Resolution here which is Order No. 3 and this Resolution cannot be in consequence of that other Resolution because we have not got to Order No. 3 yet. Could Order No. 1 be in consequence of Order No. 3?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, I quite agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter on the procedural point, but as to the substance of the Resolution, I welcome the proposed increase. The fee for attending parades has been so low in the past and has existed for such a long time that it would not be amiss if the minimum amount be made 5 shillings instead of $1.00 which is proposed for attendance at these parades. The amount could easily be a little more with full justice to the people concerned. As a matter of fact, I would like to throw out the suggestion to the Hon. Premier that it would be a good gesture to intimate to the Transport Board that volunteers in uniform attending parades should be allowed to travel from the City on the Transport Board's buses free of charge instead of having to encroach on their small allowance to pay bus fares from the City to the Drill Hall and back. If you are going to the Hastings Road for a drive, Mr. Acting Chairman, you will see volunteers or soldiers walking up or down the hill to and from a parade because they cannot afford to pay the amount of bus fare.

12.45 p.m.

It would be a good gesture which would not cost the Transport Board any appreciable loss of revenue, and I feel that the Minister of Transport should take it up with the Board that when they are going in uniform in the afternoon from the City to the Drill Hall, they should be given passes, or their uniform on that particular afternoon, which is well known to all of us in this island, should be sufficient pass to entitle them to a ride without payment of fare.

The question that Head XXIV – Barbados Regiment stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for $7,473 do now pass.

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

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

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

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

Order No. 2 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 2 and to take Order No. 3 as the next Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier is asking leave to postpone Order No. 2 and to take Order No. 3 as the next Order of the day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

THE BARBADOS REGIMENT (RATES OF PAY) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1958.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is to give effect to the $7,473 just passed in the Supplementary Estimates. As set out here, the increased rates of pay have been recommended as a result of the increase in out-of-pocket expenses incurred by members of the Regiment, e.g bus fares, cleaning materials, etc. The rates have been increased from 60¢ to $1.00. We know that these items have advanced in cost, and consequently, the volunteers have to pay more to get ready to go on these parades.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to move the second reading of a Bill further to amend the Rate of Interest Act, 1754.

RATE OF INTEREST (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Rate of Interest Act was considered during the last Session. The principle was agreed and passed to increase the rate from 6% to 7%, but the amendments which now appear before us have nothing to do with that principle; it is just a result of legal verbiage.

When the Act was referred to the Solicitors of C.D.C

on this side, they agreed to what the Government had submitted in that Bill, and they considered it all right, accepted it, and it was passed in this House. When this Bill was referred to the advisers of C.D.C. in England, they thought that the safeguards were not enough and proposed further safeguards in that Bill, and when the safeguards were submitted to those on this side, they felt, and I think they still feel, that there were quite enough safeguards in the previous Bill. Nevertheless, Sir, if we want to go on with expansion in this island, Government feels that these amendments which have been suggested here should be accepted, and consequently they are now presented to the Legislature.
12.55 p.m.

The amendments, Sir, are as follows:-

Subsection (1) of section two of the Rate of Interest Act, 1754, is amended (a) by inserting in the proviso thereto, immediately after the word "contract," the words "judgment, bond, assurance, debenture, debenture stock or security;" and (b) by inserting immediately after the word "made" in the said proviso the words "given, granted, issued or created."

As I have said, Sir, it was a difference of opinion between the legal advisers on the two sides of the Atlantic and the Government says that there is no harm in accepting these amendments.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I was not in this Chamber when the amendment to this Act was made; therefore, I think I am free to speak on it now. It is true that the Government has a habit of coming to the Legislature and the public with measures without giving you any information on them.

In the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, it is stated: "Since the enactment of the amending Act, an interested corporation outside Barbados has requested certain amendments to the Act without which it is not prepared to lend money which is urgently needed in the Island. The amendments which are purely of a legal character and do not involve any change in principle are therefore sought to be effected by this Bill."

One would have thought that coming to the Legislature with an amending Bill for which you want to get approval and in which you said that it was because we need money in Barbados, that at least hon. members would have been told what you need this money in Barbados for. The Hon. Premier said that Colonial Development Corporation needs this money. Do we know why C.D.C. wants this money? If this Bill was discussed in the House of Commons, could you see Mr. Macmillan discussing it and saying that it was necessary because an interested party wanted to borrow money without telling the House who was the interested party and how much money the party wanted? You do not know what company in Barbados needs this money or what it is for. I understand from one of my colleagues in the House that this is needed by the C.D.C. for the purpose of making a loan to the Barbados Light and Power Company.

Sir, it is true that when it comes to finance and matters of that nature, it has been regarded in Barbados that those matters are not generally matters for poor people to discuss; therefore, as the majority of the people in the Legislature today are people of humble means and by no means rich financially, it has been regarded that these are things which should not be discussed in Parliament. However, I would like to say that when you enter this House as a member, I think it is your business to pay attention to every matter that comes here in order that you can give adequate representation to the people who sent you here. We should know more of the Colony's financial position in order to know if we can grant a concession, whatever it is, to anyone.

