

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th 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*); 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 Hon. L. St.A. THORNE.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of 17th February, 1959 have been printed and circulated to hon. members and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection the Minutes were taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Accountant General of the Island the Report for the year 1957-58;

Also, I have received the following from the Deputy Clerk:-

His Honour the Speaker, 24th February, 1959
House of Assembly,
Public Buildings,
City.

Sir,

I hereby request one week's leave of absence from my duties of Deputy Clerk of the Honourable House as I am unable to attend today. Mr. D. A. Banfield has kindly consented to act on my behalf with the permission of the House.

Yours Faithfully,
H. L. THOMAS.

LEAVE GRANTED DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be given one week's leave of absence as from today.

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

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

MR. D. A. BANFIELD TO ACT AS DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. Dave A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today's sitting.

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

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Message No. 6/1959 forwarding the Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1959-60.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. F. E. MILLER:-

Resolution to approve the payment to the Barbados Arts Council of the amount of \$480 provided in the 1958-59 Estimates under Head XXVIII - Subsidies and Grants, Item 31, as a subvention to the Central Council of Drama.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

Resolution to place the sum of \$78,435 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1959-59, No. 46, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

Resolution to place the sum of \$6,080 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. 47, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. F. E. MILLER

Resolution to place the sum of \$300 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 48, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

Resolution to place the sum of \$8,460,987 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet expenditure to be incurred during the financial year 1959-60 on the Capital Works included in the Estimates 1959-60, Part II - Capital.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

A Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

A Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

A Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that I am ready with my oral reply to Question No. 5/1959 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John regarding the construction of the East Coast Road.

MR. SEARLES TO ACT AS CHAIRMAN

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Hon. junior member for St. James act as Chairman until the arrival of the Chairman.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, as regards Resolutions of which notice has been given today, it is my intention to ask for leave when in Committee of Supply to deal with those Resolutions in all their stages. It is also my intention to deal with the Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958 in all its stages today.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to proceed with the Resolutions and the Bill of which notice has been given today.

Mr. DOWDING: Am I to understand, Sir, that these Resolutions have not yet been circulated?

Mr. SPEAKER: They have been circulated.

Hon. M. E. COX: They have been circulated. I do not mean the Resolution for \$8 million because that is included in the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister describe the Resolutions with which he intends to proceed?

Hon. M. E. COX: There are two Resolutions - one for \$70,000, and that has been amended to read \$78,000 and the other one is for \$6,080. Those are the two Resolutions with which we want to deal and those are the two which were circulated to hon. members over the weekend.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to ask the Honourable Leader of the House to ask that it be an instruction to the Committee when the House is in Committee to proceed with these Resolutions.

Hon. M. E. COX: Perhaps at this stage I had better inform the Honourable House that it is my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with certain of the money Resolutions of which notice has been given today.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, there still seems to be some confusion in the matter. I am in late receipt on Saturday afternoon of two cyclostyled Resolutions - one for \$70,000 and the other for \$6,080. As I said, Sir, there seems to be some confusion in the matter. I am in late receipt on Saturday afternoon, after my Order Paper arrived, of these two Resolutions and I am still not clear as to the Resolutions with which we are asked to deal in all their stages today. Attached to these two Resolutions was a letter signed by the Clerk of this Honourable House stating that "the attached Resolutions and Bill are circulated with permission of His Honour the Speaker. The Honourable Premier intends to ask leave to deal with same in all their stages at the meeting of the House on Tuesday, 24th February, 1959."

That is as far as I understand the matter at the mo-

ment. That is to say, that we are requested to deal with these two Resolutions which I said I received late. I want an assurance that these are the two Resolutions with which they are going to deal out of this seeming confusion.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as I understand, permission has been asked to proceed with two Resolutions which the Hon. Leader of the House has just described. I understand that there is still the necessity for correcting one of them as far as the figures are concerned and possibly the Schedule as well. If the figures are incorrect in the Resolution, then those in the Schedule will have to be changed accordingly. The Hon. Leader of the House will have to amend the Schedule in order to relate to the Resolution with which he intends to deal.
12.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this Resolution for \$78,435 was apparently corrected when notice was given of it, I do not intend to ask that it be dealt with today. The whole thing will have to be changed including the Addendum; so in the circumstances we are not prepared to go on with it, but I will be asking to proceed with the Resolution for \$6,080.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958, be now read a first time.

I should like to remind hon. members that as the Hon. Leader of the House intimated, it is proposed to proceed with this Bill in all its stages today, and I think permission has already been granted.

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty, be now read a first time.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. James be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees until the Chairman of Committees arrives.

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

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

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, and that it be an instruction when in Committee of Supply to deal with the money Resolution for \$6,080.

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. SEARLES being in the Chair.

equated to a basic index of 100 and that each year the latest Index of Retail Prices computed by the Statistical Service of the Government be used to determine the change in cost of living of the wage earner, and this change be applied to the basic wage index to compute the change in basic rates. In order to provide for any increase in revenue which may accrue due to increases in the price of free sugars, the wage index so computed be increased by a further ad hoc percentage increase representing the difference between the negotiated price and the weighted average price obtained for free sugars and negotiated price sugars."

3.10 p.m.

Could you expect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that any Trade Unionist in a modern day, could ever accept the Cost of Living basis in an industry which is noted for low wages from time immemorial? He is asking you to negotiate on the basis of the Cost of Living index. Let me show you another weakness in that; you will never raise the standard of living of the worker above whatever is the basis now. If \$2.72 per day is stipulated as the basic rate for a man, if that rate remained as a basic rate he would never get anything more unless the cost of living index rises. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not your duty to study wage negotiations, but it is my duty to do so. The calculations on a wage index or figure cannot be on the basis of the cost of living index; the cost of living is an indication in wage negotiations which if they have moved, you can use that; but if the cost of living does not move and other things are changing, the means test will remain. If the price of a pair of pants remains the same, you are paying a man everlastingly to the same standard, irrespective of the proceeds which are accruing to the means test. Your business is conditioned by the volume of trade; the cost of living index may not move in five years, but the industry can move so rapidly that you find that the wages are going up. The ability to pay is an important criterion in determining wages and it is not conditioned by the Cost of Living Index.

Another contradictory statement is this: Mr. McKenzie already speaks about 100 as the basis. I am going to read what is stated in this Report and that is why I ask; how can we accept a Report on the premises based on what somebody has told you and you draw your own conclusions on that? Let us see what is his recommendation on that question. In paragraph 60 of the Report he says: "The factories are in no position to pay for a three shift system without a reduction in the existing take home pay of the worker." Then in paragraph 65, he says this:-

"I recommend that any increase in basic wages, should not be applied as a percentage applicable to all sugar workers. When a change in basic wages is negotiated that the ratio of 75 to 25 of the benefits will be granted in favour of the field worker in relation to the factory worker."

You will see the contradiction. I want to say that this gentleman has not had time to spend on this matter. In one statement he says that the rate should go up by the cost of living amount and why is it that you put it at 100 for factory and field? The cost of living has shown that the amount of money we should get is 10% and you say that that is the basis; but he recommends in negotiating a new wage, although the cost of living has shown an increase of 10%, you must accept 10% for the field worker but only 2.5 for the factory owner. Can you not see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how illogical that is? You will have to bring the field worker up to the point which you say is the point and then call that the basis and work from there on. Do you know how that difficulty came about? The Government wanted Mr. McKenzie to be an agricultural economist, a general economist and also a Board of Enquiry investigating wages; they required three men to do this task for them and that is what we suggested, but unfortunately, our suggestion did not hold good.

In paragraph 60 of the Report which I was quoting just now, Mr. McKenzie says this:-

"The position regarding the long hours of work in

the factories is not satisfactory. The factories are in no position to pay for a three shift system without a reduction in the existing take home pay of the worker. It is understood that the Workers' Union would not accept any reduction in pay."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, how can you get a Report which is factual making a statement like that when Mr. McKenzie never had the Union to give evidence on that? Let us examine that statement and see what it means. Barbados has a sugar crop of about 16 to 18 weeks. The factory workers are not paid on a time basis; they are paid on a production basis, which means that if no production comes, they get no money. If you are paid on a production basis - the old system was that you pay a man on the total production of the factory. The equivalent price per ton at Haggatts under any conditions would be equated on \$8.90 per ton of sugar. If you pay a man by the hour and you do not have your manufacturing capacity right through, then your rate per ton is likely to increase; if your juice does not come up to scratch you do not pay him anything more; that is to say, a man who is working in a factory only receives what goes on the weighbridge as the sugar manufactured. It does not matter how many hours he takes to produce it. You do not pay a man by how many loaves of bread he produces but by how many hours he works per week.

3.20 p.m.

It would therefore cost this employer more money per unit of production if within the same productive period a lower amount is produced. These are the delicate and technical things in wages negotiations and we said so. When your Report makes a recommendation to guide someone which you can see you have not paid attention to, what can you say? Some people believe that when somebody as an expert writes a Report, you must accept it. Is it not a fact that this Government refused to carry out some recommendations from Reports on Inquiries they have had? As a Government, they said they did not agree.

What I do not like, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that anyone reading this Report would feel that the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers Association had discussions on the three-shift system. May I tell you that on the basis of a man working in this Report it is said that it is a wonder that we allowed the twelve hour system in Barbados? If we had started out on the eight hour shift in Barbados, working on the same basis you could not work for the same money. Even an employer would tell you that you could not ask anybody to reduce his wages by 50% in Barbados. It would mean that in order to have the other 100%, two men would have to lose 50% of their pay in another shift; that is to say, two men would have to lose four hours each in order to provide the other man with eight hours. You would have to equate the rates of pay in order to do that. In a small community like this and in a casual industry, working on a system of production, a sugar curer works for sixteen weeks and a boiler for eighteen weeks, but they are idle for another 27 or 30 weeks. What are you going to do with a situation like that if you reduce the earning capacity of the workers? The factories themselves are using less people, but now you say we have resisted this. Nobody has ever even suggested this. The factories themselves know that to have a three-shift system on the basis of how they pay would require more money. Can you imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. McKenzie saying this is being resisted? It is like resisting the natural elements. All over the world the system has been that wherever you reduce the hours of work, you do not reduce a man's take-home pay. The hon. junior member for Christ Church would tell you that he used to work at night when he first started the Bakery Industry; he worked as much as 60 hours a week, but when he progressively reduced the hours of work, a man did not take home less pay. If you were giving a man \$20 for a ten-hour week and reduced his working time to eight hours, can he carry home two hours and say "Sweets, here are two hours?" Or can he go to a firm and say, "You know the Skipper has reduced my time by two hours, can you take this ticket for two hours?" It is just like the 48-hour week or the 6-day week; you reduce the days but not the pay, because if you do that

the man would be like a man who is carting lime - if he only brings ten bags he gets paid for ten, and if he brings twenty he gets paid for twenty. I do not believe that anybody would come with the suggestion that if you reduce the hours it means a reduction in pay, because you would be reducing the earning capacity of the people and lowering the standard of life.

Do you believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that any worker in Barbados could withstand a 50% reduction in his money?

Let me quote a little more of Professor Laski. When these people die, I often wonder what the Conservative members say. He says:

"The study of trade unionism, especially in recent years, has a multiformity of possible analysis which makes it touch all the social sciences at some point. Sometimes it touches one of them more closely than another; that depends very largely upon the questions we ask about it, and the meaning of the questions, and, still more, of the answers that the facts on analysis reveal."

Is that not applicable to this? We asked that you go into the economic state of the sugar industry in order to reveal something to work on. This is the most vital document that has come the way of members of this House of Assembly for some years. You hear people saying that I do not represent the workers, but this document is going to seal the doom of these workers, not for now but for years to come, because the gentleman asked for this to be an agreement for three years. Praise God we have passed the stage in the Trade Union Movement where we have to depend on these people only to tell us the facts; we can rely on other people.

Last week I read the comparative figures of Barbados. Sugar production in Barbados is relatively higher than any other country in the commonwealth, but he has made such an adverse Report, that it appears that Barbados is in the worst position in the Commonwealth. If he makes such a Report on Barbados, what would he make of Jamaica or Antigua? He is telling us that there is no hope. Let me quote his words from the Report.

"The correct solution to this problem might be to obtain the services of competent job evaluators in the industry to study each job."

This man is crazy! If he knows anything about job evaluation, job evaluation has never been carried out in the sugar industry in the West Indies. A man is not paid in this crop by the job he is performing. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe you have some experience in this. A factory requires the services of some men all the year round. In order to retain their services, they have to put them to certain jobs or keep them at any price, because it means the sugar industry would go bankrupt if they needed the services of certain mechanics; those are the men who can pull down and put back up a factory. In milling sugar, Mr. Deputy Speaker, technical ability is not at stake because the mills are moving and therefore all the men are in a similar position. The rate which you pay is a rate to a man, and although these are not excellent methods, that has been in view of the fact that the man is not now doing a higher job than a man making sugar. For instance, a sugar curer is working to the heat and doing an arduous job, but so far as the sugar curer in the industry is concerned, he is not more important than the man who can take down the mill. 3.30 p.m.

The man who can do the job so far as the processing of sugar is concerned is not the man who is doing the manual work. Job evaluation is one in which you have to put points to certain types of jobs. You can work a job on an evaluation basis where the man's skill is not required in the job at all. Take for instance the Manager. You put him to watch how a job is doing but you do not evaluate what he is watching. Job evaluation is not conducted in the sugar industry. In Barbados a man does not work in the sugar industry as such, because he may be a man who works during the out of crop period as a painter, carpenter or mason: but during the crop season he goes and works in a factory. This is what Mr. McKenzie says:-

"Output bonus on a reasonable basis could also be paid as an incentive to the worker to keep the factory running at maximum efficiency. If this is not possible, as I understand there are considerable doubts whether agreement would be reached on this, I would recommend that when a factory is proposing to increase its output by the installation of further machinery, that the actual rates per ton produced, be re-negotiated on the basis that the worker will not receive less take-home pay than before the change comes about. It is not unusual to agree to some small increase in pay on the change over to new rates."

What is it that he is suggesting? As I have said, at Haggatts we agreed that we would have to make a different rate because that factory had a different production but the increase has to be reflected in what the production capacity would mean to the new rates.

Sir, you can see that it is not a question only of the amount of money you have but that there are broader questions. I have a little information on this. Looking at the plantation industry, you will see that it has been running here for many years, but in this Report we have not seen one single thing said as to whether there are any reserves in this industry. You cannot see what the plantations have done all over the years. Have plantations written off their capital expenditure? There should be a separation between the factory and the plantation because if I bought a plantation 28 or 40 years ago, I have paid off for it. There should be something to show how I am operating and what profits have accrued or whether there are any reserves or whether I have had any amounts from the Rehabilitation Fund and how it is used. You should say how it is used, whether it is used in this way. Running through this Report the indications are that the sugar industry must be put on a basis that the machinery setting it up can build a new factory out of it. Hon. members know that you cannot run a business like that. You are lucky if you have a business which in itself can give you sufficient to buy over that business again. What you want from business is that you can get your money back and you can get something from it to live on.

There is nothing in this Report which can lead those of us who represent labour to agree with it. Of course, some people who represent labour are the very people who are very reactionary when it comes to paying out money. You will have some labourites attacking an employer about the paying out of more wages to his employees when it comes to his political standpoint, but as an employer himself he reacts to that just the same as any of the employers whom he is attacking or even worse than they. Those are the dangers in this society with which we have to deal. Some of our own people can be regarded as capitalists.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I close I will say this. In so far as these negotiations are concerned with employers locally I would like to make it quite clear that the negotiations with the employers in a general way have been always good. What I would also like to make quite clear is that no one should ever believe that in my capacity as a Trade Unionist and in my public capacity I would ever condone a situation in which the maximum benefits to come from the worker in any negotiations is something which I am going to tolerate on a basis of peace for peace's sake. I am not afraid to say that the workers have very little at their disposal in a society like this to press for their rights because on many sides you are being hamstrung. You have a situation in which members of the Government are willing to get up and say something adverse if they think it will have some adverse effect on me. I have this to say. If employers are willing to negotiate, the Union is quite willing to negotiate; but if employers think that they should only negotiate with the Government and that statements made between themselves and Government will cause me to back off from my standpoint on behalf of the people whom I represent, let me say here that I will never do that. I repeat there can be no justification whatsoever for this Report to be regarded as what you would call a private document. What I mean is that this Report should not have been made as a result of a private discussion. I have been all through the country and there is no parish in which I have been in which I have not dealt with this Report since it was pub-

lished. We have said that we do not agree with the Report and apart from its findings we feel that the enquiry should not have been conducted on the basis it was conducted because we regard that we are dealing with a matter which was too vital a one for it to be conducted on a private basis. 3.40 p.m.

We stated that the findings in the Report are as a result of not being dealt with on a public basis; the conclusions in this Report are conclusions which would be based on false premises. I have shown that some of the very proposals or recommendations to deal with wages will be very vital for the future not only for the sugar workers but also for any type of workers. We would have to regard this Report as being unsatisfactory. I do not believe that any hon. member of this Chamber could condemn a public hearing in the biggest industry. This is not a dispute about whether a man should join the Union or not. It is not a dispute as to the rates of pay of a particular Section; it was an investigation into the economic state of the whole industry and in our life time I have not seen an investigation with such wide terms of reference conducted into the sugar industry, or since I have been in public life.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to amend the Resolution to read as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its dissatisfaction with the Report of the Enquiry by Mr. A. F. McKenzie which investigated the economic state of the sugar industry in Barbados." In moving that Resolution I want to say that my objection is based on the main points that I have enunciated, namely, that the Enquiry should have been conducted on a public basis in view of the fact that it was a public enquiry, that because it was not investigated on a public basis Mr. McKenzie came to conclusions based on premises which could not be regarded as sound; the recommendations in the Report which deal with wages on a cost of living basis cannot be regarded as an accurate and expert basis of dealing with wages in the sugar industry. Those are the basic reasons I give for this matter, that is how I summarise this position and those are my comments. I therefore beg to move the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that motion. This Resolution requests that this House place on record its dissatisfaction with the report of the enquiry by Mr. A. F. McKenzie which investigated the economic state of the sugar industry in Barbados.