The net result is this: if this money is needed for the Electric Company and they have to borrow it from the C. D. C. at a higher rate of interest, it means that the people in Barbados who are consuming electricity would have to pay more rates for electricity because the higher rate of interest at which this company will get it from C.D.C. would mean higher operational charges, and that would mean that this Utility Company would be putting up a request to the Public Utilities Board for a higher rate on the charges for electricity. If that is so, can we not know how much money is required? Are there any possibilities of this Government or anybody in this Island lending this company that money if the rates of interest are so much above what we regard as normal rates? I take the broad view. If it is electricity, I take the firm view that there is no point in allowing C.D.C. to make a loan to this country at a rate of interest which would result in an increase to the consumer. I say that because there are people in this Island who are obliged to use electricity; therefore, the consumption of electricity must be looked at in the normal context and must be looked at in the light that you have moved into a different economic group from the one you are accustomed to live in and that you are dependent on it for the minimum necessities of life. Life in this age cannot be regarded as a life of luxury when you are called upon to consume electricity.

Sir, as I have said, I would like to know what are the financial implications of this Bill in order that C.D.C. may make this loan. Have you any money at your disposal that you can make the loan at a cheaper rate? Is it wise or profitable to do so? I am gradually coming to this view as regards Public Utilities. If a Public Utility is functioning efficiently, but its efficiency is at such a cost that it becomes burdensome for you to pay for the service you are getting from it, then it is in your interest to subsidise it to keep it at such a level where it would be of benefit to the community. If I may give an example, if gas is regarded as something vital to the community and it has to use coal to keep it operating but it is costing you much to get coal out of the bowels of the earth, then you should give a subsidy towards getting the coal to be used for that service because by so doing you are giving the community something to live on.

Barbados is 166 square miles and up to now it is still not properly electrified. I say this. If the purpose of this Bill is to allow the C.D.C. the opportunity of bringing in money to make a loan to the Barbados Light and Power Company, the Trade Union to which I have the honour to belong is at present making negotiations with that company and it means that these are some of the things which are at present affecting the wages in this community, because this company is using this same very thing as an argument why they cannot pay more money to its workers. They are saying they have to borrow money and the higher rate of interest at which they have to borrow it is a reflection on what they can pay to the workers.

There are still thousands of people without proper light in Barbados, that is to say, without the use of electricity: and anything which can foster the further development of electricity anyone would be in favour of having; but the financial ramifications of this matter are something of which we should know something. Sometime ago, when we went to the British Government to get some money, it was said to us that there was enough money in Barbados lying idly which could be used. I do not know what the financial position of the Government is today or what is the surplus over last year's estimates, nor do I know what is the amount of money that is required by the Electric Company; but I feel, if this is a development which would be of benefit to the people - and electric power is something which should be kept as low as possible in order to help industries - then if Government can make this loan, it would mean a saving in the interest rate and if this company can get the loan it wants at a lower rate of interest, it would mean that the charges for electricity would bear some relationship to the amount of money this company has to pay out.

The other serious thing about this matter on which I have to comment is that the Government has been pressed by some people to change this Rate of Interest Act of 1754. This came about because the Bank of England rates went up to the astronomical figure of 7 percent but today it has come back down to 5 percent. The hon. junior member for

St. John spoke in here some time ago on this matter. The difference between Barbados and the United Kingdom is this. The Labour Government in England in 1955 did something which if this Labour Government of Barbados was in the same position it would not have done, that is to say, the Labour Government in England nationalised the Bank of England and in that way, they brought money under the control of the Government. That is the reason why we find, when the bank rates fluctuate, there is not anything like the hand of the Almighty God in it, but it is purely a matter which the Government in power has a hand in and which it does in order to stabilise the country. They do that in the manipulation of the currency rate. Well, the Socialist Government did not use the manipulation of the currency rate.
1.05 p.m.

But different philosophies are at work. The local financiers who have money to invest would like Barbados to remove this figure and all it means is that if the interest rates are higher for the service which you have to get, therefore it is bound, as night follows day, to increase the cost of living for what you have to use. If you have higher interest rates to pay, obviously these things would be reflected in the charges. This amendment gives you the opportunity of having this advantage, if you have the money from outside; but if you have the money locally, you do not get that advantage. I do not believe the financiers in Barbados are angels and if they find that by some stockbroker - if I had £100,000 for investment in Barbados, I would be restricted to 5%, but if people outside can lend Barbados money, all it means is that the money can be diverted into other channels and come back into Barbados with a higher rate of interest. This is something to make people dishonest and to make financiers look for avenues to get more money. If any of these financiers have money for investment and they feel that projects are going up in Barbados and they know that outside capital is likely to get a higher rate of interest, they will be able to avail themselves of it. This is not an aspect on the basis of saying that you should change the whole Act so that people can charge whatever interest they like; this is something which calls for more explanation.

I am of the opinion that instead of having money lying idle in Barbados and not getting any substantial rate of interest, it is better to utilise some of the funds you have. I am bold enough to say that this Government today - and I challenge the Financial Secretary or anybody else to say that there is not enough money available to the Government of Barbados; but if the Electric Company is a project which is worthwhile developing it should be able to get development on the basis of a loan. If you have money, what is the point of sending it outside without making use of it? Some people like to borrow money and keep their own, but when you borrow money you still owe away that money. If you have $3.00 and you want to borrow a hundred dollars you get it, but if you have $3,000 there is no sense in borrowing $100. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter on which we should be given a lot more information as to what the outside sources want to use for development so that the public is aware that when we pass these things we know what they are. When a man who is not elected asks anything in the Other Place, the Leader of the Government in the Other Place will say: "I will seek the information for you," if he does not have it; but the position with that Party - and I see that one of them is smiling - is that they need not answer any question and we cannot do anything. Their idea is that whatever we ask they do not have to answer. Well, anybody who has not got any manners need not say "Good morning" to anybody who speaks to him. It only shows that you are not fit to occupy the position which you are occupying.

It is quite true that on simpler matters dealing with medicine the Premier cannot or is not able to deal with them as adequately as you would think a medical man should deal with them; therefore, in dealing with matters relating to finance, you would not expect him to deal with them adequately; but we have this infliction that when you have financial matters to deal with, the Premier always seems to be at sea. I have to make it clear for the record that when matters of this kind come here we need more information than what we are given in the "Objects and Reasons" like this which states that since the enactment of the amending Act, an interested corporation outside of Barbados has requested certain amendments to the Act without which it is not prepared to lend money which is urgently needed in the island. We would like to know whether this interested corporation outside Barbados is engaged in having development for this purpose. I think we have the right to know these things.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member who has just sat down did not hear what the Premier said because I think that in mentioning an interested corporation, he mentioned the Colonial Development Corporation. As you know, Sir, I had my say on this Bill when it came here on the last occasion. I am of the same opinion now as I was then. I know that this is a very touchy thing and it is difficult for one to make up one's mind on this subject. What I am worried about is if the Government has sufficient information or whether they have paid enough attention to this matter. On the one hand, the local financiers or the majority of them have a tendency to resist an overall and a wide, sweeping amendment to this Act. The reasons are fairly obvious although one Minister, I remember during the time in an interview with the Press, said that this could not interfere with anything. I say that the commercial business in this town is carried on through the Banks and businessmen all over the world see things more from the business point of view. If you are giving a Bank the opportunity of charging more than 6% on an overdraft, that must affect the food which people consume and the clothes which they wear. In the long run it must all be passed right on to the consumer.
1.15 p.m.
That is why I have always been very much in favour of Government's stand in not just amending the Act in the sense that whosoever-will might be able to charge as much interest as he likes, because I have borne in mind the fact that the Banks of this country and the businessmen of this country (who are the Commission Agents and representatives of the manufacturers and so on) would obviously, contrary to the views expressed by certain Ministers, make the most for their Company. That is one side of it. On the other hand, Sir, when you read the Objects and Reasons which state that the Rate of Interest Act, 1754 was recently amended by the Rate of Interest (Amendment) Act, 1958, so as to exempt from the provisions of Section 2 of the Act certain contracts for loans of money by individuals resident or domiciled outside the island or by any firms registered or bodies corporate incorporated outside the island to persons within the island, I have always contended that my own view would have been to amend this in a different way. I cannot see any Bank trading in Barbados taking up lock, stock and barrel and leaving because Government amended the Rate of Interest Act to affect Commercial Banks. I do not want to go into any ramifications on that, but I cannot see it whether it be Barclays, Nova Scotia, Royal or Canadian. That is my first consideration in amending the Act and would be the first thing I would do if I had anything to do with the Government. I would have to get people to advise me along those lines.

I believe I read where Mr. Money and some other people interested had to advise Government, but the time comes when you cannot advise Government if you are interested in your firm's business, because the interests must clash; it does not matter how honest the intentions of the particular individual might be.

Let us examine the amendment here. The amendment was to exempt individuals resident or domiciled outside the island, any firms registered or bodies corporate incorporated outside the island to persons within the island. On the last occasion there was some controversy over the actual meaning and the difference between the two words "resident" and "domiciled". I am not going to bandy words with the Lawyers who advise Government on the difference of the meaning, if there is a difference; that is a matter for them. What I do want to say is this: this is an amendment for the C.D.C. people to be able to lend the Electric Company money. All of us would like to see the Electric Company expand for the benefit of the inhabitants of this country, but on the other hand as the last speaker asked, is it justifiable that the same British Government through a cor-

porate body should say: "We will not give you money for other essential developments unless you amend your Act to let us lend money at a higher rate of interest?" We were able to raise money at a fixed price for our Deep Water Harbour. You are not fooling me or any thinking person. We were lent money for the Deep Water Harbour at 6% because we had a certain amount of responsibility and made a pledge, but if they are to lend us money to develop our utilities, we must amend the Act so that they can lend us at 7%, 8% or whatever rate they want!

Of course, Sir, the Government had its advisers in this matter, and they were advised to do it this way. What I am asking is this: could you not have been advised to let C.D.C. come in and lend money to the Electric Company or anybody else at 8% or 8 1/2% without going on to say "bodies corporate?" What is to prevent a Trust Company with its hundreds of thousands of pounds from moving its registration from Barbados and getting 10%? The difference is that you are penalising the local people who must invest in Barbados at 6%, whose dividends are subject to 40% income tax rate, and who in the majority of cases - I am thinking of high financing and big investment - must plough their money back into Barbados for its development, and saying: "You can slip down to Bequia, Trinidad, St. Lucia or any other place, register as a company there and get 8%." You are going to take the same money which was made in Barbados out of Barbados. I believe the Canadians told us that the other day when they were here. You can take the profits which you make in Barbados to Demerara, Trinidad or Jamaica and register as a company and send it back here at 8% because of this Act.

My own way of doing this would be to amend the Act in a different manner. There are Banks in this island which carry $3,000 or $4,000 overdraft because the importing of shipments of rice, potatoes, flour, onions and other commodities carry overdrafts. Every cent which is paid in overdraft is passed on to the consumer, and that is why I always agreed that to amend it generally was not the correct thing. I am going to throw this challenge out; no Director of any Bank in this country, whether it be Barclays or any other Bank, could advise this Government - that is what I understood happened in this instance - because they would have an interest in their Company first. That is the principal thing for commercial purposes, banks and so on. That is how I see it, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I agree with the stand Government took in not amending this generally.