The specific terms of Mr. McKenzie's enquiry were:-

"To enquire 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.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am happy to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution because I am sure that my own dissatisfaction with this Report is possibly more profound than even that of the introducer of the motion. Mr. McKenzie, in my opinion, came to Barbados and he made a most casual investigation of the industry; he got a lot of half-baked information and therefore he drew a lot of hopelessly wrong conclusions. Let us take for instance that

part of his Report firstly which deals with the price to be paid for canes. Well now, Sir, he began by saying—as a matter of fact I should like to go a little further back. This Report became necessary in view of an island wide unrest in the industry early last year. There was a voluntary and spontaneous cessation of work on behalf of the workers in the industry throughout the island. After this spontaneous strike, the representatives of the workers had to come into the picture and give needed and effective representation of the employees in the industry. In order first and foremost to resolve that issue the Government appointed an investigator, Hon. A. M. Lewis an eminent barrister of St. Lucia, to enquire into the dispute and to make recommendations for a resolution of the issues involved. Mr. Lewis was appointed along with two other arbitrators and in the report which he published, not only was the position of the workers substantiated because he not only granted a fairly reasonable addition in earnings but he went further and he almost said in effect that the original dispute itself was justified.

Nowhere in Mr. Lewis's report on this matter does he blame either the workers or their representatives for the dispute which took place and the fact that in his report he recommended a 7% increase in wages is in itself an endorsement of the stand taken by the employees in refusing to work and a recognition of the rights and justice of their cause. Mr. Lewis said that much of the trouble was due to the fact that the representatives of the sugar industry had declined to give any information with respect to the economic state of the industry. He also said that this policy is a mistaken one and undoubtedly it placed the Union at a disadvantage in their negotiations and in our opinion led to the difficulties which occurred during the 1957 negotiations and have since culminated in the current dispute. 3.50 p.m.

Later, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in that Report, Mr. Lewis also made further reference to this position adopted by the sugar employers. Mr. Lewis said: "The Board is of the opinion that the causes of the present dissatisfaction and unrest are two-fold. The first and fundamental cause is the persistent refusal of the Federation to furnish the Union with financial information about the economy of the industry. This places the Union in a decidedly disadvantageous position in its wages negotiations, since all the relevant information is in the hands of the employers, and there is no other source from which such information can be obtained. Refusal to disclose such important and essential information naturally leads to suspicion that the employers are making huge profits of which they do not wish the workers, their partners in the industry, to be aware."

Now, that was the background to the position when Mr. McKenzie who was Agricultural Adviser to the Federal Government was brought in to investigate the basic economic situation of the industry. One arbiter was saying that the basic cause of the dispute was (1) the feeling that big profits were being made and (2) the refusal to place in the hands of the Workers' Representatives basic information with regard to the economy of the industry. Mr. McKenzie came in and in a very short space of time produced what he called a Report. This Report, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was nothing more or less in my opinion than a misguided attempt to white-wash the sugar industrialists in Barbados. It is of course to be conceded that Mr. McKenzie had every good intention in the world; it is highly possible; but certainly he was obviously misguided by the information supplied to him, and as Mr. Lewis had earlier pointed out, there was only one source from which this information could have been derived, and that was from the employers. It is human nature, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that since the employers are party to the dispute and since they stand to lose or gain by the findings of the investigation, and since they are the only people with the basic information which will lead to a final resolution of the issue, then it is not to be wondered at that this Report is nothing more or less than an attempt to white-wash themselves.

Where I blame Mr. McKenzie is that even on the basis of some of his own findings, he draws wrong conclusions. For instance, Sir, he said in his Report that he had exam-

transporting cost and then what you have to pay for bringing them to maturity over a period of sixteen months - the remaining \$10 is manifestly insufficient to pay for the production cost of canes; therefore, if we had two or three years at which the prices paid for canes were around the figure paid this year, few small-holders would grow canes. I say that Mr. McKenzie is to a great extent to be blamed for the prices paid last year. It is he more than the economics of the industry who is to be blamed because sheltering behind his Report, the industrialists paid out less than what should have been paid out.

I would say, Sir, that one thing which annoys me is the apparent complacency with which the Government reviews the McKenzie Report because since the publication the final prices paid for canes in respect of the year for which the investigation was made - the Government must know, like anybody else, that there was intense dissatisfaction over these prices and nowhere nor at any time has there been any official statement to the effect that the Government was of the opinion that the McKenzie Report did not lay bare the true situation of the industry, nor has the Government gone on record making it clear that it intends to get.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 o'clock, the House now returns to Government Business. It has been intimated that the Bill to amend the Rate of Interest Act was being dealt with in Committee at the time when Government Business was suspended.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE ON THE RATE OF INTEREST BILL, 1959

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill to amend the Rate of Interest Act, 1754, Mr. HOLDER in the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Section, we are told that the underlying reason for the introduction of these amendments is that an interested corporation outside of Barbados has requested certain amendments to the Act; otherwise they would not be prepared to lend money which is needed in the Island. Indeed, the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. John have made it clear, without contradiction on the part of the Government, that this is being done because C.D.C. which is supposed to be financing the extension plans of the Barbados Light and Power Company wants this higher rate of interest.

I want the Government to consider carefully what I am going to tell them. If it is true that this increase in the interest rate is being permissible merely for the Electric Company to get additional finance, it does appear as if the correct procedure for going about this matter would not be by a general Bill, but by a Bill with specific reference to the Barbados Light and Power Company. What the financial advisers to the Government are doing is getting the Government to leave the door completely open so that any foreign company can ride through it after.

The original amendment to the 1754 Rate of Interest Act which we effected last year in August permitted the investors in the country under specific conditions to charge a higher rate of interest than they normally charge to in-

vestors or interested companies. Now, this corporation - the C.D.C. - wants further terms before providing the money needed by this Public Utility Company. Earlier today, I commented on the lack of vision on the part of the Government when they stupidly failed to grasp this opportunity to acquire a foothold in this Public Utility Company.

4.40 p.m.

Even with that as it is, there must be some good reason why any further concession required by the financiers of this capital should not be made specifically to apply to them. A general amendment to the Act would mean that the position would be taken advantage of by other foreign investors; that is an open secret in Bridgetown. You have not got to be a member of the Committee of the Chamber of Commerce in order to know that a number of locally-registered firms are changing their registration; I know of more than one firm registered in this country and which is now registered outside in order to be able to take advantage of the special provisions which recent legislation afford to companies registered outside the island. Therefore, I feel fairly justified in saying, all the surrounding circumstances being taken into consideration, that this Bill should be a Bill dealing exclusively with the Barbados Light and Power Company and the requirement of the Colonial Development Corporation should not be general in its application.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Clause 3 was called and passed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move Mr. Acting Chairman, that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that concludes the consideration of Government Business for today.

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 24th February, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 24th February, 1959 at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5.00 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1958-59 NO. 43

Head IX - Markets was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for \$45,761.

The note to Item 1 reads as follows:-

"Consequent upon the opening of the Fairchild Street Public Market and the expected opening of the Six Cross Roads Public Market additional funds are required to pay part-time and casual employees at these Markets for whom no provision had been made."

Item 2: "The extension of the number of hours during which the Fairchild Street Public Market remains open has caused an increase in the consumption of electricity. Additional funds are required to meet this increase."

Item 3: "It is necessary to carry out extensive repairs to a scale beam at the Cheapside Market. Funds are required for this purpose."

Item 4: "It was necessary to purchase certain items and to install an electric bell at the Fairchild Public Market the expense of which was met from this Item leaving inadequate funds under this Head for the remainder of the financial year. This Resolution seeks to supply the amount required."

Item 5: "It is considered advisable to put an additional coat of paint on the walls of the meat stalls and to replace a few broken glass louvres. Funds are required for this purpose."

Item 6: "No provision was made for running the refrigerating plant at the Fairchild Street Public Market and certain unforeseen repairs had to be carried out to the refrigerating plant at the Cheapside Public Market. The balance remaining in the vote will be insufficient to meet normal expenditure to the end of the financial year. Supplementary provision is accordingly sought."

Item 7: "Increased travelling was necessitated by the opening of the Fairchild Street Public Market and is expected consequent on the opening of the Six Cross Roads Public Market. This, in addition to the increase in travelling rates, makes it necessary to supplement the vote under this Item."

I beg to move that Head IX - Markets, stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
12.45 p.m.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I must again throw out a warning that it seems to me in the very near future the Supplementary Estimates are going to surpass the Annual Estimates. I regret that I have not finished accumulating and adding the Supplementary Estimates for the present financial year but it is such a vast task that I have been unable to get through it by today's meeting. It does seem to me that the method in which the public money is being expended needs more careful attention and it does seem to me that the Heads of these Departments should not be allowed to obtain the idea that they are being paid to do a job and that they can get money from the Treasury at any time. That, Sir, is the impression which I think is prevailing today. One sees in the majority of the explanations to these votes the words "no provision was made."

Now, Sir, it strikes me that the Head of the Department should know what provision should be made under his Department and he should budget accordingly. Everyone of us fully realises that there is an exception to every rule but, Sir, at the rate at which Supplementary Estimates are coming before this House today it seems to me that the exception is being accepted as the rule by the Heads of the Departments of this Island. I repeat, I fail to see how the business of this Island can be run in a proper manner and to the benefit of the people of this Island if those who are responsible and who are being paid do not make provision in order that the finances of this Island may be properly and faithfully administered. I hope that some attention will

be paid to what I have said in the near future. It is, I repeat, indicative of the habit that is being acquired today that the work of a Department is not being carefully planned and carefully budgeted for; therefore, it must in the long run come to what we see occurring here today, that is to say, votes being passed for a particular purpose and part of them being used for another purpose and the money being expended. I do feel that the Hon. Ministers should give some attention to this matter.

Now, Sir, dealing in detail with what the Hon. Premier has read for us under this Head, the Note to the first Item reads as follows:-

"Consequent upon the opening of the Fairchild Street Public Market and the expected opening of the Six Cross Roads Public Market additional funds are required to pay part-time and casual employees at these Markets for whom no provision had been made."

I regret that it is necessary for me to turn myself around in circles to find out which part I am reading from and to what the note is referring. It is not my intention to delay the Committee but it is necessary for me to turn myself in that position to find what I want to speak about. This Note refers to Item 15, Labour. Now, Sir, I do not know but surely somebody should know, and perhaps the Hon. Premier can give me the explanation as regards what are the consequential items arising out of the opening of the Fairchild Street Market. Perhaps, if we can be told what was necessary before and what was found to be necessary afterwards, we might be able to decide who is accountable for this supplementary amount. I want to stress the word "accountable" because in any business, in any organisation, there should be somebody accountable and he should be brought to account; so, Sir, I hope that some accounting can be given why it is unforeseen as regards this vote of \$1,200. It may be a good explanation - I do not know - but I am wondering if there is a good explanation for each and everyone of these Supplementary Estimates.

Now, Sir, the Note also says "the expected opening of the Six Cross Roads Public Market." That expectation may be this year, next year or I do not know when. I would have thought that this Honourable House would have been given a little better assurance as to the opening of this Market. Surely, those responsible should know that the opening is not only expected but that it is recommended for completion by such and such a time. If we go on expecting and not providing, the Supplementary Estimates must in the long run surpass the annual estimates.

The Note further says that additional funds are required to pay part-time and casual employees at these markets for whom no provision had been made.

Is not it incredible to you, Mr. Chairman, that the casual employees who are going to be employed and, as far as I can understand, have been employed - no provision was made for them? Well, Sir, it sounds to me as a very, very, casual way to prepare a business. I am also wondering who these casual employees are that no provision was made for them. Who are they? What do they do? What do they work for? How is this money spent? Is it spent casually on the casuals? Has this note been thought of by someone, or has someone just jot this down casually for the casual manner in which this Honourable House does its work? I must at this stage remark on this Honourable House, including myself, that the paucity of attendance during the opening hours of this House points to the casual way in which every one of us undertakes our work for which we are being paid.
12.55 p.m.

The note No. 3 states that it is necessary to carry out extensive repairs to a scale beam at the Cheapside Market. I would be grateful and this is at the risk of being somewhat inquisitive perhaps, but as long as I retain my honourable seat in this House, I hope I will be granted permission to ask questions and to receive the answers to those questions. I would like to know about this scale beam which has to be extensively repaired. It sounds to me that this is an antiquated beam; I believe it is one which could well be dumped and a new one put in its place. I would be

grateful if we could be told if it is necessary to carry out these repairs.

Mr. Acting Chairman, with your vast knowledge of machinery you would appreciate, I think, that carrying out extensive repairs to this scale beam is something which makes you, and those of us who know something about machinery, think that it is not a matter for extensive repairs but for replacement. These extensive repairs may be done now, but the intricacies of a scale beam call for proper upkeep and renewal of the intricate parts. If I am correct, I believe that this is an ancient model and I have my doubts as to the wisdom of carrying out extensive repairs to this ancient model. I would be grateful if I could be told how old this model is and what are exactly the repairs which are intended to be done.

As regards Note No. 4, this is a matter of incidentals amounting to \$566. It says that it was necessary to purchase certain items and to install an electric bell at the Fairchild Street Market. I would be grateful to be informed exactly what is the use of an electric bell at a public market; for what purpose is it going to be used? I am not too clear as to the necessity for an electric bell at this market; it may be for the purpose of a fire alarm but I would like to be informed as to the necessity for it. This is a clear case; "it was necessary to purchase certain items and to install an electric bell at the Fairchild Street Public Market." I do not know if the items include an electric bell, or if they are other than this electric bell, at the Fairchild Street Market. The note goes on, "the expense of which was met from this item leaving inadequate funds under this Head for the remainder of the financial year." It would seem that unforeseen, unprecedented expense was met from money allocated under this Head for the remainder of the financial year. The note also states that this Resolution seeks to supply - it does not say that it seeks to supplement - the amount required.

In Note No. 5, I believe even the person who is writing this note is probably right when this error was made whether it be typographical or not. The note states that is considered advisable to put an additional cost of paint and that seems to be exactly what is occurring. It is not an additional coat of paint but an additional cost of paint regardless of investigation or proper budgeting or of proper supervision, regardless of proper accountability for these items.

Again Note No. 6 states that no provision was made - and the fact that we have the constant recurrence of the words "no provision", seems to indicate that the person whose job it is to make this provision is not doing his job. The Note states that no provision was made for running the refrigerator plant at the Fairchild Street Market. That implies to me that provision was made for the plant but of course none was made for running it. Again, it is indicative to me of the manner in which, according to the note, the public funds are being expended in these Supplementary Estimates. One can understand that certain unforeseen repairs may occur, but one cannot understand why no provision was made for the running of the refrigerator. Sir, I do hope that the hon. Ministers and the Hon. Premier will pay attention to these matters. Possibly they have good explanations, but from my observation and from the notes which I have at my disposal and the increasing rapidity with which Supplementary Estimates are coming before this House, I think it is necessary that these words of warning should be issued.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Acting Chairman, when one hears the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down one would think that he was free of all blame; that he was the most perfect man on earth and that his organisation which he manages or partly manages is without any blame. Sir, I do not mean to be offensive, but I just want to recall one little incident which took place not so long ago. The hon. member's memory is not so short. Sometime ago I heard that it was a big catastrophe which occurred at a place called Lower Estate. At a place with a lot of money an unfortunate man lost his life and another was maimed probably for all his life.

1.05 p.m.

I want to ask him now in the light of all that, whether it is

fair to come here and talk without reason when a man, a bread-winner, lost his life. God knows how much the man's family got. The whole thing tumbled down and he is responsible for it - and caused a man to lose his life on the spot and another was maimed for perhaps all his life. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones; and he should set his house in order before he comes here to make these criticisms. You keep your machines and kill people wholesale. I wonder if he takes a chance to go and look for the man's family. He lost his life because of faulty machinery.

We are asking for money to carry on Government business and to pay higher wages, but he comes and makes wholesale criticism when he killed a man through faulty machinery. We want more representation to see that these factories are kept in a proper condition. You let your machinery so deteriorate that you kill a man, and you come in here to talk about Government spending so much money. All Governments have to spend supplementary amounts. Who can be so perfect as to say what will not occur or what prices will not go up? We budget at one time of the year, and if prices for some reason or another go up, we have got to carry on the service. We are unlike you because if you budget for a certain amount and see that you are running out, you set the labourers adrift or do not pay them any more; we are not having that conservative policy. That is what you are asking this Socialist Government to do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must address the Chair.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but when I got up I addressed you. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member should not come here and make these false accusations because he is free to talk on the floor of the House. You can take any amount of money and make it do for you in one year, but what you should do is to have a supplementary amount. Your firm should go to the Bank and draw more money to pay people and do services. You are telling us that we should not ask for more money for the services of the people. Do you realise what the market means to the people of this colony? Respectable people now go there in peace, quiet and good surroundings and buy their wares, and I am reliably told that more peasants are beginning to get interested in the planting of vegetables because they know where they can go and sell them.

When this market was first opened, nobody could foresee the many needs of the market such as now required. We had an old dilapidated market, but now we have a most modern market, and certainly we should give them the supplies they want to make it comfortable. You are asking us to give you a break-down of a bolt or a wash-basin or some little thing which might make the hawkers happy. If you want a break-down, you are entitled to it and will have it. The amount required is \$1,200. We are not subscribing to the cheese-paring policy which you have when it comes to running a service for the people of this colony.

The hon. member asked a question about Item 3. The note says:-

"It is necessary to carry out extensive repairs to a scale beam at the Cheapside Market. Funds are required for this purpose."

Sir, we are asking for \$54. Government property must be kept in good shape. The hon. member should realise, Mr. Chairman, that it is the duty of Government to keep what belongs to Government in a proper state of repairs. That is the reason why a man lost his life, which is a serious thing.

The next item about which he spoke is the refrigerating plant. The note says that no provision was made for running the refrigerating plant at the Fairchild Street Public Market and certain unforeseen repairs had to be carried out to the refrigerating plant at the Cheapside Public Market. The balance remaining in the vote will be insufficient to meet normal expenditure to the end of the financial year. Supplementary provision is accordingly sought.

Everybody knows that we have got to keep the meat in this country in a proper state and wholesome condition, and any money we spend in preserving the meat and fish in this colony is money worthwhile spent; otherwise we would have an epidemic or people would be ptomained. The money we spend in keeping meat and fish frozen to a proper edible state should not be quibbled over, because a lot of people in this island would get hurt if the standard is not maintained so far as sanitary conditions are concerned.

Item 7 concerns travelling. As you know, Mr. Chairman, we are contemplating building markets around the island and have already started on a couple. There is one now in St. Philip which is finished and we are awaiting a boiler which is the reason for its not being opened yet, and we have to do quite a bit of travelling to see that these things are done correctly. The office of the market has now been transferred to Fairchild Street, and the Superintendent has to do more travelling because he has to see that things are going well. We would not come and ask for more travelling for an officer if he did not satisfy the Ministry that he is travelling more, so this item is because of the inception of the new markets which must necessitate more travelling. I hope that satisfies the hon. member.

Item 2 is the main one. Item 2 says that the extension of the number of hours during which the Fairchild Street Public Market remains open has caused an increase in the consumption of electricity, and additional funds are required for this purpose.

Now, Sir, we cannot make people who are permitted to work a certain amount of hours carry on over and above those hours; therefore we had to look for part-time help to keep this market open so that the people can promote sales and buy their vegetables and wares after working hours. Were we to close the market just about the time the stores close, what would be the use of the market? There are those people going home after work who have to buy supplies; therefore we had to get additional help to keep the place open so that people can buy their wares. 1.15 p.m.

Do not close the market at the same time when the stores are being closed when the people who work in the stores will find a closed market, but get additional help and pay them so that those people who are engaged in work during the day at the stores will be able to buy their wares from the market. It does not take a Solomon to see that. We have to pay these people. Everybody knows that electricity rates have gone up. This is a big market. We had a small market before and they took their estimates by what they spent down there at the small market. Now we come to have a big market and it is being kept open so much more additional hours you must see that the expenses would of necessity be greatly increased; so in order to keep things going as as they are now, they have to ask for this additional expenditure. It is as plain as that.

It is our duty, and we have decided, that we will spend money on refrigeration because we want to maintain the health of the island. Meat must be kept fresh and properly secured as well as fish. When it comes to the market itself we intend to keep it clean. In fact, we intend to do everything to maintain a high standard of what a market should be. So far as the labour force is concerned, we do not intend to overwork them. We are not asking those already established to come and do extra work for the Government for nothing. I hope these things are understood and that the hon. member is thankful for the explanation.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I fail to see how any other hon. member except one with the mentality of the hon. member who has just sat down would have replied in the way he did to an honest effort of constructive criticism. I hope, Sir, that this House will send for what they have in Trinidad, that is, a machine for recording what hon. members say so that the public may hear what they have said. Such replies as what the Hon. Minister just gave are such that I will not pay any attention to them. To take the circumstances as they were, you, Mr. Chairman, should have stopped him. When the Hon. Minister started to bring comparison with something which is completely outside of this Resolution, he should have been stopped. That, Sir, is

despicable behaviour. Let me say that I can match him with anything he does. I have matched him before, I have brought him down already and I will do so again if he wants it that way. For any decent-minded member of this House to say that what the Hon. Minister said in reply was a reasonable reply to which I am entitled in this Hon. House, he is not speaking the truth. I shall leave him alone. I will only say this: if the best man in the world has his faults written on his forehead, so that he will have to bury his head, the Hon. Minister for Agriculture should have his written on his posterior so that it would keep him in his seat.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, in order to clear the record, I will just like to add that this is a lesson to the hon. member. When he is making these comparisons he must understand that no hon. member on this side of the House is going to sit down and be trampled and let the hon. member go away with the feeling that he is safe and secure. I give him the warning: when he comes to criticise my Ministry he must bring his facts; but whenever he descends to a low level I am not afraid to descend to that low level also. If he keeps high I can remain high. I will continue to make comparisons because the same right which you have to criticise my Government, the same right have I to make comparisons of the running of it with your private industry. Therefore, Sir, I am not making any apology for anything I have said. The hon. member came in here in the spirit of condemning these matters and because he has been answered, he tries to hide behind you.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to hold a brief for one side or the other in this House but I want to see preserved as high a standard as possible of parliamentary debate. I myself am a very serious critic of the policy of the Government. I am a serious critic when it comes to corruption of public officers and matters of that kind.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not use those words.

Mr. BARROW: Do you mean to tell me that I cannot use the words "corruption of public officers"? I have not called the name of any hon. member. I am saying this, Mr. Chairman, when you allow a Minister to get up and call an hon. member - and I am not concerned about the member being the hon. senior member for St. George, because I myself am actually fighting to see the rights of particular workmen maintained against the particular hon. member - I cannot sit here and allow the Chairman or any body else to condone a member of the House calling another a murderer. That is what I resent.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I said that the incident was one which was tantamount to murder.

Mr. BARROW: If the hon. member says now that he said it was tantamount to murder, then he is a liar.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. John must not use those words of another hon. member.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am asking that those offensive remarks by the hon. member be withdrawn.

Mr. BARROW: I consider, Mr. Chairman,.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of order. I repeat, I ask that those offensive words which were spoken by the hon. junior member for St. John be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Agriculture is asking that the hon. junior member for St. John withdraw those remarks.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what words were wrong. I said if he had used those words. He never used the word "tantamount" at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister has taken exception to these words.

Mr. BARROW: You can only take exception to an accusation.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I rise on a point of order. I ask that those offensive words spoken by the hon. junior member for St. John be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister is asking the hon. junior member for St. John to withdraw those offensive words that he is a murderer.
1.25 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I said, if the Hon. Minister - and I used the word "Honourable". The words you thought I used were the words "he is a liar", but I never used them. I said that if he is saying now that he used the words "tantamount to murder" then he is a liar. The Reporter can prove that he accused the hon. member of being a murderer. I should like to ask which is the more serious - a liar or a murderer? Which is the one that he wants me to withdraw? Mr. Chairman, you are Chairman of the Committee, not of the Party. I fought the hon. member in the very case; I did not have to fight him really, because they paid the measly compensation which this Government said that a workman's family must get. I resent the standard of the debate deteriorating to such a level that you have people like that.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am asking that those words be taken down.

Mr. BARROW: He cannot now ask that words be taken down. I have not called him a liar; if I called him a liar I withdraw that, but he never said that that is tantamount to murder. Did you hear me use the word "liar" Mr. Acting Chairman?

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: The words were used that "it is tantamount." I am appealing to the hon. member to keep the debate on a high level. Even assuming for the sake of argument.....

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Acting Chairman, you do not seem to understand what I said. I said this: if I said that the Hon. Minister is a liar I withdraw the remarks; but if he says that he stated in his original speech that it is tantamount to murder when he directly called the hon. senior member for St. George a murderer - and he should be the last person to call him a murderer - I am saying that you are failing in your duty as Chairman to rule. The day when we allow members of this Assembly to get up in here and, because of an industrial accident, call a member of the House a murderer for cheap publicity, then we have sunk to a very low state indeed. I have always fought on the political platform, in elections and in the Law Courts. I am only (ASIDES).....

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter stop making these asides?

Mr. BARROW: I am making an appeal to you; you are Chairman of the Committee, not the Chairman of that Party of kleptomania. I did not want to get into this debate, but I happen to know more about the facts. When we are talking about the Public Market, the Hon. Minister accuses the hon. senior member for St. George of being a murderer!

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: He did not make any statement like that.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order. The hon. member said that I was a murderer.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: He did not say that.

Mr. BARROW: He did say so and you sat down there and smiled; but it all points to this: "he that entereth not by the door to the fold the same is a thief and a robber."

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am too old to be dictated to.

Mr. BARROW: You are Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: I want the hon. member to realise that there is a certain amount of dignity and respect to be maintained, and as long as I have the honour to be a member of this House and to be in this Chair, whether you are a member on the left or on the right, I am prepared to maintain that standard.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. senior member for St. George has always been able to take care of himself. What I deplore is that you have Ministers of the Government in answer to criticism, getting up and calling members of the House murderers. I thought that the hon. senior member for St. George would have objected because the Hon. Minister used the remark three times. If you want to call me a liar you can do so.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am not going into the gutter. I am asking the hon. member to desist from using such remarks; whether it is on the side of the Government or on the side of the Opposition, let us maintain a high standard. The mere fact that the hon. member has asked to withdraw those words he should withdraw them and let that be an end of it.

Mr. BARROW: What are you referring to? I have said I would withdraw the remarks. The Hon. Minister said that the hon. senior member for St. George *si quid inest* was a murderer. Do not let the Ministers get away with that standard of conduct; we must be indignant about this kind of thing. Everybody in this House heard the Hon. Minister make allegations against the hon. senior member for St. George. Nobody will ever hold me out as being a defender of the hon. senior member for St. George, neither of his Party nor otherwise. Personally, I have nothing against him. I am not like the other hon. member who would be always under his window. The only time that I went to that factory is when the crane broke down, and it is heinous for an hon. member to come into this Chamber and accuse another hon. member of being a murderer.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw those remarks immediately. I do not even know where the hon. member's house is; so that I do not know where his window is. That is an untruthful remark.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. George is asking the hon. junior member for St. John to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. BARROW: You would have to rule whether the words are unparliamentary. Have any unparliamentary words been used?

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: The remark was rather uncouth.

Mr. BARROW: I heard the hon. senior member for St. George say that on many mornings when he opened his window to spit outside he would spit on the hon. junior member for St. George, the Hon. Minister of Social Services. I believe that to be true; there is nothing unparliamentary about that.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am not saying that the words are unparliamentary; I am saying that they are uncouth.

Mr. BARROW: If they are uncouth I would withdraw them. But I do think that this debate is getting slightly out of order.
1.35 p.m.

I only rose here to say that I have no brief for either of them, but when it comes to the question of the rights of hon. members you will always hear my voice in protest, and if we allow them to get away with that type of conduct now, it means you will never know for whom the bell tolls; it may be tolling for you, Mr. Chairman. The little side issue with the hon. junior member for St. George is not important; that is only a little criticism we heard during a campaign from the hon. senior member for St. George, and since I am not in a position to say I was there, since I have never

been there to know whether or not it is true, if you think it is unkind to be associated with the hon. junior member for St. George either in business or socially and it is a most serious indictment you can have on somebody in his particular sphere of life, I withdraw. I do not think he is being dishonest to that level, although I do not have much use for him either.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must.....

Mr. BARROW: I do not have any use for you either except as a Chairman. As a person, I do not have much use for you, but as a Chairman, I respect you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please get back to the debate?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am not concerned about those matters. I think the Resolution which Government brought down is quite in order for a supplementary vote; there is nothing wrong with it at all, because from time to time these unforeseen things will arise, but that is all the Hon. Minister of Agriculture had to say; he did not have to abuse another hon. member and call him a murderer, and I regret that you did not see fit to stop it; and my only purpose in rising is to ask when in future you see a member going to that extreme, stop him. If somebody says something is corrupt or dishonest, it is an entirely different matter; but if an industrial accident occurs in a man's place of business, you cannot come in the House of Assembly and abuse your privilege and call that particular man a murderer. I say this again for the last time that "he that entereth not by the door to the fold, the same is a thief and a robber."

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, it is very unfortunate that this debate through inadvertence particularly of the Chairman was allowed to sink into this level. There is nothing unusual in the Items in the Supplementary Resolution before us dealing with markets which include labour, light, repairs to weights and measures, incidentals, maintenance of refrigerating plant and travelling. You cannot budget for these Items with any precision with a result that towards the end of the financial year you will be called on to make certain adjustments and seek supplementary provision. There is really no need for a lengthy debate on this matter, but it is very unfortunate that the Minister is so thin-skinned or becomes so sensitive whenever a member attempts to ask any question affecting his Ministry. It is the duty of the Opposition to ask questions and if the hon. senior member for St. George who is a capitalist and conservative and who understands the spending of money and how to control and tie up funds, objects to certain expenditure here, he is justified in doing so. He was not even really objecting; he was merely asking questions and seeking certain information, and for the Hon. Minister to descend to such a low level and to launch the personal attacks is unparalleled in this Chamber in that he accused the member of a felony, of being connected up either as an accessory before the fact or after the fact in some murder. Expressions like that were used and were uncalled for. I was hoping that the Minister would have given some information as to how this money in connection with the first Item - labour - is to be spent. The amount is for \$1,200 and the explanation given is that consequent upon the opening of the Fairchild Street Public Market, and the expected opening of the Six Cross Roads Market additional funds are required to pay part-time and casual employees at these markets for whom no provision had been made. I want to know what sort of work these part-time employees are engaged in doing. Or is it money for the opening of the Market? Is it money for having a splash at the opening of the Market? It is very strange that for part-time and casual employees they did not envisage what money they had to spend.

I thought when the Minister rose that he would have given some explanation to the points raised by the hon. senior member for St. George instead of making long, abusive and uncalled-for statements. The people who put us here want constructive work done and not a long talk and abusive language, least of all from the Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter cease those loud asides?

Mr. WALCOTT: Cease? Do you know I have been elected here?

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, it is very encouraging to see, in spite of the asides, that the Cheapside Market is being renovated and will soon be on a proper and better footing, and I am hoping, Sir, that it will be a much cooler Market than it was under the old set-up, when by mistake the Crown Agents or whoever they were sent the wrong plan down here for the construction of a market. The plan for the Market went to some other part of the world, maybe Timbuctoo or Honolulu, and the plan which came here was for an entirely different structure; but in those days with the lack of architectural knowledge and having many incompetent architects and engineers in our midst, the plan which was never intended for a market was built for a market with the result that it never served that purpose. That same building is now being re-constructed for use as a market and it is to be hoped that when the money has been spent in the reconstruction of this Cheapside Market it will serve the purpose for which it is being designed.

I should like to ask the Minister the following questions: (1) How soon does he expect the Cheapside Market to be completed? (2) What system, if any, is adopted in the allocation of booths in the markets and will be adopted in this Cheapside Market when completed? and (3) Whether there is a Marketing Committee still functioning and who are the personnel of this Committee?
1.45 p.m.

I want to know what is the policy of the Government in so far as the allocation of booths to tenderers or applicants. Can you tell me what policy, if any, is adopted? I would like answers to these questions, if not now, at some future time. If the Hon. Minister were to study his portfolio in the manner in which I hope he is, questions such as these would not be difficult to answer at this stage even though they are given impromptu and offhand.

Sir, I hope when these two markets are finished that the Hon. Minister will not fail to realise that there are other parishes which need markets also. There is a system and scheme of markets which was worked out by me and I am hoping that that scheme will be followed in every respect. What the Hon. Minister is doing now is nothing new. It is what we were doing from 1954. What I am saying is, I hope the Hon. Minister will not stop at the Six Cross Roads Market and that he will see to it that the market for Four Roads will go up as well as one in Speightstown and the one which was allocated for St. Thomas at Welchman Hall. There was also one which was allocated for Top Rock, Christ Church, but we found some difficulty in acquiring the land. I hope the Hon. Minister will not close his hands when he has finished with the Six Cross Roads and the Cheapside Markets and feel that he has done a wonderful job. Try and remember the regular marketing scheme and refer back to your files and study them carefully and see the policy for markets.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I hope anything which I ask the Hon. Minister will not cause him to lose his temper. I am glad to hear the hon. senior member for Christ Church answered the question because I am going to give my reason why I have asked one. I would like the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to look into this question of the whole marketing arrangements. I am not averse from the Government building markets but I think the time has come - and the Hon. Minister should examine this - when the administration of markets should not really be the job of the Central Government but that of the Local Government. If you examine other places in the world which aspire to self Government you would see that the question of people selling fish, yams, sweet potatoes and eddoes and where they sell them are not things which a Minister sees after. Let these things be done by the Local Government. These are the functions of the Local Government. Do you think a Minister of the United Kingdom would worry about where to put a market, say, in the county of Derby? He leaves that to the local people to decide. Sir, we have a

market debate in the Central Government when the proper place for any real market row ought to be among the local authorities with the fledglings now coming into politics. Give them something to do. We have to ask these questions in here because of this stupidity of centralising every little petty thing. If you are putting down a little standpipe or erecting a bath, you talk of it in here. Leave these things to the proper authorities to do.