Nobody is allowed to see the returns of the Income Tax Commissioner. Fortunately, some of us were allowed to see returns of trade; therefore money is made in Barbados.
1.25 p.m.

You are saying to the world today that we cannot invest our money here, but we are allowed to make it here and then send it abroad to any other country for investment and you also allow other people in another country to bring money in here at a high rate of interest. For every $50,000 you make, you want to invest it. You are saying that if you want to invest it, you can invest it abroad. I think you really need a lot of advice on that. What is it subjected to if you invest it here? If you have that money outside, what is it subjected to? I do know that this is a subject on which few of us can speak with any authority, but I feel myself, as the Hon. Premier has said, because of C.D.C. you cannot get the money locally. But why? What do you see if you go into any solicitor's office? If anybody has any money to loan out you find them getting together with their lawyers and solicitors and sending it abroad for investment because there is nothing in our law to prevent you from taking your money from here and sending it to Trinidad, St. Lucia or Jamaica. We can only lend you money here at a maximum of 6%, but if I send that money to Trinidad with the same Government's backing, I can get it back in here and get 8% on it. Few of us understand the implications.

I believe that it is only because you are building your Deep Water Harbour that you got a loan on the London Market at the percentage you have got it. Now, this money which C.D.C. wants to lend to the Electric Company is the same British money. We got that for the Deep Water Harbour at one rate of interest but if you want it to develop one of your public utilities, they say that they will give you at another rate of interest.

I say for the last time that I do not favour just an overall general amendment to this Act unless it was so framed as to protect the consumers of electricity. Nearly all the business done in Barbados by manufacturers' representatives is not done because somebody has a tremendous lot of money in the bank but it is because of the business man's influence, his name in business and everything else that he can go to the Bank. I know some firms with a small capital which have overdrafts of $3,000 or $4,000. You can therefore see as soon as you go up 1% on your interest rate what that would mean to such firms. When such firms have to pay on overdrafts, surely, that would be passed on to the consumers. I understand that Government accepted the advice of the big bankers in this connection and I feel that in a matter of this sort, it may be better your going beyond your own shores for advice. I cannot see any man working as a Director of a Bank of Barbados who can advise the Government on a matter of this sort against the interest of his bank or business. As I see it, I feel that we are in the same position as we were on the last occasion. As I have said, you have got money in England on the British market for the Deep Water Harbour. Now you have the Electric Company wanting this money from C.D.C. but C.D.C. is saying that it is not going to lend the company any money until you make an amendment to the Act in the way you are now doing it. I think you are hindering a tremendous amount of development in this country because of the way you are amending this Act.

Mr. GODDARD: When this amendment first came to this House it was brought here by Sir Grantley Adams who was the then Premier and I am sure it was brought here for the same reason as it is brought here today. The Electric Company wants to borrow a large sum of money and they have found themselves unable to raise that money locally. There is not one corporation here that is willing to loan them this money and we all know, because it is no secret, that C.D.C. can only lend them this money at a greater rate of interest than what our law stipulated. Well, our law was amended and it was amended in such a way that outside investors could lend local people and corporations in Barbados at any rate of interest.

What I want to know is this. I am sure that the interested parties themselves must have advised Government that they wanted this Rate of Interest Act to be amended in such a way as to enable them to borrow this money. My question is this: why are these items which you are now putting in were left out when you made the amendment? Why were they not inserted then? We have a habit of amending Bills to suit local conditions. That means nothing.
1.35 p.m.

I have often seen that Bills of this nature have come back here for further amendment and I am sure that this is one of them. The Electric Company wants to borrow this money and the Colonial Development Corporation says: "We will lend you the money if you amend the Act." In that case, I am sure that they would intimate the manner in which they wanted the Act amended. I wonder now if this amendment will suit the case or whether we will not have to come back here to amend this amendment further. There is no doubt that once you have opened the door and changed your policy there is no closing.

Now let us get back to investors from outside. That is a big subject, but we can all understand it quite easily. There is nothing that we cannot understand in this elementary principle; capital throughout the world is in short supply. That is a truism. The undeveloped countries are asking the capitalist countries for capital so as to develop their countries and they are making big applications for large sums. Fiji wants millions, money is also needed in South Africa and in Canada there is a great plea for capital to develop mineral oils and new industries; therefore we have to play a correct part if we want to get capital into these areas.

One of the fundamental things which we must have in

this matter is a stable Government. There are people who would willingly invest money in Barbados at 5% rather than send it out to South America at 10% because you do not know what the Government of tomorrow will be. Up to now we have a stable Government, but let this be a warning that this is a matter with which we should not tamper. We should see that the Government as well as conditions in this island remain stable because that is one of the primary factors in attracting and holding capital. I have said this more than once; it is not my political theory: it is a fundamental theory. If you have a stable Government you are more likely to attract capital than otherwise.

We have always been fortunate in the past in being able to attract capital at reasonable rates. There is one thing - we have never borrowed a lot of money. As a matter of fact, this country is free of debt but we are now undertaking to borrow in large amounts. We have to watch that matter carefully too. Do not let us borrow more than we are able to underwrite and pay back because we will find ourselves in difficult waters and I am sure that this Government will realise that that would be the death-knell for all of us.