Since it is this way, Mr. Chairman, - and I am sorry it has fallen on the Hon. Minister of Agriculture because he is very willing to give information - I would ask the Hon. Minister to consider the question which I asked about the market in Speightstown. It has been drawn to my attention that there is no stand for hawkers there and that the Police have been pushing these people around and preventing them from selling their wares according to the law, the Bridgetown and Speightstown Act being the same. I am asking the Hon. Minister to go into this matter. Let him ask the Police to be more considerate and not to carry out the letter of the law and not to be too hard on these people until such time as a market is erected there. I will honestly tell the Minister that I have not examined that aspect of the matter as regards the Police moving them around but I know the law is there and the Police have the authority to do it. What I am asking is that until such time as a regular market is erected in Speightstown - I mean apart from the Fish Market - restrictive methods are not used against these hawkers. Sir, you can well understand that trade is going up all over the island. People have to hawk their trade and you are forcing them off the street while there is no market to accommodate them and other people do not allow them to use their doors to sell. You can well see that you are creating a hardship on these hawkers.

I think this is a view which the Hon. Minister himself will express because he has shown a willingness to look into these matters. I am sure he will take what I have said in good faith because there is nothing wrong in it. Of course, the general question is not for him but for the Government. I repeat that they are taking away the right of the Local Government authorities and I feel that the Central Government's time can be utilised in dealing with matters of higher policy than just simply the erection and siting of markets. Of course, the Central Government has to provide the money for the erection of markets but when these markets are erected they should be turned over to the local authorities so that we would not be asked questions about them. I hope that my question as regards the Speightstown market will not cause the Hon. Minister any worry or incur his wrath because I am in a good mood at the moment.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see the spirit of the last hon. member who spoke. I would only say it is not always that he is in such a mood and it is not always that I am in this particular mood.

As regards the questions asked by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, first of all, he asked how soon will the Cheapside Market be opened. My answer to that is that I think in the third quarter of this year it will be ready. I may say that work on it should have started before but the delay was due to rum which was stored there. One merchant who stored rum there did not have a bond of his own and we had to wait on him. However, we hope in the next three or four months to have the opening of that market.

As regards the question of allocation of booths there, we advertised in the newspapers and applications have come in. They are all being dealt with by the Superintendent and I can assure the hon. member that the people who occupy stalls there will get the first option; they will have the first refusal.

As regards the Marketing Committee which was another question by the same hon. member, I must state that we are in touch with the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom in order to secure the services of two Marketing Officers who are coming here very shortly, I hope, not only to instruct us but to advise us on many points in the marketing system. I am very much concerned about marketing facilities and

we are getting down two top men to lay the foundation for them, because marketing is very primitive. This advice will be free because we are getting one of these gentlemen from the I.C.T.A. and the other from the U.K. One of them should have been here three or four months ago but he had to attend a very important Conference. (Mr. WALCOTT: Can I see them?) The hon. senior member for St. Peter is asking if he can see them and I should like to say that if he is invited, then he must come. (Mr. WALCOTT: I will come if I am invited.)

As far as the Speightstown market is concerned, perhaps the hon. senior member for St. Peter will have a word with some of the people down there with whom we are dealing as regards the land. We are having any amount of trouble in getting this land. I am addressing these remarks to the hon. senior member for Christ Church when I say that these markets should not stop with the one in St. Philip. I think that I have made my position abundantly clear as to the future of these markets. I was at pains to say that the only reason why we worked on that one in St. Philip before the one in Speightstown was because of the availability of the land. Even now we are having trouble with the Queen's Solicitor in getting this land in Speightstown. In order to get ahead with the job we had to build where we could get the land. As regards the land in Christ Church, that proposition was turned down in the hon. member's time. I would not resurrect that. As regards other markets.....

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order, Was that the only site in Christ Church which could be considered? I should like to ask that question. I am not talking about resurrecting anything; the question is whether a suitable site could not be acquired.

At this stage, it now being 2 p.m. of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair and suspended the sitting until 2.30 p.m., of the clock.

2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that there is no quorum present.

On the Bell being rung, a quorum was obtained

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing has laid the answer to Question No. 5 asked by the hon. junior member for St. George. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Resolution re Report on the Sugar Industry by Mr. A. F. Mc.Kenzie.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume debate on the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution re Report on the Sugar Industry by Mr. A. F. Mc.Kenzie. On the last occasion the hon. senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, on the last occasion when this matter was discussed, I think I had got to the point where I was discussing the price paid for canes. Now the relevant paragraphs of the Report in connection with cane prices are paragraphs 72 and 74. Paragraph 72 says - in fact just immediately before paragraph 72 the Report presents Table XIII showing the value of sugar cane, of sugar including preference margins from the year 1950 to the year 1957 and what not; it shows the cost of purchasing canes and it also sets out the purchase price of cane in proportion to the total value of sugar. Arising out of the Table, the author of the Report went on to say this:

"If these percentages are compared with those obtaining in other territories the grower in Barbados is in an extremely fortunate position. I am informed that canes in Jamaica are paid for at the rate of approximately 66% of the value of sugar. British Guiana by virtue of its conditions does not purchase much cane, but I have been informed that it is usual to value the cane at 69% of the value of sugar. In Fiji it is believed that canes are only valued at 62%"

In paragraph 74 he says this:-

"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."

That is a very strong statement. In other words, Sir, what Mr. McKenzie is actually saying is that the position of the cane growers in Barbados is so superlatively satisfactory that he was not prepared to make any recommendations at all with regard to them. When the debate took place last week I was trying to point out, first and foremost, that if the statement is made that the producer of canes in Barbados is in a satisfactory position, that statement would only apply to the large cane growers. Apparently, Mr. McKenzie did not investigate deeply enough the over-all aspects of cane production because he failed to appreciate the fact that cane growers are divided into two categories - the large plantation producers and the small holder producers. I am not in a position to say whether or not the price paid for plantation canes is satisfactory; but I can definitely say that the price paid to small holders is not satisfactory.

2.45 p.m.

Mr. McKenzie himself has recommended in paragraph 79 a corrective not for unsatisfactory cane prices but for unsatisfactory delivery, because in paragraph 78 he referred to the inappropriate delivery of canes by smallholders to the factory and said that there was a certain amount of bitterness amongst the estate cane-cutters because estates were given quotas for the cane delivered each week and very often these quotas are lower than the estate could deliver, restricting the earnings of cane-cutters in consequence; and this, as he said, is done because the factories want to take a certain amount of smallholders' canes early in the crop.

He goes on in paragraph 79 to recommend that the solution to this is to try to establish amongst the smallholders Cooperative Societies for the sale of their canes to factories by contract over the crop period in an orderly manner, the Societies benefiting by obtaining a premium for their cane if delivered at the factory in stated quantities over the period of the crop.

It is funny, Mr. Speaker, how these experts who inquire into the Sugar Industry appear to mix up all these things. Mr. McKenzie claims that in 1959 in order to resolve the dissatisfaction on the part of the cane-cutters on sugar estates who are restricted in their cutting every week because the estates want to take a certain amount of smallholders' canes, the smallholders should band together in Cooperative Societies and deliver their canes in an orderly manner over a stated period. Now in 1946-47 when you had the investigation into the industry by Professor Shephard, he recommended that the canes should be delivered cooperatively by smallholders and that they should get a special premium for so doing, because in those days the big sugar factories were not getting enough canes to grind, and that the smallholders should get together and send their canes in large lots so as to keep the factories fed with canes; and if they did that they should get a small premium over and above the price paid to them. Mr. McKenzie arrived at the same conclusion for entirely different reasons, and makes the point that irrespective of whether or not they delivered canes on a cooperative basis, he is going to make no recommendation as regards to price because the price is already satisfactory.

As I said last week, arising in my opinion to a large extent out of this Report, the price for canes last year received by smallholders was considerably less than what it was a year before. There were, of course, certain factors which influenced production costs which are to some extent responsible for the drop in price, but they were not entirely responsible, because the prices paid to smallholders last year were in many cases \$3 a ton less than the year before in spite of the increase in the price of sugar, and a factory like Haymans which had paid \$18.21 in 1957 only paid \$14.87 last year. That is over \$3.00 but in the case of many other factories the prices dropped by between \$2.50 and \$3.00 per ton.

It is of interest to note that the Department concerned with fostering cooperatives in the island is now pushing this idea of trying to get the peasants to market on a cooperative basis and to market the maximum amount of canes cooperatively. We all endorse the principles of the cooperative movement, but we certainly are not going to allow the peasants to be fooled that if they market 500 tons of canes they are going to get the same price a plantation gets. I want to stress that because since Mr. McKenzie has laid it down in the most emphatic terms that nothing at all should be done about the price to be paid for canes, it means that nothing will be done more than this effort for the smallholders to market canes in lots of 500 tons under the belief that they are going to get what the plantations get. They may get a small premium of 15¢, 20¢ or 25¢ a ton more for obvious reasons because when a factory obtains a quota of 500 tons, it is 500 tons, and were it not for this idea of marketing cooperatively, the smallholders who live near a particular factory might not send their canes there at all but send them elsewhere even although transport costs might be more. I am emphasising that the small premium they get on the 500 tons will not bring them to the plantation price, and if the plantation price is satisfactory - I do not know whether or not it is - since they are not going to get the plantation price, then the price must be less satisfactory than the plantation price. The plantations are getting more even than the 500 ton group, because they have shares in the factory, and as I said last week, over and above the dividends on these shares, they still get a higher price for canes. I personally do not see why this should be so. All they are entitled to more than the small grower is the dividend on their sugar factory canes. The smallholders spend money on fertilisers in the same way as plantations do. In any case, the final price is based on the recovery of the factory, so that even if there is a slight difference in the sucrose content between some peasants' canes and plantation canes, in the final analysis the price for canes is based on the overall recovery of the factory.

2.55 p.m.

Therefore, there can be no cause for paying other than the plantation prices to the small producers.

It may be possible, Mr. Speaker, for the plantation owner to be satisfied but the peasants are not. It is therefore cause for further investigation into the position of the smallholder and the small producer of canes. I want to repeat today the statement which I made last week that in consequence of the prices paid for canes last year many small holders want to produce an alternative crop. I want to say that the prices paid for canes last year was largely the result of Mr. McKenzie's Report and it has done a lot of harm to smallholders because obviously Mr. McKenzie has failed to differentiate between the two types of marketers and failed to probe deeply enough in order to discover that two prices are still paid for canes. Therefore, Sir, all he has done so far as this aspect of sugar production is concerned, means nothing at all to the small holder producers of canes. My own opinion is that if there is any difference between the prices paid small holders and plantation owners, the difference should be to the small holders and for two reasons. In the first case, production costs are lower over the larger acreage and, secondly, even if the plantation owners were not entirely satisfied with the prices paid for canes they would have the chance to be recouped when they get their dividends on their shares in the factory. Small holders have no factory shares, therefore, any difference should be in favour of the small holder and not as it is now of the factory holder. Therefore, it follows, as a matter of course, that anyone interested in the small producer of canes will have to refuse to accept the recommendation of Mr. McKenzie and to endeavour to pursue this matter further.

Now, Sir, there is one other point of this aspect of this matter which I want to emphasise. It is more than passing strange with the experience of producing sugar in Barbados that the percentage profit which Mr. McKenzie stated accrues to factory owners should be so different from what it is in other Islands in the area. Last week I challenged Mr. McKenzie on the 5% overall profits. I said

that the average percent in Jamaica is 10% where wages are higher and the experience of one sugar factory in Trinidad is worth recalling here. None of us, of course, had a chance to examine any of the figures in Barbados as regards this matter but some of these public companies in the other colonies have to publish a balance sheet, and in Trinidad one of the Tate and Lyle factories at Caroni declared additional profits in 1956 of \$390,000 made on the extra production of 4,748 tons of sugar. In the case of St. Kitts, they for years, have been declaring a 7% profit. As far back as 1949, they were declaring around a seven percent profit which was taxable and which would mean something around 12 percent; and at that, they were getting the same price for sugar as Barbados gets. Let us say that we pay higher wages both in the factory and in the field and let us say we pay a little more for canes; yet still the difference between 5% and 7% is enormous. People will tell you that the original capital subscribed for the St. Kitts sugar factory was less than £4,000. Today it is worth £12 million. Just fancy, a little island like St. Kitts with 50,000 tons and London investors putting up between £3,000 and £5,000 twenty years ago to put down a factory, and in twenty years the assets have multiplied to £12 million in spite of the fact that they have been declaring dividends of 7% and over. It does not appear as if we can be talking about the same industry when you want to say that the capital investors here only get 5%. Sir, in any case I have answered that last week. In fact, Mr. McKenzie himself answered it because he said that he noticed that plantations do not change hands frequently here

To pass on, Mr. McKenzie had something to say in connection with the wages in the sugar industry.
3.05 p.m.

In paragraph 62 in connection with wages he says this:-

"Another factor which is of significance is that the field workers earn the major part of their yearly earnings out of crop, and this portion does not carry the increase due from the production bonus. The following table shows the percentage of total wages paid." And the table is given. The paragraph goes on:-

"It will be seen that in a year of heavy crops the in-crop wages do rise considerably. From this table it may be thought that factory workers do not obtain a great deal of work during the out-of-crop period. From a study of the estate and factory pay records this was not evident. The skilled workers obtain employment throughout the year. Certainly some of the unskilled workers in the factory were not given work in the factory itself, but other employment was available to them if they wished to take it up."

It is most unfortunate that Mr. McKenzie has not said where this employment was available to unskilled workers after the crop. He says that the workmen in the factory can find work somewhere else if they want to find it. I do not know if he means in the oil fields or the bauxite mines or where, but none of us knows where they can find this work, and it would have been most enlightening if Mr. McKenzie had told us what part of Barbados unskilled workers could have found work if they wish to take it up after the crop.

He has given the impression that the work is there but that these workers did not wish to take it up; he has said that the cane cutters have one further grievance, and that is during the early part of the crop when the estates are put on quota for the delivery of canes to the factories. The estates have a quota in that they are only allowed to send in a certain amount of cane and the workers have a grievance because their work is restricted. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the cane cutter is as bitter over this as Mr. McKenzie wants to point out, because all this really means in fact is that the crop is spread out over a longer period. If you restrict the intake of the factory of estate canes it means that you will prolong the crop. What a cane cutter does not work for in January or February, he works for in April or May; but my own experience is that if the cane cutter has a grievance it is due to the fact that he is restricted in his earnings by dilution of labour, that is to say, by the introduction on the estates of a number of workers who normally are not agricultural workers at all. My experience has been, in the southern part of the island

especially, for the last few years that at the beginning of the crop people who are artisans, carpenters and masons for instance, even people who work in the roads now, find themselves cutting canes. I believe that the original reason for that was because when we first started with the Labour Welfare Funds, the provisions of those funds were restricted to agricultural workers, and a number of artisans who wanted money either to buy or repair their houses, worked during the crop in order to qualify as sugar workers; therefore the solution to that problem would seem to be to make more money available to the general Housing Loans Fund so that non-sugar workers could get money for housing readily. Still, however, the basic problem facing agricultural workers from dilution of labour remains, and the fact is that the earnings from the crop in any particular year are divided among a larger number of people than they would normally be divided among, and the agricultural worker who has been working for two or three days a week out of crop and piling up debts to feed and clothe his family, when the crop comes along, instead of getting the full benefit of all the money paid for reaping canes in crop, finds himself faced with competition with non-sugar workers in the harvesting. As a matter of fact, it has been worse than that in the last few years because you must have seen yourself that we have introduced in this island during the crop season numbers of foreign workers — we have St. Lucians, Dominicans and Grenadians — being employed by the estates during the crop time to cut canes thereby further reducing the earning capacity of the bona fide agricultural workers.

We are in a Federation and those of us who believe in Federation will concede that there must be freedom of movement between the units of the Federation and what not. That is not in effect yet and how these people come in here as freely as they do, I do not know. In the parishes of St. George, St. John, Christ Church and St. Philip — I cannot speak for the Leeward parishes — you will find a number of Grenadians and Dominicans employed. As a matter of fact, in the parish of St. George, I understand that one plantation was actually building houses for some of these imported workers. These are things which have to be reported because it is not fair for a man who is paid to undertake an enquiry as Mr. McKenzie is, to come out with the mere superficial grievance that cane cutters are dissatisfied because the estates are restricted in the supply of canes to the factory. That is not enough; restriction or not, these workers have a grievance in that their total earnings are below what they should be, one of the reasons for this fact being that there is too much dilution of labour during the crop. The average cane cutter on a plantation can work for five days a week and would probably earn about \$25 a week if he did so, but under present conditions his average earnings are about \$15 to \$16 a week.
3.15 p.m.

This is manifestly insufficient since it is only for four months in a year, and after it is over he is only going to have two or three days' work a week, and some weeks none at all. Those people who come in during the crop and who have other occupations, return to their full-time daily occupation after the crop. Far be it from me to say that a man should not get work where he can get it, but this specifically concerns workers in a particular industry, and only by facing up to this problem as Mr. McKenzie was supposed to do can you arrive at a satisfactory solution. In my own mind, I am satisfied from considerable inquiry into this phase of the matter that something should be done to ensure that sugar workers receive a greater portion of the monies paid out during harvest time especially in the field than they receive now owing to this dilution of labour.

Now there is one further point with regard to production costs both in field and in factory, but since I know there are going to be other speeches in this debate from this side of the House, I will leave some of that ground for them to put over. I was certainly interested, Sir, in Mr. McKenzie's reference to the establishment of a Provident Fund for both field and factory workers. He refers to the documentation in the Richardson Report of social security and the I.L.O. Report on proposals for an amended labour code for Barbados. My interest, of course, in this phase of

the matter does not spring merely from Mr. McKenzie's Report, because it has been some years now since I have been urging and suggesting that the Government should have embarked long ago on some sort of social security scheme for workers in the industry. Only about two or three months ago, even before the McKenzie Report was concluded, I had occasion to deplore the absence of some such provision when a man I knew who had been employed on a plantation in Christ Church - Bentley Plantation I think it was - for over 30 years was dismissed purely for some dissatisfaction between himself and the Manager over the manner in which he dug some cane holes. He found himself dismissed after thirty years' service at Bentley for a matter which the Manager might not have regarded as trivial, but which I certainly feel did not warrant dismissal; but he was dismissed at a fairly mature age without a single cent in benefits to be expected from the industry, and without even a job to which to turn.