Now a lot of talk has been made about this loan, which we raised in seconds, on the London Market; but if the rate is 6% and you are raising the loan at 98 1/2%, that is more than 6%. As a matter of fact, when that Canadian Mission came here the other day and had that conference, what was summed up in the afternoon was stated in these words: "You are asking outside investors to come in and bring their capital and develop this country and yet, on the other hand, local money is going out; and the reason is that it is attracted abroad at greater interest rates than you are permitted to have in Barbados. That does not make sense to us"; but we have jealously guarded this for all these years. I feel that I would not wish to see the interest rate in Barbados raised above 6%, but there are certain things which we cannot help.

When you start with controls, you can control things up to a point and after that you have to open the gates; it is like asking the Canadian wheat growers to sell us wheat at our price. They will tell you: "This is my price and if you cannot buy this wheat then you must grow it in Barbados yourself": you have to buy it at their price.

This money is sadly needed in Barbados for the development of electricity; I have no doubt about that. I would like to see electricity installed throughout Barbados; there are places crying out for development and the electric poles are just a little distance from them, but the Electric Corporation have not got the money to put up the additional poles and run the wires.

I voted for this Bill already and I will vote for it again. This amendment is for the lawyers and the financiers to determine. Now that you have made this amendment, I am wondering how long it will be before you come back to this House and say that we have to open the local market as we opened it to the foreign investor. That is anybody's guess; but once you have started this, there is no turning back; I look to the not too distant future when what I have mentioned will have to be done.

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

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

Clause 1 was called

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, this Clause is the important one. As I said before, it is proposed to amend sub-section (1) of Section 2 of the Rate of Interest Act, 1754, (a) by inserting in the proviso thereto, immediately after the word "contract" the words "judgment, bond, assurance, debenture, stock or security" and (b) by inserting immediately after the word "made" in the said proviso, the words " given, granted, issued or created".
1.45 p.m.

Now, Sir, as I said earlier, it was felt by the Crown Law Officers here in Barbados that this amendment is not necessary, and it is more interesting to learn that the Solicitors of the Company on this side do not think it is necessary; but in order to facilitate this matter, Government decided to accept this amendment and to come down to the Legislature for its endorsement. It is a point of Law on which I am not in a position to say who is right or who is wrong, but one thing we are sure of is that this does not interfere with the principle of the Bill. I suppose the people on the other side think that in order to make sure they should demand that these words be incorporated in this Proviso.

I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I did not say anything on the second reading of the Bill, because as far as I can understand, the hon. senior member for St. Peter has very ably dealt with most of the points which I would have wanted to raise in my objections, if they could be termed objections. We have already passed the Bill extending the provisions of the Rate of Interest Act, 1754, Chapter 1, and therefore I do not want to reflect on a vote of the House, and I do not want to add to anything which the hon. senior member for St. Peter may have said during the course of the second reading of the Bill; but the very point which has just been raised by the Hon. Premier is the point which I would like to make, because I want to know how long it is that we in the House of Assembly of Barbados take the time from a private or public Corporation outside this country. I have complained before that a lot of legislation which is embodied on the Statute Book of this island is often done at the instigation of private persons or corporations. This is one example where in the Resolution itself the Government has set forth that not as a question of general principle or a question of necessary legal interpretation this legislation is being enacted, but because some misguided people outside this colony decided they want this legislation in the Laws of Barbados.

I want to say this: the Queen's Solicitor belong to the same firm, as far as I know, that represents the corporation in question, and in a manner of this kind, not only the Crown Law Officers but also the Queen's Solicitor must necessarily advise the Government; therefore the mere fact that they corroborate the Crown Law Officers does not make it necessarily authentic, but in this case they happen to be right, because any contract for a loan must necessarily include a debenture, a bond, an assurance, a stock or security, because at the back of every debenture there must be a contract to pay a certain rate of interest, and there must be a contract to repay the loan at the end of the term of defeasance without giving the debenture holder any participating voice in the operations of the concern. The holding of stock in a company also gives rise to a contract between the shareholder and the Company itself as a legal entity, and I really do not subscribe to the view that we should take up the taxpayer's money printing Bills which are unnecessary, just because they do not feel happy over an omission to mention specifically certain words which are almost tautologous and completely unnecessary for the carrying out of the spirit and terms of the amending Act of 1958, Chapter 26; and it means that this is another illustration of the general criticism which I have made so often that the Government seems more prepared to initiate legislation at the instigation of people who have no vote in Barbados and who have no responsibility to the people rather than to carry out the wishes of the electorate in enacting legislation.

To me it is a very unfortunate state of affairs because any Government which gives in on behalf of a private corporation to the demands of another private corporation

outside of the island of Barbados is really handing over to private corporations the right to initiate legislation. If they are not going to be firm and adamant in matters of this kind, it means they are completely reckless as to whether the cost of printing is unnecessarily high or whether the people are just being squeamish over matters which really do not affect them. I really do not think that they have any right to come here and say: "We do not think it is so;" we have been advised legally, that it is not necessary to do this, but we are going to do the unnecessary just to please them. They are not lending money to the Barbados Government. I would like to say that what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said is absolutely true. How much money does the Electric Company need? Why doesn't the Government of Barbados let them increase the capital and put shares in the Electric Company or lend the money at 6% on a debenture? We are getting 2 1/2%, 3 1/2% and 4 1/4% on most of the loans which we have now, maybe $11 million, outside this island. Why can't we lend money to the Electric Company at 6% instead of enacting legislation of this kind? I think our senses seem to have deserted us that we are prepared to abandon our God-given rights to other people, to private individuals and private corporations outside and inside this island even when it is contrary to the dictates of common sense and the established Law of the land.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, much of course of what has been said today in this connection has been said very much earlier and perhaps at greater length in the past by myself. From the time when it became known that C.D.C. would have been advancing the capital required by the Barbados Light and Power Company for expansion, I made it clear on the floor of this House that it was the height of stupidity by the Government not itself to have undertaken the responsibility to supply the required capital and to acquire a proportionate amount of shares in the Company which the amount of money they wanted would have paid for, especially on the part of a Government which proclaims its intention to nationalise the Electric Company. Here was a God-sent opportunity for them to get in on the ground floor and to acquire shares in the Company since the Company needed capital and the good name of Barbados in order to acquire the capital it needed.
1.55 p.m.

The Government went ahead and ratified, so to speak, the loan for them and you had the spectacle of a private utility undertaking getting this new capital on the endorsement of the Government of the country in which it was operating. In Trinidad, not so long ago, - sometime last week to be exact - when the Telephone Company wanted money for expansion, you had the Government there, knowing what it was doing, setting up itself to supply the additional capital which the Company wanted and it was doing it in return, of course, for the appropriate number of shares in the undertaking. Now the wheel has almost turned full circle twice because you are not only underwriting the loan to some extent by staying security for it but you are allowing the people who are going to supply the capital to dictate the terms under which the capital should be acquired, and you are asking us to give legislative sanction to that. This is bound to have the natural corollary of an increase in the rates being charged by the corporation and it must be borne in mind that these rates are even now excessively high. Electric power is supplied cheaper in Trinidad and in British Guiana than it is in Barbados and not only our private householders are going to be hard put to pay these rates but it must have an effect on the industrial development of the country if the rates for electricity are abnormally high. People cannot put down industries here if the electric rates are high because such industries would cost too much money to operate.

There must be something fundamentally wrong with the present Light and Power Company. Ever since the war, they were trying to expand their business, this of course being contingent upon the installation of new equipment. Every year we are hearing that additional equipment is being installed but the rate at which the supply of electricity is being made available to the rural areas is scandalously small. For the number of districts throughout the Island for which the Company had applications for power, the rate at which the Company is attending to them would take another fifty years before these applications are fulfilled.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

(Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.)

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

On resumption Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

(The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is Question Time, but there being no replies to questions ready, we go to Private Members' Business.

Order No. 1 of Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution re Report on the Sugar Industry by Mr. A. F McKenzie. On the last occasion, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking when Private Members' Business was concluded.

RESOLUTION re REPORT ON SUGAR INDUSTRY BY A. F. Mc KENZIE

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I propose to summarize what I had said on the last occasion but before proceeding to deal with the summary of what I have said I will begin on the point with which I was dealing when Private Members' time concluded. During my speech, I was reading from page 16 of the Report and I made the statement that what was stated in the Report was not a factual statement and that it was not true to say that the Union had no discussion with the Employers Federation and the impression given in the Report was that we were resisting something stated in the Report. I will re-read that paragraph which is as follows:-

"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. 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."

I took exception to that and when I was reading that, the Hon. Minister of Trade in his usual *sotto voce* style said that was what happened at Haggatts.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That is incorrect. What I did say was: "what happened at Haggatts?" I was asking a question.

Mr. WALCOTT: He could not ask me a question if I were speaking to the House. He was making a statement to the effect, when I read that paragraph, that such a state of affairs never existed. He has had a week now to reflect.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I again rise on a point of order. I have not yet spoken on this question.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister has had a week to refresh his memory and I have had a week to bring back to this House the facts on the Haggatts case. I would like the Hon. Minister to bear this in mind. As long as I am a member of this House, he will have to listen or go out of the House; he cannot stop me from speaking.

These are the facts. The first thing is that anyone writing a report must write what is factual. What are the facts?
2.40 p.m.

Haggatts Factory presented to us a proposition in which they were paying $9.87.65 per ton when they had a manufacturing capacity of 200 tons of sugar per week. They said that they were going to increase their production capacity to an amount of 400 tons per week and they gave us a proposition of $7.90.35 per ton. I want the Minister to understand that there is no question of favours with me. I want to say that I am not one of the type of persons who are looking for favours; whenever you want to please them you want easy money. I should like to say that politics will never become a way for me to earn a living. I was saying that that proposition was made to the Union, and at the beginning the Union said that we were not in favour of reducing this amount by 20% which was the equivalent reduction that Haggatts Factory wanted us to accept. We said that we were prepared to accept 10% and by methods of negotiation the amount was reduced from $9.87 to something like $8.69 per ton.