The Government of Barbados did not have to wait for Mr. McKenzie to come here to talk about a Provident Fund. As Mr. McKenzie himself points out, there has been a lot of agitation for this for a long time, and in the final analysis running a Provident Fund is merely a question of efficient administration, and it is little removed from the operation of the ordinary Friendly Society. It has never taken any genius to work them; we have had them running in Barbados for over a century and operating successfully, paying people sick benefits and death benefits, yearly bonus and what not. You did not need Mr. McKenzie to come here and tell us that we could use funds from the sugar industry and from the Savings Bank to finance a Provident Fund. All the time this talk is going on, and having the Richardson Report, the Matthews Report and the McKenzie Report, there are people who have worked for years in the industry who have been dismissed or have resigned or superannuated and going home with nothing at all to depend upon, and it is high time that we pass the stage of mere talk and getting more Reports on this matter. We had the Richardson Report on social security for all the years we do not care to remember. There are people in this country - not one or two but a few hundreds - who within two or three months would have a proper scheme operating, but we are going to sit here and wait for somebody to do another Report. We will have another Report on the Richardson Report, on the Matthews Report and on the McKenzie Report. Long before Professor Richardson, Mr. Matthews or Mr. McKenzie came here, in a Resolution which I tabled on the floor of this House, I recommended a contributory insurance and pension scheme to provide pension benefits payable to sugar industry workers in all phases - field, factory and waterfront - during sickness, disability and superannuation. All you want is a contributory insurance scheme with contributions from both sides of the industry and perhaps even from Government also to pay the operational expense of the scheme.

3.25 p.m.

Certainly, with an island with a quarter million people and with our educational facilities, the time has come to stop talking about an insurance scheme and get down to the operation of it. The means to finance this scheme were recommended by both Mr. McKenzie and Mr. Matthews and before them by Mr. Richardson. That has been there for over ten years. I do not know of anyone who can point to me an issue of greater magnitude to occupy the attention of the Government and which should preclude them from devoting the appropriate time and attention to this issue. Of course, what the Government wants is somebody to come in and do everything for them and to present them with a cut and dried job, because they have nothing to contribute themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that hon. members are bound to agree with some remarks which I have to make on the sugar industry pretty early in this session but which may be considered inappropriate under this discussion. I refer specifically to the absence of any provision to make some more of the land available to some of the people in the industry. Mr. McKenzie, it is true, was not appointed to deal with this aspect of agriculture in Barbados but in passing I cannot refrain from saying that it is highly significant that the political change-over in this country

has not witnessed any effort drastically to change land ownership in this country. Land still remains primarily the special preserve of the few, and there is no other island in the West Indies in which a similar situation obtains. Since the framework of the late thirties and the changes in political dominance there have not been far reaching changes in land ownership. Of course, some people would readily want to think - it was even suggested before the Royal Commission in 1939 - that this means there should be wholesale cleaning up of the large land-owners in this country. It does not mean that by any means. People who are foolish to think it means that are entitled to their own conclusions. I do want to see between these two poles of large-scale fragmentation of land and extremely large holdings owned by a limited number of people, what there is now in operation, that is, a number of schemes which would result in practice in ensuring that some more of the profits obtained from the industry are made available to the people who are engaged in it, and there is no reason why we should continue in Barbados to allow two-thirds of our arable acreage to remain under such limited ownership with the consequence that two-thirds of the profit made in the industry will still accrue only to that limited ownership. As I have said, that is an aspect of agriculture which does not properly belong to a discussion on this Report. That, in addition to one or two matters which I have in mind, can and will be made the subject of a discussion at a more appropriate time.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I will begin by saying that I am well aware of the fact that each and every hon. member of this House has the right to raise any question whatsoever and to debate that question so long as it is not at variance with the Rules of this House; but, Sir, I would have thought that in view of the fact that discussions on this question were taking place between the Sugar Producers Association, the Barbados Workers Union and the Government, this question would have been left over until these discussions were concluded.

I should like to say that if this question were raised by even the hon. member who has just sat down, who no doubt is the President of a moribund organisation, I would say that due to his years....

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member has reached a point where he should only use words of which he knows the meaning; therefore, he should not use the word "moribund" unless he knows what he is talking about.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would say instead "atrophied". I was saying, Sir, even if the hon. senior member for St. Philip had raised this question, I would have thought that as he happens to be a member of this House for so many years he would appreciate the fact that discussions seldom take place on matters which can be regarded as *sub judice* 3.35 p.m.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter who has just raised this question, in his haste to denounce and to try to rip to bits the report made by Mr. McKenzie, has, in my opinion, flagrantly violated all rules of ethics and conventions. The very fact that the hon. member had a meeting pending with the Ministry for the following day, the 11th day of this month, and then raised this question on the 10th of the month, surely does tend to prejudice these discussions. I would like to say here and now that the members of the Sugar Producers' Association and the representatives did turn up and I made it clear that, in the circumstances, I did not think it proper to continue to discuss the question of the Provident Fund and of severance pay until such time as this debate was concluded.

I know that I will be accused of delaying these discussions and thereby preventing conclusions from being reached, and the workers from getting what benefits they are likely to get on account of the delay; but in the face of all that, I am prepared to say that as one who for all his life has been associated with labour and one who has been fighting in the interest of the working-class people of this island until today, unlike many of the others who happened to have been with us and then crossed the table and went on

the other side and supported the employers, I can say that from the time I started I was on the side of the workers and I shall always be on their side irrespective of whether I am a member of this House or an ordinary member of the public. No amount of propaganda which may be used against me will sway the minds of people into thinking that I am opposed to them, but rather it will strengthen my hands whenever I have to deal with the various questions which may arise from time to time.

That being the case, I am forced to reply to many remarks which have been made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and I have to go right back to the year 1957 when some sort of agreement was reached between the Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation. I shall have to deal with the hon. member because he has made some wild, rash, glaring statements against the Ministers of this Government and against members of the Government as a whole. To deal with the first question, the hon. member said in connection with the dispute which was dealt with by the Board of Enquiry under the Chairmanship of Mr. Lewis, that the Ministers of the Government had discussions with the sugar producers in an attempt to get them to conceal something in connection with the 1958 sugar dispute and that the discussions were unknown to the Union. In replying to that first point, the position is this; when this dispute had reached a dead lock - perhaps I should put the Government's position in this way. The Government is not responsible for, and has little or nothing to do with, these discussions at domestic level; it is only after a breakdown takes place that each side reports to the Government that there is a deadlock and then the Government has to step in. Other than that, the Government is never called in, neither can the Government go in.

As soon as a deadlock was reached, delegates from the Sugar Producers' Association telephoned my Ministry and asked whether they could see the Minister. They did not say what the matter was all about and my Permanent Secretary said "Of course" - and at this point I would like to say this. Whether it is an enemy of this Party, whether it is an enemy of mine or a friend of mine, I have always made it a point that whenever anybody wants to see me, I try to accommodate the person concerned. Even the hon. senior member of the City telephoned me on two or three occasions and then he came to my office and had discussions with me. I have only mentioned that because the hon. member is an arch enemy of mine but he cannot do anything with me. I have mentioned that just to show that even with the hon. senior member for the City and so in the case of the Sugar Producers' Association or the Union or anybody else, my door is open to accept at any time anybody who wants me.

The delegates from the Sugar Producers' Association came to see me and as soon as I found out what it was all about, I got in touch with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and had him to sit in. The Sugar Producers' Association explained the position to us and pointed out that they were honouring the Agreement which was made between them and the Barbados Workers' Union in 1957; that they had agreed that the Agreement in the rates would be based on the Commonwealth wage increase which was 5.9% or 5.6%, but they were prepared to offer a flat amount of 6% instead of 5.6% and they were also prepared, in view of the fact that there was a breakdown in the negotiations between the Union and themselves to give the workers an increase at the moment without prejudice to whatever is being done in the future.
3.45 p.m.

That is what they put up to us and I told them quite flatly that that was a matter purely and simply for them and not for the Government. I was not prepared to advise them to pay the increase at the time, but in the course of the talks I think it was the Minister of Agriculture and the Labour Commissioner also who asked if they would not be willing to give a little something more in order to get the canes reaped. I am going to say here and now that even if that was done without the knowledge of the Union, it was done in the interest of the Union and nobody should regard that as something against the Union. The Union did not ask to see me on the question. The Sugar Producers Federation

asked to see me and we discussed the matter, and as I said, a suggestion was put up as to whether they would pay a little more to get the crop reaped, and they said they would because it was a part of the agreement.

Now, Sir, the hon. member also accused us and said that Government had set up a Board of Inquiry with terms of reference similar to what the Sugar Producers' Federation had requested. The Union did not agree to the terms of reference as said by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, but of course you know the reason why he said it; he was prepared to give a distorted picture of what had gone on and transpired in order to discredit this Government as he often does. But what is the position, Mr. Speaker? This letter is the starting point and with your permission I will read it. This is on the 19th April, 1958.

"Sir, - I am directed to refer to correspondence on the subject of the present dispute in the sugar industry resting with the Labour Commissioner's letter to you No. H5001 of the 18th April, 1958, and to say that it has been decided to establish a Board of Inquiry under Section 8 of the Trade Dispute, Arbitration and Inquiry Act, 1939 to investigate the dispute and to recommend what wages should under all the present circumstances be paid to workers in the industry in respect of the year 1958. The precise terms of reference remain to be finally decided.

I am to inquire whether your Union or the Federation has any suggestions to offer as to the membership of the Board for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor. It is proposed that a further inquiry 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 settlement on the wages and conditions of employment to be adopted in the industry for 1958.

Here also I am to inquire whether you have any suggestion as to the person or persons by whom the inquiry should be conducted.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
L. A. SECCHI
Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of
Trade, Industry and Labour."

That letter was addressed first to the General Secretary of the Workers' Union, then to the Secretary of the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Labour Commissioner, and was sent out on the 19th of April.

Now, Sir, on the 19th April, the Hon. Premier gave an Address over the air relative to the dispute and I think he appealed to the people and informed them that Government was working on a Board of Inquiry. The Federation replied on the 21st April as follows:-

"The Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour,
Government Headquarters,
Bay Street,
St. Michael.

Sir,

We have for acknowledgement receipt of your letter C/62625 of the 19th April, 1958 on the subject of the establishment of a Board of Inquiry under Section 8 of the Trade Dispute, Arbitration and Inquiry Act, 1939.

The Federation desires to draw to the attention of the Government that in their opinion the sole cause of the dispute at present between the Federation and the Workers' Union is as to whether or not there is in fact in existence an agreement between the Federation and the Workers' Union governing wages to workers in the sugar industry for 1958 and as to the true terms thereof. Accordingly in the opinion of the Federation a Board of Inquiry should first consider and determine this question and in case the opinion of the Board is to the effect that there is in fact no such agreement, then the Federation will be prepared forthwith to enter into negotiations as to what should be paid to the workers in the sugar industry in 1958.

As to the question of membership of the Board which has been referred to the Federation for its consideration, the Federation is of the opinion that the membership of such a Board should be composed of not less than three persons and should have on it at least one person who is legally trained, preferably also with experience in industrial relations.

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

Yours faithfully,
Sugar Producers Federation of Barbados
per R. Grey F. Mandeville
Secretary."

Now, Sir, a little later on we recommunicated to both Parties the terms of reference. We heard the terms read out relative to what the Sugar Producers Federation had put up; they wanted to go into whether there was an agreement and so on. This is what we sent;

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

Now, Sir, up to then we did not get a reply from the Barbados Workers' Union at all.
3.55 p.m.
The Union replied on the 26th of the month and this is what they said:-

"With reference to your letters No.3/626/28 dated 19th April, 1959 and No. 3/626/31 dated 23rd April, 1958, in connection with the present dispute in the sugar industry, I have been instructed by the Executive Council to inform you that in respect of the first letter the Union has nominated Mr. Osmond Dyce to be a member of that Board. The Union cannot at this stage make any statement on the enquiry to be instituted but will give this matter further consideration.

"The Union is in agreement with the proposal to set up this enquiry with such terms of reference to cover the industry in its widest aspect."

"With reference to the letter of the 23rd and the suggested terms of reference, the Union does not agree with the terms of reference as stated by you. It is the considered opinion of the Union that the terms of reference should be as follows: 'to investigate the present dispute in the sugar industry between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Sugar Producers Federation and to make recommendations.' (That is their request.) Such terms of reference are wide enough for the opportunity to hear arguments of any kind and will give both sides the opportunity to state their case as they think fit. Yours faithfully, F. L. WALCOTT, General Secretary."

These were the terms of reference to which we actually agreed that Mr. Lewis should carry out this enquiry.

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

The terms of reference which were decided by the Government was as follows: "To enquire into the present dispute into the sugar industry and to make recommendations for the setting up...." The Union asked that it be: "to investigate the present dispute in the sugar industry between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Sugar Producers Federation and to make recommendations." The two are as close as anything you can get. What the Government says here is as close as anything that the Union has submitted. He says in his letter to investigate the present dispute between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Sugar Producers Federation. The

phrase "the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Sugar Producers Federation" is what we considered as unnecessary verbiage.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt the hon. member, he said that he only got a reply to one of the Union letters and that he did not get a reply until the 26th April. If the Hon. Minister will look carefully in his files, he will see that he got a reply on the 21st April. He will see that the Union replied to the letter of the 19th on the 21st April.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I was saying.....

Mr. WALCOTT: You said that you did not get a reply until the 26th April. Is that a fact? Did you say so?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, the Union replied by cable!

Mr. WALCOTT: I am asking again. Is that a fact? Did you say so?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is just drawing a red herring across the trail.

Mr. WALCOTT: No. It can be a red herring or not. You said that the Union did not reply until the 26th April and that the Sugar Producers Federation had replied before the Union.

Hon. M. E. COX: You are going to get all that is coming to you in a moment.

Mr. WALCOTT: This is no public enquiry into my conduct. If this Island were like the United States of America, you would be just like Goldfine and Adams.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am asking you to regard the sound of the gavel. When you are speaking, you must stop and listen.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order to point out to the Hon. Minister who was addressing you that he said something in his speech stating that the Union did not reply to their first letter of 19th April until the 26th April and I said that was not true. He said that the Sugar Producers Federation replied and that the Government was waiting on the Union. The Hon. Minister searched the files and said afterwards that they got a cable. I am pointing out that the Union did reply to the Government's letter on the 21st April.

Hon. M. E. COX: As I was saying, Sir,.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Oh no, Sir, I am on a point of order. Is it a fact that the Union did not reply until the 26th April? Is he denying that he said so? That is what I am asking him.

Hon. M. E. COX: He has a right to reply to me when I am finished.

Mr. WALCOTT: Oh no, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If the Hon. Minister can treat other hon. members as he likes and thinks he can treat me the same way, he makes a sad mistake. I am saying that the statement which the Hon. Minister made is not true. I am going to say that if he continues in that vein I will say that it is a lie to say that the Union did not reply and it will be another untruth to say that the Union did not reply by cable.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will take the opportunity to repeat what I said so that in passing you will know what took place. The Hon. Minister of Trade made a statement to the effect that a letter from his Ministry was sent to the Union dated the 19th April, 1958, informing the Union of the setting up of a Board of Enquiry into the dispute in the sugar industry and he said that the Union did not reply to that letter until the 26th April. I am saying that is not true and that is all I want. If the Hon. Minister says that the Union did not reply until the 26th April, I am saying that is not true be-

cause there was a reply before.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, what I was drawing to the attention of the House was that the letter communicated to the Union as regards the terms of reference was sent on the 19th April and a reply from the Union was not received until the 26th of the month. I am talking of the reply to the terms of reference which we submitted to the Union.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is speaking with reference to the date of the letter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, Sir, there was a first letter: but it was as regards the proposal to appoint somebody to be a member of the Board of Enquiry and the hon. member sent a cable from Port of Spain in reply to that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister read letters; I did not read them. He said that he was going right back to the beginning and was going to read the letter of the 19th. He said that the Union did not reply to that letter of the 19th until the 26th. They wrote the Sugar Producers Federation and they replied on the 23rd to their letter of the 19th. That gives the impression that the Union took one week to reply to their letter when the Sugar Producers Federation took only four days.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the hon. member is interrupting me.

Mr. SPEAKER: He is repeating the point he made.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of order. He cannot say that he sent a letter to the Union on the 19th and we did not reply until the 26th.

Hon. M. E. COX: We sent a letter on the 21st to both parties asking for suggestions as to what the terms of reference should be (Mr. WALCOTT: That is a subsequent letter.) The hon. member cannot behave well under any circumstances.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member should not take the file and read it incorrectly; the letter was not on the 19th but on the 21st. He is saying that the letter written on the 19th contains the terms of reference; but that letter did not contain the terms of reference. It was the letter written on the 23rd.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that we have to repair to the Other Place to attend a Joint Meeting of members at 4.00 o'clock and at this stage the sitting of the House should be suspended to meet the members of the Other Place.

Hon. M. E. COX: Very well, Sir, we shall have a long time at this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members will remember that we have pledged ourselves to meet the members of the Other Place at 4 o'clock. I now declare this sitting suspended until 4.45 p.m., of the clock. The sitting now stands suspended.
4.05 p.m.

On re-assembling,

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for the resumption of Government Business. On the last occasion when Government Business was being considered, the House was in Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has the opportunity of speaking now.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Acting Chairman, I would like to know how you can assume the Chair now. The sitting of the House was suspended and the Speaker has not returned to the House. (Laughter)

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry.

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

HEAD XVI - PRISONS

Head XVI - Prisons - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Under this Head, there are three items. In respect of item 18 "Provisions", there is a supplementary vote which is being asked for, and it is required to meet increases in the prices of foodstuffs, especially imported commodities, and also to meet the additional cost of an improved diet. As to the item "Travelling Expenses", supplementary provision is required to meet the additional expenditure occasioned by the increase in the rates of travelling allowances made since January. The next item is "Farm Expenses" and the supplementary provision is required to provide for the upkeep of additional live stock and poultry which have been acquired by the farm at the Prison. The policy is to supply milk and eggs and garden food stuffs to the prisoners. I beg to move that Head XVI stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD XXI - DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND AGRICULTURE

Head XXI - Department of Science and Agriculture was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Under this Head the first item is item 63 "Labour - General". This amount is required to meet increases due to the increase in the basic wage of 6% and the 7% *ad hoc* bonus on crop wages earned by the workers at the Pine Estate. The next item is item 74, "Upkeep of Government Laboratory," and in connection with that, the note explains that equipment ordered during 1957-58 has now arrived and funds are required to meet this expenditure. The next item is item 81 "Importation of Parasites". As you know, Mr. Acting Chairman, certain parasites are imported from Trinidad, especially the moth borer which affects the canes, and it is hoped that these parasites will become established in the Island and, consequently, the yield of sugar will be increased by about 2,000 to 3,000 tons per annum. I beg to move that Head XXI stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Acting Chairman, I believe that a little better explanation should be given relative to this item "Labour - General" than what is printed in the note. The note states this: "Owing to the basic wage increase of 6% and the 7% *ad hoc* bonus on crop wages earned, additional funds are required to meet expenses to 31st March, 1959." It is known by everybody now that wages have been increased this year and therefore the statement here referring to the 31st March, 1959, relates to something which took place last year. Now that we are dealing with this matter in February, I should like to know how this explanation fits in, because you have begun paying these wages as from the beginning of 1959. This note refers to a long time ago but it is not quite an up-to-date explanation of the situation. 5.00 p.m.

It may be true that you may be estimating for the amount for 1959 in the Estimates, but if this is up to the 31st March, 1959, the question of *ad hoc* bonus would not arise because there is no *ad hoc* bonus to be paid in 1959. As I take it, you could only have this supplementary provision for something that had been dealt with in 1958, because there is no *ad hoc* bonus to be paid in 1959. The position is that wages have been increased and the *ad hoc* bonus has also increased, so as the note states, this amount is to meet these conditions. I should like to know if this provision takes care of that or whether this provision is to run you through along with what money you have.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member should realise that our fiscal year begins in April and ends in March, but these negotiations and decisions were finalised some time late in 1958; therefore when we had the strike and then the Inquiry, one of the recommendations was that the labourers should be given a 6% increase on the basic wages and an *ad hoc* bonus of 7%.

We did not foresee all these things when we put in the estimate for the Pine Plantation; therefore, that being the decision of the Commission, we had to fall in line. That was in 1958-59 and our fiscal year ends in March; therefore the basic wage began on the findings of the Commission, but the *ad hoc* bonus has already been paid. Now that we have paid the *ad hoc* bonus and have had to pay an additional 6% on the basic wages for the remainder of the year, we have had to bring this Resolution. When this Inquiry finished - I do not remember the month - we had to pay the *ad hoc* bonus plus the fact that we had to pay a 6% increase on wages, but ever since then we have had to continue paying 6% on the basic wages; so we find ourselves paying this increase for which we did not budget. We now want this amount which is necessary to carry us to the end of the financial year which is March. I hope that explains it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I appreciate that, but the point I was making to the hon. member.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: If I may interrupt the hon. member, I might tell him that in the new Estimates we will take care of the 6% increase which was brought in last year.

Mr. WALCOTT: Now that you have increased wages at the Pine, they should know roughly and make an estimate for the production bonus. If you have a forecast that the production is going to be 160,000 tons or 155,000 tons, there is a scale at which you could look and estimate on that basis. I appreciate the explanation which the hon. member gave, and although I was aware of that, I raised the point in view of the fact that he said it was 1959. I thank the hon. member very much.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I did not realise that Head XXV was continued on the next page, and I did move that the three items stand part. If you would allow me, I will go on with the remainder of the Head. I think, too, that I should formally ask that my original motion be withdrawn. I am asking leave to withdraw my former motion.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier is asking leave to withdraw his former motion in order to continue with the Head, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Item 85, Sir, is in connection with the Pine Plantation and Central Livestock Station. The increase sought is to pay labour costs and also to meet the increased cost of fees.

Item 86 is for District Agricultural Stations. The reason for this amount is the same as under Item 63.

Item 100 is for Co-operative Section. The note reads as follows:-

"Educational media ordered during 1957-58 have now been received. In addition there has been a marked increase in the activity of this Section." This, Sir, is properly a revote.

Item 103, Subsidy to Pig Breeders. Apparently, Sir, an increased number of applications for assistance under this Scheme has been received. The Scheme, as we all know, is to provide feed for pigs up to a certain age and a record number of applications have been received; hence the need for this subsidy. There is also an increase in the travelling rates, and an increase in the amount of travelling done makes it necessary to seek supplementary provision under this Item. The Inspectors, I believe, have to visit the applicants and check on the number of pigs and re-check as to how the feed is distributed.

I beg to move that Head XXI - Department of Science and Agriculture stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I should like to know

what the Minister of Agriculture has to say on the question of the Co-operative Section. The Section here in Barbados is beginning to show a little new life, and I would suggest to the Minister that it would not be a bad thing if we broke away from tradition of the United Kingdom in sending people there. I would suggest to the Minister to investigate means so that persons who have the right education might go to see how the Co-operative Movement is conducted in Denmark, - the Danish Folk High School - and also in Sweden. I have visited some of the Co-operative Sections in Sweden and it is practical work where an officer can see and discuss things which can be very useful to the people.

5.10 p.m.

I say that because in Barbados as Secretary of a Trade Union, I can see the people who run Co-operatives in the Union have a good field in which to work, but there must be a man to say how these sorts of things are done and run among men and adults. We should not only have co-operatives run by cane farmers but we should have co-operatives run by other sections of the community. I have often said that the Fishing industry is an industry which can lend itself to a co-operative. Unfortunately, in the service, the only one man who has been to Nova Scotia and knows something about co-operatives among fishermen was the then Librarian, Mr. D. Wiles, who until recently was acting Chief Secretary.

However, I would like the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to give that matter some consideration. Let him send the Co-operative Officer on a visit to Denmark where he can learn much of Co-operatives. You have a young man at present as Co-operative Officer. Send him on a visit to Europe and I would recommend that you send him to the Danish people because they are the best. If you send him there, he would see co-operation in the milk industry, its condensary and that sort of thing and that must breathe a different atmosphere as regards co-operatives here. Give him a trip; it can mean a great advancement in the movement here. It would give added stimulus to what is going on here.

I hope the Hon. Minister will accept this as a suggestion and do not be afraid to act in that respect. Of course, if he does not agree with my suggestion he may say so, but I doubt that he will disagree. I repeat that the money spent on this will be money well spent. We have to live up to new ideas and to see whether we can break through the barriers of ignorance and get ideas which would be better for the community. I think the Co-operative School in Denmark is something which the Co-operative Officer should see for himself. Co-operation cannot succeed unless groups which can be formed from it can fall into line and know something of it. I throw this out to the Hon. Minister and I think this is a good time to do so coming as it is just after the Co-operative Seminar.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would just like to refer to Item 86, District Agricultural Station, for which the sum of \$4,219 is being voted. I see that the reason given in the Note to that item is for the same reasons as under Item 63. I was not in here when the Resolution was first introduced and I would like to know what are the reasons. I have not a copy of the Annual Estimates handy. In any case, I feel that this is a bad system of supplying information to hon. members. Why should not the reasons be set out here instead of making this a sort of cross-word puzzle? It is a bad way of doing things and I would be grateful if the Hon. Minister would draw this to his Permanent Secretary. Let him set out the reasons and do not expect members to delve into files. It is not at all satisfactory. If he has work to do, let him do it; do not throw it on other people; in this case on members of the House of Assembly.

There is another point which I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister. This is as regards Item 103, Subsidy to Pig Breeders for which the sum of \$14,000 is being voted. I will always support any Resolution or Supplementary Resolution which has as its objects the increase of funds for the pig subsidy scheme. While we are dealing with this item, I would like to hear the Hon.

Minister give a review to us as to the present position of the pig subsidy scheme. I would like to hear what is the pig population in the Island. I would like to hear how many piglets are being produced as a result of the scheme, as well as I would like to hear what is the quantity of animal food issued.

I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that all of these schemes are alright but I have good reasons to believe that an incalculable amount of harm is being done to this scheme by the so-called authorities or experts. They say that the animal food should not be issued until the piglets are six or seven weeks old but meanwhile the mother pig either becomes ill or, if she has a large number of piglets, the quality of her milk may be such that the piglets may die. I am suggesting that where the food is supplied it should be given at an earlier stage. If the concentrated food is given to the mother pig, it is my opinion that it will be more beneficial to the scheme generally. The experts tell you that it should not be given until the piglets are in their sixth or seventh week but, meanwhile, waiting until the sixth or seventh week the mother pig and the piglets will all be dead.

I am hoping that the Hon. Minister who is very *au fait* in matters like this will look into this pig subsidy scheme carefully and see whether the advice given by the so-called experts is the best advice. I, personally, have had any number of conferences and discussions with the advisers on this matter and up to now I am not convinced that their advice is the best. While the subsidy is being withheld and no assistance given at all, it means in the case of the poor individual who owns the sow that he cannot maintain it. The same principle holds good in the case of the dog. If you have a dog which has seven or eight pups, you will find that if you try to raise the seven or eight pups they will usually run into mange because the mother is unable to provide the necessary amount of nourishment for them; therefore the usual practice is to destroy about five and keep two. In the case of piglets, you cannot destroy them.

5.20 p.m.

As to the price of pork, the object of this scheme was mainly to reduce the price of pork. Has the price of pork risen within recent months or has it gone down? In 1956, up to the time when I occupied the role which the Hon. Minister now occupies, the price was 40 cents a pound; it was so for the last two years and it has increased to 60 cents or, in some instances 65 cents per pound. Is that good enough? Have the wages of the average worker increased proportionately within the last two years? I am asking that this pig subsidy scheme which is a productive scheme - and we need productive schemes... (ASIDES) I am glad to hear the Hon. Minister say that, because one of the Ministers who is not now here... (Asides) I am pleased to see that the present Premier is willing to bring down a supplementary vote such as this and so assist the present Minister in getting more money in this respect. I wish him well and I wish that he will continue to receive the co-operation which the present Minister is giving.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Acting Chairman, a few questions have been asked and it is true that some of them could have been asked by way of putting questions in the ordinary way; but what information I have at my disposal I will give. The last speaker began by referring to the mortality rate of the piglets; this scheme has been really designed for pig rearers, not for pig breeders, and that is why the technical people say that you should give this feed at a later stage because during the early weeks the piglets get milk directly from the mothers and that is enough to sustain them; but you want a healthy pig by feeding it at a certain time when it can eat. We are not feeding the sows; we are feeding the piglets after a certain time; we want to feed them when they can eat.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Minister, but I want to get the position clear. I am saying that he is continuing to do a good job but I am asking him to extend the scheme so as to protect the lives of the sows. In other words, let this scheme be a subsidy scheme for the sows and not merely for the piglets because in many cases the piglets cannot get to the stage where they can be adequately maintained.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I understand that point. We are practically engaged in the Ministry as to what we will do with this amount of pork which is now in the island. I see that some hon. members are smiling, but it is a fact that the pigs have become so numerous now that the butchers, instead of buying pigs by weight, will go around offering so much for them as such. That is not such a profitable business. I am reliably informed by people who know - and you have to take instructions from people who have had training and practical experience - that in Barbados we tend to keep pigs for too long; we want them to weigh 300 or 400 pounds. In my view, that is uneconomic. When people buy meat they do not want to have it too fat; people have the idea that the bigger the pig, the more they will get for it, but they do not study the economics of the matter. I suppose that we will be able to educate the people along lines of pig rearing. Nevertheless, the hon. senior member for Christ Church has made some points which I, myself, have taken up; like the hon. member, I have some conviction that things which people have told me are right, and I say that with a certain amount of responsibility.

As regards the price of pork, the hon. member must admit that from time to time the price of feed changes. We have got to bear in mind that we want to control the price of certain commodities, and we must also bear in mind that we do not want to stultify the aims and objects which we have set out to achieve. It is a wrong policy for a person to keep a pig, put his money in it and then he cannot collect what he has put in it. Representations have been made to us to increase the price of pork; the price of meat was increased because the price of feed has been increased. We have kept to the price of 60 cents per pound; the hon. member has mentioned a price of 65 cents a pound, but anyone who sells pork at that price is breaking the law. I may say that representations have been made to us from time to time that it is of no use rearing pigs because when you get rid of them you cannot collect the money which you have put in them.

When we got the comparative prices from other West Indian Islands as to the price of pork, we were surprised to see how low our price was. In some places, you have the price of pork at 85 cents, but we are trying to keep at 60 cents.

I should like to refer hon. members to Note 11 in respect of Item 63, "Labour - General." That note states this:

"Owing to the basic wage increase of 6% and the 7% *ad hoc* bonus on crop wages earned, additional funds are required to meet expenses to 31st March, 1959."

This same wording is applicable to Item 86, "District Agricultural Station", the only difference being that one is in connection with the Pine and the other is in connection with the other Stations. My Permanent Secretary refers to the note to Item 63 instead of tiring you with the same note. I repeat that the basic wages have been increased by 6% and we also had to pay an *ad hoc* bonus of 7% to the labourers at the Stations.

5.30 p.m.

When you see that you refer to Note 11, that means that the same thing is applied in this particular case. I hope that answers all except the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

I agree with a lot he has said about the Co-operative Movement and I think that everybody in this island knows that the Government is solidly behind the Co-operative Movement in Barbados; but I should tell this Hon. House that we are making negotiations to have the Co-operative Officers trained not in Sweden or Denmark as he said, but in America under the I.C.A. Scheme and in Great Britain. Quite recently I have met some of the officers of the Trinidad Government here and they say that they have a scheme also, so that the avenues for training these men have become very wide, and I can assure you that we might have to come to this House to ask for funds to develop the Co-operative Section. If we know that you are in agreement with these things before hand, certainly it is the desire of

the Government to push co-operation in Barbados. I cannot promise the hon. member that we can send them to Norway, Sweden or Denmark but I can assure him that there is a scheme in America, and America has very large Co-operative Sections, and the Credit Unions there are something big too. We are hoping to get in touch with all these Organisations which will not only render assistance, but in some cases it will be free; that is one aspect which we have to bear in mind. This Government is not able at this stage to do everything because of its financial limitation, but when we get help from people who are willing to give it free, we certainly will take it and make the best of it. I appreciate his wanting the Government to foster these schemes and see that these people are properly trained because that is one of the hazards of the Movement. You have people who are fairly ambitious and like the Movement, but they have not got the technical know-how and what the Movement stands for. They have to be taught before they can teach other people, and seeing that this Government has made up its mind to have these people trained so that we can have a better spirit of co-operation in Barbados. I hope that satisfies hon. members.

The question that Head XXI - Department of Science and Agriculture stand part, 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: Mr. Chairman, this item is for the Public Service Commission and this amount is needed because the Public Service Commission is having more entrance examinations and tests relating to promotions and passing of efficiency bars.

I beg to move that Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services, stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on this Public Service Commission I will have to say my piece now. I have said already that there is no point in having a Public Service Commission and having the belief that it is something sacrosanct and nobody can say anything about it. My criticism of the Public Service Commission is that you do not know whether it is a Public Service Commission or whether it is Government. In this island we are voting money for this Public Service Commission to meet and appoint people to discipline them and to make recommendations to the Government. What type of Public Service Commission are we paying if up to this day it cannot make a recommendation as to whether there should be an Acting Permanent Secretary to a Ministry for which we voted money? Why is it that you come here and ask for money for this Public Service Commission to have Permanent Secretaries, and then on the face of it the Commission does not appoint them?

There are six Ministers and we are paying all six of them. If we say we will pay for six Permanent Secretaries, why is it that they are not appointed? If there is no need for a sixth Permanent Secretary, then abolish the post. The last time I made a criticism Mr. Burton was acting as Permanent Secretary to the Premier and also to the Ministry of Education. Now you have a young man in the Service by the name of Mr. Forde. I do not know this gentleman: so I do not want you to think that he has been to me. I understand that Mr. Forde is a man with a degree; he has been working in Grenada as a Schoolmaster and came here and was appointed over the other candidates as an Assistant Secretary; he was moved from the Secretariat to work with the Ministry of Education when it was formed, but he is only acting as an Assistant Secretary, and in my opinion you are robbing a young Civil Servant with potential of the right to draw a salary like that. You would only do this with local people, but you cannot do it to English people who would fight and make a row for money. As I said before, the Civil Servants here are a bunch of spineless back-scratching people - that is, you scratch my back and I scratch yours. They have not got any courage and guts to stand up. If I were a Civil Servant or if the Civil Service was a branch of the Barbados Workers' Union, this could not go on for one week. It is not fair to the Minister, because if you regard the island is so important that there

should be a Ministry of Education and separate it from the Premier, simultaneously there should be a Permanent Secretary. You say there should be one but you have Mr. Burton acting in both Ministries. Either there is not enough work for him or the Premier does not need one.