I read that to show that you cannot have a public report making suggestions of wage negotiations between employers and workers on the basis that it has been resisted and it is illogical when we have proved that not only at Haggatts but at Hayman's Factory we had agreed to a reduction such as that. But let us examine it. In the last ten years or in the last number of years that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have been a member of this Assembly, have you ever seen members of this Assembly reduce their remuneration? Has there not rather been a progressive increase in emoluments? Is it not a fact that Ministerial Government has only been in operation five years ago and the Ministers said that the remuneration was not enough and in five year's time we have found that the salaries and allowances have been increased? In the same community are you suggesting that while increases are coming from the Legislature itself, the Trade Union should accept a situation in which the workers must accept lower earnings than what they were getting before, and if there is going to be any insistence on anybody getting less, that that situation should not be resisted? I can give this House more information on that matter. Where you have higher productivity it follows that higher productivity connotes higher profits and higher profits must mean better prosperity; therefore, those who work with you should share in that better prosperity. If you are not going to follow that principle what then are you going to follow? It is no more than what Harold Laski has said. This is the last book which he wrote on Trade Unionism before he died, and what he has written is an apt description of the type of situation which you have today; what you find is that in a Government they are resisting the claims of a Trade Union on a subjective basis, not an objective basis; it is not on the basis of the objective but on the basis of the subjective. The members of this present Government believe that when they try their best to discredit me as one of the leaders in the Trade Union Movement they are hurting me; therefore they start with me and it is part and parcel of that Party of which, unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have the honour to be a member - I do not accuse you individually, but the collective outlook is to destroy me, and in trying to destroy me they are destroying the tenets and principles on which the Trade Union should stand. This is what Professor Laski had to say and it is applicable to this Government:-

"Where un-employment is the whip which enforces discipline, and where the employers' search for profit is the central motive of the economic system, it is wholly natural that the trade unions should maximize their independence of the state power since the operation of the state power is, by its very nature, bound to be on the side of the employers. The area in which the Government of a capitalist country can be neutral, it is said, still more the area in which it can be favourable to the workers, is necessarily small. Both the law and the administration of a capitalist society are directed essentially to the support of the employers; it is therefore natural for the unions to insist upon their right to as fully independent a judgment as they can make, because, normally, the scales are weighted against the interest of the workers."

Professor Laski said that where you are dealing with a situation in which the capitalist society is predominant as in Barbados, and where there is any insistence on the part of the Trade Union to get any right, the Government comes out with the idea that you are going to bring this country into ruin; that is the situation which we will get if we are not alert. That is the sort of vague statement I heard on public platforms dealing with this subject. You get a situation in which the Trade Union is pressed, not only by the employers but, as Professor Laski says, by the administration and people write reports like this. When this gentleman came here we told him that we would submit to him a memorandum but we said that he should have a public session.
2.50 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a public report, not a private report. This is a Report for the public to read. The Trade Union is a big Organisation representing more people than the Employers' Federation represent. Now if the employers had been in favour of a public hearing and the Union was also in favour of it, what would have been the answer of the Commissioner? Would he have said: "no public hearing?" We can only conclude that the employers were not in favour or did not care whether or not it was a public Sitting, but the Union insisted that it should have been and were told that it was in the interest of the public to have a private Sitting.

The Sugar Industry means as much to this country, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as coal means to Great Britain; therefore we could not accept that. My view of this matter is that the Trade Union should be given the right to have a public hearing, or that evidence for this Report should have been given in public. I think we have just distributed a Report here dealing with the Vestry of St. Lucy; that is a Parochial body, one of eleven Parochial bodies, as compared with the whole Sugar Industry which was at stake. The situation in St. Lucy could not by any stretch of the imagination be as vital to the whole island's economy as an investigation into the economic state of the Sugar Industry, and if it were regarded that that could be made public, how much more so should be an investigation into the economic state of the Sugar Industry? Any Commission, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is safeguarded in that when it begins to take evidence it can decide what type of evidence it is going to hear in public or in private, because there is a Restrictive Act in Barbados that if there is any information which the inquirer can only get in the capacity he is holding as an inquirer, that information must remain secret and confidential. Do you think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the broad economics into the Sugar Industry should be regarded as secret? Do you think the Minister should have in that *sotto voce* remark said what he did about Haggatts? Do you think the Report could have been written the way it was written if we had given evidence in public? There could not have been the suggestion that this was resisted, because it would be shown that the Union agreed on two occasions. In these matters the Union must see to it that their members get the maximum representation.

I said that the Report must be factual, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but it is not factual because the inquirer had no evidence in it. I feel that the Report is unsatisfactory because the Union should not have been refused a public hearing; the Commission itself should have been conducted as a public hearing, no matter who came to give evidence. I am sorry I do not have the Salisbury Report which went to Antigua to show you the patience and diligence that has gone into that. How can anybody in Barbados say where there is a Trade Union in existence as powerful as the Barbados Workers' Union that you can ignore that? As I said earlier, in 1945 when Professor Shephard came here, the Trade Union Movement was not what it is now, and he made an enquiry into the dispute of cane cutting. This was not a dispute in cane-cutting; this was a Report into the economic state of the Sugar Industry and going into its wide ramifications. We asked what was in a Report or could be in a Commission like this that it could not be done on a public basis, and said that any evidence he wanted to take in private, he could; but the Trade Union wanted a public hearing because to the best interest of the people we represent, evidence should have been given in that way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those of us who spend our time in negotiating agreements know the difference. I want to

say that I do not listen to people who have never sat down and got agreements done; it is my duty to sit down year after year not only with the Sugar Industry, but in industry after industry and make agreements; when the Minister states that I claim to represent the workers, let him challenge the claim; let him say that that claim is unfounded. I challenge him or any other member on that side to say which of them has sat down and concluded more agreements which provided better conditions both in wages and conditions of employment than I have in this island. What greater contribution have they made to the pay-packet of the workers of this island than I have? Let them show anything which they have initiated or introduced to which I did not give my full support, and the things which I have done where they played no part whatsoever in assisting one way or another. Today, the Minister of Labour in a so-called Labour Government is standing on public platforms on the eve of a Commission which he has given permission to set up and speaking in derogatory terms of that Board. You would not believe that in a place like Barbados where you talk about democracy that the Minister who sets up a Commission of Enquiry would be the person to speak on the issues involved before the Commission meets. What type of justice do you expect? What type of fair-play can you expect in an atmosphere like that? It is just like before there was the Ministerial system, the Government of Barbados set up an inquiry to investigate into something, but the Governor in a public speech before the Commission got down to work made a statement about the facts with which the Commission was going to deal.