Nowhere in the world, Mr. Chairman, with a salary to a Permanent Secretary of \$8,000 would you find that post remaining open. \$8,000 in any part of the world is a lot of money; even in the United States. No man lives in a poor condition at \$8,000 a year, but you have a \$8,000 post which you regard as so unimportant that you can allow it to go abegging. I think the Minister of Education was appointed on the 1st September and six months have passed from then until now and you have not appointed a Permanent Secretary. I have been to Dominica for four days, so I do not know if meanwhile anything has taken place in this connection. Is it fair to the colony? Why do you say you want a Permanent Secretary and then do not appoint one? Is it fair to the Minister not to have a Permanent Secretary in his Department? Is it fair to the Premier to have the same man acting for him because he used to do the job before? 5.40 p.m.

What have you done? This Order became effective when Mr. Burton or whoever was the Permanent Secretary to the former Premier was in office. All they have done is to tell you that Mr. Burton could not draw the two salaries. I remember on one occasion the former Premier said that was the law and Mr. Burton was appointed to the two posts. Now, you told Mr. Burton that he could not get two salaries but I am not at present dealing with the money. I am saying that he is a capable officer but he is not two men. If God meant that one of us should be doing the job of two He would not have made so many of us. We are not Siamese twins.

You have six Ministers and we ought to have six Permanent Secretaries. These are vital matters of principle. If you can carry on for six months with one man acting in the office of two Permanent Secretaries, it shows that the job of Permanent Secretaries is not that big. If he can do the two jobs and it is that big then he is a giant or the job is not that much big. The Hon. Minister himself has said that the Premier could not be Premier and Minister of Education. A man who has to deal with policy cannot have as much detail work as the man who is Permanent Secretary. It is the Permanent Secretary who must lift things up to the Minister because you do not expect that a Minister will read a file. Let us take for instance that a Minister has to reply on a certain question at the next meeting of the House. He will have a talk with his Permanent Secretary and say that he is going to reply to that question. It is the Permanent Secretary who will go and make a research on the matter in his files and he will put in flags to note the pages from which the Minister should make his points. He will do all of that so that the Minister will have the matter before him. All that requires time and research, diligence and ability. Can you see a Permanent Secretary doing two jobs if you regard the office of Permanent Secretary as a top post? There is no higher post in the structure of the Civil Service than the Permanent Secretary. In some instances he carries a higher salary than a Head of a Department.

I do not want to say anything about some of the activities of these Permanent Secretaries. All that I would say is that I hope you do not allow one Permanent Secretary to do as he likes. I know that you look at one of them as if he is a quasi-political man.

I hope nothing will happen to this poor man when I call his name but I want to know if Mr. Forde is not good looking enough that he should be appointed to act as Permanent Secretary. You know that it happens if a man is not sharp looking enough some people keep him down. What is wrong with Mr. Forde? He has a Bachelor of Arts Degree in the same way as any of them. He has the equivalent to Mr. Williams, Mr. Burton and Mr. King who is at present in England. The only one of them who has not a B. A. degree is Mr. Cozier. Mr. Forde has been a schoolmaster. I have nothing against the Postmaster General who is acting in that capacity but do not tell me that the Postmaster is more

capable of acting in the capacity of Permanent Secretary than Mr. Forde. All that you are doing is preventing this man from working for a few more dollars when the month comes to take home to his family because if he acts as Permanent Secretary he would get more money. Why not give the man the opportunity of showing his ability in this post which also would give him the opportunity of carrying home more money? You have not tried him. Allow any one of them to act in that post until you appoint somebody rather than to leave the post vacant or allow one man to do two jobs.

The Ministers are sitting down on certain principles. When there was a change in Government and they had a friend and knew a white fellow who was acting in two posts, you would hear them saying: "why not give the other coloured fellow the opportunity to act?" Now, it is black men who are running the Government, and you are allowing the same principle which you preached against to go on. Why have you given that privilege to Mr. Burton? Is it because he is a friend of the Hon. Premier or is it because he is a supporter of the Party? If you have a Civil Servant who is not doing his job, get rid of him. I have called Mr. Forde's name on the basis of the type of qualification which I have heard is required for the job. Of course, Mr. Pinard is a man without a degree but he is Permanent Secretary and he is looked on with respect by all of them. If you have a young man with those qualifications - and Mr. Forde is the only man with those qualifications whom you have not made use of - surely you should give him an opportunity to act. I remember that sometime ago, you gave Mr. Fields the opportunity to act as Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Communications. Mr. Inniss also acted as Permanent Secretary. Why is it that Mr. Forde or somebody else cannot act as Permanent Secretary in the vacant post? This is a post which should not be allowed to stand vacant without an acting appointment for five months.

Sir, I feel that we are not discharging our duty. I think it is unfair to the Civil Servants as a whole, but again I say that the Civil Servants are such spineless, backscratching people, that they do not deserve the representation which you give them.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$45,761 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59 NO. 44

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The next Resolution is for the sum of \$454. It is a supplementary Resolution under two heads of capital expenditure. The first Item, Christ Church Foundation School, comes under Head VI - Education. The sum of \$154 is required for this item and it is proposed to put a bronze plaque to commemorate the grant made by Colonial Development and Welfare towards the construction of this School. It is estimated to cost \$154 and will be offset by savings under the Five Year Development Plan. I will deal with this Resolution Head by Head.

I beg to move that Head VI - Education - stand part.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, in seconding the motion, I should like to elaborate a bit, not very much, on the Note and in doing so I should like to observe that this idea has emanated from the Governing Bodies of the Foundation Schools. I feel it is a desire to heighten and perpetuate a sense of gratitude for services which have been rendered in the construction of their school by Colonial Development and Welfare.

5.50 p.m.

We all, I am positively sure, are supporters of the idea that "God helps those who help themselves." It is not a bad idea for us to remind our children of help which has been rendered on their behalf, and they in turn would be more likely to appreciate the fact that they must help themselves. With those brief remarks, I have very much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this item of the Resolution.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Acting Chairman, in supporting the passing of this item in this Resolution, I should like to say that I am speaking as one who has fought in season and out of season for the construction of this new Foundation School. I speak as one who fought for it not only in this Chamber but as one who also agitated for it outside for many years, even as far back as 1945 when the idea was first mooted and when a former Director of Education in the person of Mr. Hayden insisted on having a system of co-education; having only one school built and inaugurating a system of co-education in the strict sense of the word. I had the privilege of resisting any full-scale scheme of co-education and I fought it off in those days. The scheme was considered from year to year; it was also considered by Mr. Glendon Reed and I would say that Mr. Reed, in spite of his shortcomings, saw the wisdom of the proposals which were put forward by the Governing Body of whom I was a sort of spearhead, with the result that the scheme was adopted whereby you now have two independent schools with a common hall where, in the case of the teaching of certain subjects like arts and science, the children of the higher forms who are taking certain examinations would be together under a general scheme of co-education. We have a better scheme and I pay tribute to the commonsense and understanding of Mr. Glendon Reed in agreeing to these proposals and not agreeing with Mr. Hayden.

I want to pay due tribute to Mr. Reed because not only did I happen to represent the parish of Christ Church but I agitated both in season and out of season, as I have already said, for the construction of this School, by virtue of the fact that I received my early education there sitting at the feet of the late Mr. Percy Goodman of cricketing fame. I feel very happy at seeing the interest which the Government has taken and in having the explanation of the Minister.

I regard that as a good gesture and a mark of appreciation in having that plaque there because there are many C.D. & W. Schemes which have never seen the light of day. In paying this tribute I should like to associate the names of the Comptroller of C.D. & W. Sir Stephen Luke, our present Governor and also Mr. Turner, who, while acting as Governor on a few occasions, always raised the question of the Foundation School and brought it to the forefront. Mr. Turner took a keen interest in the matter and, in my opinion, he has made a great contribution in having this school erected apart from the representations which were made both by the hon. junior member for Christ Church and myself from time to time in this Chamber as well as outside. I feel very happy, Mr. Acting Chairman, to be associated with the words of tribute which have been spoken; I pay tribute where tribute is most due and we have a deep regard for C.D. & W. for providing Christ Church and the island generally with this plaque in the best and biggest school of education in this island.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The new Foundation School is an attempt to provide additional accommodation at a school which has outgrown its size. From time to time I have reminded this House that the old Education code of 1890 envisaged a second grade school in every parish of the island. Sixty-eight years ago the people who were responsible for providing educational facilities in this island laid it down as a matter of guiding principle, that there should be a second grade school in every parish and therefore, the fact that we have a larger Foundation School in Christ Church is, for me, a matter of satisfaction. My regret, of course, is that instead of putting a proper second grade school in St. Philip we have the bastard project up there known as a modern Secondary school. It would have been of infinitely more use for the benefit of the children in that part of the island if, instead of this nondescript modern secondary school at Six Roads.....

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Acting Chairman, on a point of order. The matter which is before us is an item asking for the sum of \$154.00 being the cost of a plaque to be erected at the Foundation School. The hon. member is now raising the question of policy as to schools as a whole.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I object to his saying so. He does not know what I am doing; he rose on a point of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member sees that he is straying from the matter which is before us.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I am doing nothing of the kind.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has got up on a point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He has got up on a point of order and saying what I am not saying.

Hon. M. E. COX: All we want is this sum of \$154.00 for the erection of a plaque at the Foundation School, which has nothing at all to do with the Secondary School in St. Philip. The hon. member is now discussing the general policy of education.
6.00 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that I regret my inability today to express satisfaction over the establishment in St. Philip of a Secondary Grammar School rather than what we have now.

Well now, if members who want to dictate to the Chair how it is to act knew a little more about what we are trying to do, we would not have all this confusion and interruptions. To get back to the Resolution more specifically - they can grin because I do not know if anyone of them can teach me anything, - this is a money Resolution and under a money Resolution a member in this or any other Parliamentary Chamber except one run by idiots is entitled to enquire into the policy of the Department for which the money is being asked. But the point is this, Mr. Chairman; I am not at all satisfied in my own mind that the efforts of the people who have suggested the erection of this plaque are really not a bit misguided. Gratitude is always an essential virtue, and it is but right that we should give thanks where thanks is due; but I am not for one single moment endorsing the idea that the people in this country are perpetually to feel themselves obligated to Colonial Development and Welfare for any financial assistance in any public works project in this island.

I do not think for a moment, Mr. Chairman, that the pupils who will go to this school in the future should so to speak *in perpetuum* regard themselves as obligated to C.D. & W. for financial assistance in this project. What the people in this country have to understand and be told is that Barbados was a colony of Great Britain, and for over three hundred years it was a colony of Great Britain. Colonial Development and Welfare was established to provide certain financial assistance for the entire dependent Colonial Empire, and was in principle a belated attempt by the United Kingdom to repay some of the debt owed to these colonies. Not even the most ardent imperialist would get up on the floor of the House of Commons and suggest that in his opinion any colonial in any dependent territory was under any special sense of obligation to Great Britain for money provided out of this source.

We do not want to rehash what is old history, but if you go to Liverpool or Cardiff or Manchester, you are not going to find any bronze tablet there commemorating that industry and Commerce in Great Britain were established on the exploitation of the colonies. You are not going to find that at all. They want to forget that; and if in 1959 or in the 1950's with an awakening conscience the British Imperial Authorities decided that at long last they must try to give back in some small measure some of the debt they owe these colonies, there is nothing wrong with that. I do not mind telling you that in the British Parliament from time to time there have been lengthy speeches by Britishers admitting that C.D. & W. funds represent but a very small trickle, a very small, minute percentage of the debt Great Britain owes these colonies. I for one am quite willing to establish tablets in commemoration and honour and gratitude where it is due, but I certainly do not want to do anything to foster in the minds of future generations that we in this one were so unaware of the relationship of the origin of C.D. & W. and the reasons why it came to the West Indies as to regard ourselves under any completely lasting debt, because here and there we get some

funds to assist with a school or with a Public Health Centre or Hospital or anything like that.

Far be it from me to reopen consideration which had better be left buried and better not be referred to at this stage of relationship between Britain and the West Indies, but certainly, Sir, I am sure that a little more mature reflection on the part of those who know something of this matter will lead to the conclusion that the boot is on the other foot, and far from us being indebted or obligated to Great Britain, they are still obligated to us. When I say that, my remarks are not being made in a carping spirit because I believe that both this and other generations should bear in mind the fact that any effort by Great Britain to repair the damage done in the past should not be regarded as charity, but more, Sir, in the spirit of belated justice.

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

AGRICULTURE

Head VII - Agriculture was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: It is considered advisable to fit mesh wire to twenty-four windows on the southern side of the Fairchild Street Public Market. A revote of part of the unexpended balance under this item is sought.

I beg to move that Head VII - Agriculture, stand part.

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. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Resolution for the sum of \$454 was passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1958-59 NO. 45

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, those members who might have visited Seawell Airport recently will have seen that the erection of a new Terminal is proceeding satisfactorily. I am sure, Sir, that they will agree from the point of view of functional design, and when it is finished artistic merit, it will be a first-class building, indeed one of the best in the area, and certainly one of the finest for the amount of money that has been provided to build it.

I believe that the plan is being used as a model for similar airports in other parts of the world; so when hon. members hear that, they will realise what is thought of the plan itself and especially of the Director of Public Works, Capt. Tomlin's work in that respect.
6.10 p.m.

Now, Sir, we expect to finish this terminal building at the Airport at least by the end of April and in order that we can equip it as it should be equipped with furniture and other things, we are asking the House to vote a sum of money as set out in the Resolution. These include water coolers, illuminated direction signs for purposes of avoiding congestion and confusion, an air conditioning unit for the Control Tower, which will be sealed and entirely surrounded by glass, and additional furniture and cleaning equipment and utensils.

So far as some of these things are concerned, I may go a bit into detail. The illuminated direction signs will come to about \$1,000. I would just like to point out that this building was designed to eliminate any congestion resulting from passengers or baggage going through various channels or rooms; but unless we have these signs to direct persons to their destination, confusion might arise. The floor area of this building is about twice the floor area of the previous building. It is a very extensive building as compared with the previous building, and if these signs are put up it will save a lot of confusion.

There is also provision for an air conditioning plant for the Control Tower which is estimated to cost \$1,650. That is duty free. The officers and staff who are working in the present Control Tower are being subjected to an increasing amount of noise week after week by the more modern aircraft, and if we look ten years ahead we may be

getting jet aircraft. It is not our wish that the officers should work in the new Control Tower and be subjected to this noise. I may say that even now there is serious difficulty of their talking with the pilots of aircraft when aircrafts are leaving or coming.

In accordance with the International Civil Traffic Aviation, commonly referred to as I.C.T.A., we will have to surround the Tower with glass so that we will have the maximum visibility by the Control Officer. That would mean that the new Tower will be extremely hot; so we have come to the House to ask it to agree to this item so as to render it comfortable and safe and so that the officers and staff will be able to work in the Control Tower with ease.

The furniture is the heaviest item of cost. It is estimated that the requisite furniture will cost \$10,000. I do not know if hon. members want a detailed list but I will say at once that it is a very long list. Hon members who have travelled, like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, will understand what it means to equip a building like this with suitable furniture, so doubtlessly he will not want details. He will use his knowledge to good effect in this case. There are also utensils and other modern apparatus which are necessary.

As regards the water coolers, we will be having one where the air traffic officers are working in this building. It is proposed to place a water cooler on the ground floor and the other on the floor of the Control Tower which is four floors up.

I may inform the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that the revenue derived from the Airport is increasing by leaps and bounds and very soon, probably in two years' time, we hope to equate revenue with expenditure.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution which I think we should compliment the Government on bringing down, but not in the same way as the Hon. Minister has spoken of it. He has spoken in terms as if it is the sort of thing we do not expect to get although we pay people for it. Let me say at once that we pay the Director of Public Works a good pay although some people feel that we do not pay him sufficient. I will not say that we pay him everything but I think we pay him adequately and what this colony can afford. I agree with the Hon. Minister that you are going to have a fine airport and it may be different from that which members of this House who believe in low standards think about. Those hon. members have created in the minds of the people in Barbados that they should accept low standards.

When the Hon. Minister said that in two years' time the revenue from this airport would equate expenditure, I would just like to say that I was speaking to an officer sometime back and he talked in the same terms as the Hon. Minister. I want the Hon. Minister to get it out of his head that the revenue from the airport would equate the expenditure. Do not tell the people that, because you cannot make enough charges at the Airport to equate the expenditure. You must bear in mind that this is a service and it will reflect its worth in the colony by the number of people who will visit the island. The Hon. Minister wants to suggest to Government that you should make the people pay because you do it in Puerto Rico.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: We are not going to make anybody pay. The balcony is free to anybody to go up and see their friends off. I made no mention of that at all. The landing fees from planes which come here is a tremendous amount at present and it is expected to increase in the near future. I was referring to the charges for landing fees and the renting of the ground floor and to concessions to people who want to go up there and establish bars and restaurants. It is not a consideration of ours to charge a fee to people who will wish to go up there.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, even with these

charges, you will never equate revenue with expenditure. If you build a proper airport you should make people who use it pay proper charges but, as I have said, you will never equate revenue with expenditure, not when you think of the area of land which forms the airport and the capital we have put into it. Airports all over the world do not get back from the people what it takes to erect them.
6.20 p.m.

The Hon. Minister thinks that I am criticising them, but I am not doing that; I am making a statement in answer to what he has said. If you build a proper Airport you have to make the people who use it pay a reasonable amount for it, but you cannot equate it on that basis. It is not the charge which you make which will make it pay; even at Idlewild they do not get back from the people what they charge. The whole business is an expensive one but it takes a lot to keep airplanes going anyhow. The hon. member said that they would equate it; you should not attempt to equate it but you should make a reasonable charge.