We live in a community where you cannot be afraid of people; you cannot even be afraid of the Law. If the Law is going to be used to take away your rights, you have to be prepared to pay the penalty of injustice. That is to say, you have to be prepared to pay the penalty by going to gaol wrongfully in a community where you find the scales are being weighted against you in this sort of concocted matter.

I will read another part of Professor Laski. He says:-

"I conclude, moreover, that in a capitalist society where an industrial dispute is held to affect the community in a serious way, the incidence of the intervention which any government attempts will normally - the case of war being an exception - be to the advantage of an owning class and its managerial agents, and to the disadvantage of trade unionism." Why do you think Professor Laski wrote that? He was a man of learning and experience living in a capitalist society, and it was patent that whenever there was a dispute, the forces of the mighty came down on the side of the managerial classes.

3.00 p.m.

The Commission of Enquiry is set up; the Commissioner comes here and is asked to conduct the Enquiry but when one side asks him to take the meetings in public, that side is told that the Commissioner does not think it would work and the Minister feels so too. That is what the Secretary to the Commissioner told me when I telephoned. That means that the Trade Union has to fight not only with the person who is conducting the Enquiry but the Government. If the Government is using its machinery to set up Commissions of Enquiry, but in setting up these Commissions of Enquiry it is settting them up to do what they want them to do and then they invite the Trade Union or other interested bodies to participate in these things, then you can see what partial and unfair treatment the Trade Union, including myself, can look forward to. There is no doubt in my mind from all that was said when this Commission was being set up that there was a subtle attempt for it to appear that whatever was done was done in the employers' favour so as to give the impression that it is a defeat for me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to die: I am not going to live forever but millions of people are going to live after me. You get a situation where the workers can be suppressed, and in suppressing the workers it is made to appear that it is a reflection on me. I say, Sir, I have passed through a stage in my public life that I will not have to do anything for A or B to get kudos for myself or to get kudos from the public in any industrial or political matter, because I believe that the people and the public know me as I am.

If I may deal now with another section of Mr. McKenzie's Report, I will now draw to your attention a statement made in paragraph 37 on page ten. It reads as follows:-

"The value of sugar to the industry in 1957 after allowing for preferences and levies was $213 per ton. Thus it will be appreciated that if the capital assets necessary for the production of a ton of sugar are to earn only 5%, a very modest return for such a risk carrying industry, it will be required to earn the sum of $17.25 for each ton of sugar produced. This will necessitate a margin of 8.1% of the price of sugar in 1957 to cover this very modest return on capital invested."

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you realise that 1957, the year on which this Report makes that statement, was a record year for Barbados? As I have said, Bulkely Factory was bought the year before and in that year dividends were paid to the shareholders of that factory and then a bonus was paid on these dividends. If you cannot show anything in this year, according to the Report, what is the hope for Barbados? That is what this gentleman is saying. The people who are factory owners, the plantation owners and the peasant proprietors are the best judges.

Now, the small holders in this House are the ones who have said that the peasants proprietors do not do so well. The hon. junior member for St. Philip made that speech in here; I do not know if he is of that opinion today. Mr. McKenzie says: "Oh no; you, the peasants do well; you do not need any money at all." Far from that, it looks from Mr. McKenzie's Report as if the hon. junior member for St. Philip would have to give back to the factories some money from what they paid him for his canes. Mr. McKenzie says that the big estate owners, what he calls the industry, are the fellows who have not done so well because when you take into consideration what it takes to get an estate to its present state, you can see that they cannot do too well. Is not that an illogical statement? How can you tell me that a small cane farmer with two or three acres of land can get a return as a cane farmer with large acres of land. Mr. McKenzie is saying that the small cane farmer is in a better position than the man with the 100 acres of land. I do not think I need to tell hon. members that it does not need a McKenzie to tell me that it is not true that the estates operate at only 5% profit. He says that he does not have enough information to make his calculations but he has accepted the information which the sugar industry put to him.

Sir, there is nothing in this Report which will lead you to expect that this man examined the sugar industry. You would expect in an island where you have plantations separate from factories that you would at least be able to read in this Report a statement made in relation to the factories and another made in relation to plantations, because although a factory is tied to a plantation, yet when it comes to cultivation and preparation of a plantation, it is dependent on its own steam. By that I mean your cultivation of the land is an entirely distinct thing from the operation of a factory; that is to say, you can have a most efficient factory operating but you can be the most inefficient planter. For us to get a factual statement, it will be necessary for us to see what is the state of the plantation situation and what the factory situation is. I say that that for this reason. In this Report it goes on to speak about the differentiation between factory workers' wages and plantation workers' wages. Our society is a society of differentiation but it is a society of differentiation based on certain backgrounds. I will give you a little examination on why I say that. This is what this gentleman has stated in his report:-

"Whilst firmly of the opinion that wage rates should be the subject of negotiations between the employer and employee, it is clear that the present method of computing wage changes is not logical, and contrary to the spirit of The Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. As the basic indices are subject to review at regular intervals, I therefore recommend that the existing basic wages now in force be