I do not know anything about them, but I am opposed to Eagle Airways landing in Barbados and this is the first time that I am opposed to an Airways company landing here. I was in Bermuda and I had some talk about these people. I do not like 'break-away' people on the basis that you are only breaking something from someone, but as soon as they get in, you will find the danger which these people are likely to bring in. I feel that the Federal Government was right when they refused to let them come in. I believe in a free airport; I believe in free ports but the Trade Union Movement had a strike against ships using free ports because they did not carry proper accommodation for people.

I think that the Government will go into all these things with this Company very carefully; because they could operate in and out of Bermuda as they like, they are now trying to see what they can get elsewhere and the West Indies is a very easy place for them to come in. I hold no brief for B.W.I.A. or for any of them but you have to watch this position very carefully. You are building an Airport and so you will get more airlines coming in here; that is how the traffic people work; they attend the people of the place which provides the best facilities.

I am very glad to hear what the Hon. Minister has said about these charges. In the Public Service you know that the Civil Servants are not geared to economic thinking in a broad way; they think that if you spend a shilling here then you should charge the public more. They think that if the cost of a rum licence is so much therefore a man should pay a fee for a licence based on that cost. In Barbados somebody sees an aeroplane landing and that is a feature of life; there is not much for a Barbadian to do at night apart from multiplying, but we should give people an opportunity of going to the Airport. What should be done - and I would say that there should be a policeman on duty at the airport on the basis of controlling traffic and you would have a proper area for a parking spot and you would not have any congestion.

I landed at the Airport today. I left here on Friday and I can say that the Airport is as it should be. It should be the best airport in this area because you are building it after all the others - after British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica. Airports change in a matter of years. The hon. member spoke about "jets" but I doubt very much if he would have them here in the immediate future because a jet takes two miles of runway on which to land. If you have two miles of runway at Seawell Airport it would mean that you would run back past Pilgrim Road. I would like to see at the Airport the maintenance of certain standards because in the West Indies I do not think the sanitary arrangements at all of these airports can match with what you see in Europe or in North America. I feel that we have been giving reasonably good standards at the Airport and although they are not up to the international standards, they are very good.

As to the matter of congestion, I say that what is going to create further congestion is something which is beyond the control of the Government and that is the airlines themselves; they are going in for retrenchment. I landed today on a small plane with three people. I had nothing to take

away and I spent much too long at the airport; with three passengers having landed, it should have been cleared in three minutes. It is true that at our Airport things are better because they have younger men, but I see elsewhere a man who must be in the fifties doing a job which some young person should be doing. I would like to see a quicker despatch at the airport; I would like to see the Minister having a conference somewhere. You have questions as to how many times you visited somewhere, where you were born, where you live and so on. I went from here to Dominica and wrote on two pieces of paper here and on two in Dominica; that is not the fault of the airlines but of the emigration authorities. However, I think that we are doing a good job up there and I would like to see a proper staff to keep the Airport up to date and clean all the day long. At all times the lavatories should be kept clean; papers and so on which make Airports untidy should be cleared away so that the Airport can be maintained at that level. We have spent a lot of money on that Airport but there are certain show pieces on which you should spend money. Let us have a nice Airport or let us not have any Airport at all. I am pleased to see that we are lucky in the sense that we have a man who is an architect apart from a builder and he has done a very excellent job up there. I have found in him a public servant and the Minister should follow that example; he is not averse from talking with anybody as regards construction. Mr. Tomlin is a very remarkable man who has studied the art of living with people, which is a very essential thing in public life, and I would add my quota of appreciation and tribute to him in the work which is going on.

6.30 p.m.

I am not suggesting anything for myself, because the Minister knows my views; but I think that instead of inviting the Governor to see these things, members of the House should be invited. Ministers believe that these projects are for them and the Government and not for the other members of this Chamber, but when it comes to public business, members of the House should be invited to see what is going on because we have to vote the money and we represent the people. You cannot invite 200,000 people to see what is happening at the Deep Water Harbour, but every now and again people come here and are shown the Deep Water Harbour. You have taken Lady somebody to see the Deep Water Harbour and members of the House have not seen what is going on. In these projects the Ministers concerned should at times invite members to see what is happening. With projects like the Airport and the Deep Water Harbour and things that stretch over a long period, the twenty-four members of the House should be invited in batches or as a team to pay a visit to them; they do not have to go but at least you would have extended an invitation to them. I do not believe that any member of the House has been invited to see the Deep Water Harbour. I have been there because of a dispute but I feel that like Seawell, when you had these big projects that represent a lot of money, members of Parliament should be invited to see them.

I feel that a very good job is being done at Seawell and it is worth the amount of money which we are spending on it. Members should also be invited by the Minister of Agriculture to see the Soil Conservation Project; this is nothing in your back-yard; it is something you are doing for Barbados. You are the Ministers of Barbados and we are representatives, and I should like members of Government to understand that the constitution of this Government means that 24 members make up Parliament and not six Ministers or the 15 members which form the Government. If you do not work it so, then you can do all the work at the Beacon at night and have no House of Assembly; but you come here because it is public business.

Mr. Chairman, you have to take me as I am; I am fairly rash in these things because I am in public life too and I represent people. When a man comes to me about a matter in my constituency, he does not ask me about my personal affairs. He is asking something because I am representing him. Members of Government have the idea that they can run Government like a meeting turn, but even in that you have to give back people their money. I hope the Minister takes what I am saying in the right way; but if he does not, I am not responsible for that. This is

not done as any harsh criticism; but as I see it, there has been this persistent policy of the present Government not to invite members to see certain projects. If you have a Deep Water Harbour which is going to be built over five years, at some time members of Parliament should be invited to see it, but if Lord something or Lady Something comes here you take her to see the place and the Lady has to be careful that her high heels are not broken off. You want to make people believe that if you invite members of Parliament you are doing them a favour. Let us see what Mr. Collett is doing. I can teach members something if they do not understand about Government. Do you realise that when you invite representatives to see projects which are undertaking, you infuse an interest in the public which they are representing? Their whole idea is that the people they put here are taking an interest in these things; but when you take Lady Somebody, who is she? Does she beg them for votes or represent a constituency?

I hope the hon. member appreciates the points I am making. You are building an Airport and at some time or other the Minister should extend invitations to members of both branches of the Legislature, the details of which should be left to the Minister to determine whether it should be done in batches or as a team as in the case when we were invited to take a bus ride. Members do not drive in buses; so they were only taking a free ride. I do not know the last day I drove in a bus apart from one in Dominica a few days ago. What I am saying is an observation and not a criticism because that is how I see these things and how I look upon them.

I congratulate Government on the Airport; it is a wonderful job of which I think all Barbadians will be proud.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think, Mr. Chairman, that Capt. Tomlin will be somewhat gratified to learn that his efforts to provide the colony with an attractive Airport are appreciated by the members of the Legislature and perhaps by the public as well. Most of us are satisfied that he is doing a good job at Seawell. The construction appears to be good and the design is certainly attractive, and the total job should be one with which we are all more or less satisfied.

Of course I am not going to indulge in a spate of hyperbole like the Hon. Minister because I know it cannot compare with Piarco, Palisadoes or the Airport in Puerto Rico; it would certainly be better than what Dominica has or the smaller islands. I really think that the Officer responsible for the construction of this building should know that the representatives of the public feel that he is doing a good job and are quite satisfied with his efforts to date. There is no point in commenting in any detail on the construction because it is not yet finished and we have to wait until the entire thing is finished to find out whether in our views there are any defects worthwhile mentioning.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. CHAIRMAN took the Chair.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, that when you are paying an officer a good salary you expect him to do proper work, but human nature being what it is, it is meet that occasionally people are told that their efforts are being appreciated.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, there are just two points I would like to make. I do not know if I heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter correctly, but there is a statement which he made that I cannot allow to go unrefuted. I hope he will correct me if I quote him wrongly, but I believe he said the Government expected to have Eagle Airways here.

6.40 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said it appeared to me from what was written in the newspaper, as if the Government had agreed to Eagle Airways coming here. I saw a notice appearing in the newspaper about it over the signature of the Clerk of the Executive Committee and it appears as if the Eagle Airways made the application and the Government wanted to know if anybody wanted to make objection to it.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member has the wrong impression. That is the usual course which has to be adopted when an airways company makes an application to land here. We have to advertise the matter and, of course, there has been an objection to this Company. The procedure is the same here as it is in Trinidad and Antigua. We are acting according to the Regulations and an enquiry will be held. That is just by the way.

I think the hon. member rather spoiled his useful suggestion by his final criticism. I do not know if this Government has ever been guilty of the attitude about which the hon. member complained that these are closed things to members of the House of Assembly and that other people are invited by the Government but not the members of the House of Assembly. I was under the impression that members of the House of Assembly could visit these places at anytime they like. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that he visited the Soil Conservation area. The hon. member will know that sometimes you invite certain members and they do not turn up. Only the other day I read in the *Advocate* - the day after the debate in the House about the Government Printery - some criticisms which the hon. member said of the Government Printery and I mentioned to the Government Printer that some of the things which the hon. member said showed that he seemed to be under an erroneous impression. I told him to invite the hon. member to visit the Printery. He said: "Yes, he will send him another invitation so that he would see these things for himself."

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. Tell the Government Printer to show you an invitation that he has ever extended to me to visit there. He has never sent me any invitation. Since the Government Printery was operating, I never ever got an invitation to visit there. I do not remember if a member of the Government Printery was talking to me in a casual way and asked me to drop up and see the place. I cannot even remember a conversation like that ever taking place, but to say that I had a formal invitation, let me repeat that I never had one. I do not know if you sent me one when I was out of the Island.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am sure that hon. members will agree that they have had an invitation to visit there. I believe the hon. senior member for St. Philip went and I have enquired from other hon. members who have been there. I know the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is a frequent visitor to all of these Departments. I know that special invitations were sent to every member of the House to visit the Printery so as to see what was being done there and the same thing applies to the Deep Water Harbour. There is an open invitation to all hon. members.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Name another department to which we have been given invitations.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In all these matters, we have an open Sesame'. The House votes money for all these departments. If an hon. member wants to go to see the Deep Water Harbour, who can stop him? Do you think that any representative of the firm that is contracting the work there can do otherwise than show him around? If that were to happen, hon. members would themselves get up in here and let the world know that they were not received. I again extend that invitation to the entire House. As a matter of courtesy, just send a word beforehand to Messrs Richard Costain that you want to tour the Deep Water Harbour. The same thing applies to the Seawall Airport. This is far different from the olden days. In the old days, who has ever seen a Government giving people the opportunity of seeing models of projects like the Deep Water Harbour, the new Hospital and the new Airport? All of that, we are going to show to the public. I am informing the hon. member that nothing is hidden, nothing is secret. These are different days. We are in the jet age and things are different.

Mr. WALCOTT: Let me make this one point. I was talking of an official party. I am a busy man and a man who appreciates busy people. I do not want to go down to the Deep Water Harbour alone and ask Capt. Tomlin to take busy people off their work to come and show me around. What I said was that just as I have seen the Hon.

Minister make convenient arrangements for the Head of the Administration to visit some of these things, he can make similar arrangements for an official party to visit some of them. I do not like the "open Sesame" in a work-place to hon. members, that is to say, some go today and some go tomorrow. What I am saying is that whenever they have something to show you and it is suitable for the Minister to extend an invitation to all, let him take a party.

I want the Hon. Minister to clearly understand that never for one moment was I suggesting that any Head of Department or other person would refuse members of this House the right to see something, because if I went somewhere like that and a person refused to give me the information I want, I would let him know where he got off. However, you do not want to throw your weight about. If there is an official party, you should go along with it. If you go just as a member of the House of Assembly, someone may regard you as a sort of nuisance. I do not think that I made the point that we were refused. I was saying that when you have an official party, members of the House of Assembly should be invited.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1958-59, NO/ 47. FIRE APPLIANCES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the next resolution is for the sum of \$6,080. This was given notice of today. It is in connection with the extension of the Fire Service and it is for Fire Appliances. I think hon. members already know that it is proposed to extend the Fire Service by having a station at Worthing View Gap, Christ Church and that is already under construction. There is another one to be placed in the Northern Area.

These fire appliances are for these two stations. In the 1957-58 Estimates, a certain amount of money under Capital Expenditure was voted for the purchase of these two fire appliances and a rescue tender. They were ordered and have arrived. At the end of the year \$1,004 lapsed and accounts totalling \$6,079 have since been received. It is therefore necessary to revoke the lapsed provision of \$1,004 and to provide a further sum of \$5,075 to clear off the accounts. The request for additional funds has been caused by increased basic costs of the equipment and increased freight rates.

6.50 p.m.

Since then other appliances have been ordered and received, the amounts totalling the sum of \$6,079. As a matter of fact, it is a matter of freight charges, marine insurance, radio sets, provisions of stores, insurance of fire engines. The Bill for that amount has since been received and this Resolution seeks to do two things—to revoke the lapsed provision of \$1,004 and to provide a further sum of \$5,075 to clear off these accounts. As the Addendum points out, the request for additional funds has been caused by increased basic cost of the equipment and increased freight rates. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of four Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these Resolutions be now read a first time.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

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

ORDER POSTPONED

Hon. M. E. COX: I am asking leave to postpone the next Order and that the Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958, be taken as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Leader of the House.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are certain amendments proposed to the Local Government Act, 1958. If we want to get this Act into operation as we intend to do, we have to proceed with these amendments. First of all, in Sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Act of 1958 the word "Councillors" appears and it is proposed to delete that word and to insert the word "Council" in its place. As that Sub-section is now, it reads as follows:-

"Subject to the provisions of section eleven of this Act, the Mayor shall be elected annually by the City Councillors from among the Aldermen....."

The word "Councillors" is an obvious error because in the Act of 1954 dealing with the same matter, the word "Council" was used. In the same Act of 1958, in connection with the election of the Councils, the word "Council" and not "Councillors" is used, and there would be a controversy in principle if this word "Councillors" were allowed to remain in contrast with the election of the Chairman of the rural Councils. That Sir, is one mistake.

Another amendment is that Clause three seeks to correct an omission in Sub-section (1) of section twenty-five of the Local Government Act, 1958, which resulted in there being no requirement for elected Aldermen as distinct from appointed Aldermen to make a declaration of acceptance of office. Clause 25(1) reads as follows:-

"A person elected under this Act to the office of Mayor, Chairman of a District Council, or Councillor or a person appointed under this Act to the office of Alderman, shall make a declaration of acceptance of office within thirty days from the day of his election or, as the case may be, appointment, before a Justice of the Peace or the Clerk of the Council and deliver it to the latter. Any such person shall not until he has made the said declaration and delivered it to the said Clerk, act in his office except for the purpose of making such a declaration."

That Sub-clause excludes the word "Alderman" and this amendment seeks to insert that word after the word "Council" in line two.

Clause 4 seeks to correct an obvious typographical error in the penultimate line of Section 99 of the Local Government Act, 1958. In Section 99, the penultimate line, the Roman Numerals "VII" were used twice and it is sought to change the first "VII" to "VI".

Then, Sir, under the Vestries Act, 1911, provision is contained in paragraph (a) of Section 53(2) which exempts from rates made and set on persons carrying on a trade, those persons who derive from the trade carried on by them a smaller annual profit than five pounds. In other words, a trader who had an annual net profit of five pounds or less was exempted from taxation. That was omitted in this 1958 Act, and this amendment seeks to correct that omission so as to exempt from taxation traders assessed on fifty dollars or less. Those are the corrections which I hope will

meet with the approval of this House.

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

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are going to support the second reading of this Bill because of the latter part of the Objects and Reasons, and as we favoured the exemptions which are proposed. In fact, we have always advocated that and no doubt it is because of hearing us on platforms during the present campaign that the Government has realised the necessity for providing for the exemptions as is contemplated in this Bill of those persons who derive from the trade carried on by them a smaller net annual profit than five pounds as it was in the old Vestries Act, and the proposal in this Bill is to remedy the omission by relieving the Commissioner of Inland Revenue from the duty of assessing traders whose taxable incomes are in his opinion fifty dollars or less and by exempting such traders from the payment of trade tax.

We entirely concur in that and support the second reading because we want to see that on the Statute Book, I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must say this: it is unfortunate to say the least that you have an amendment such as this before us when a campaign is actually taking place. I do not take the view that it is wrong constitutionally and that it could not legally be done, but it is most unethical, when a campaign is in progress and certain points are being made by this campaign, to come out of the blue and attempt to amend the Act, as I submit, to conform with points of view which have been expressed by people at the meetings, particularly after the candidates have already been nominated. Certainly it is unethical to say the least though legally I do not think it is wrong. Where we take objection and where we cannot support this when it comes to the second reading is the proposed change in respect of the Section dealing with Subsection (1) of Section 4 which says that the Mayor shall be elected annually by the City Councillors from among the Aldermen or Councillors of the City, and it is now proposed to change the word "Councillors" to "Council". We cannot justify or see any justification for giving the right to vote for the election of the first Mayor to persons who have not faced the electorate. If they face it like you and opposition is scared away, that is perfectly in order, because you were there to meet and join battle with all campaigners; but those people who, because they are favourites, pampered by the Government in power, are handed the Aldermen's seats without having to contest, are persons for whom it would be useless to contest seats because they would not have a reasonable chance of securing an election. To allow such persons who are not elected but are simply hand-picked by the Government in power to vote for the election of the first Mayor, I submit, is absolutely wrong and indefensible.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock. 7.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: When the suspension of the sitting took place, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was addressing the Chair.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, we strongly object to the right being given to vote at the meetings of these Councils to persons such as these Aldermen who have not faced or attempted to face an electorate. To allow hand-picked people some of whom we have no doubt will be ex-Conservatives and various people who find themselves on the band wagon which they feel at the moment is holding the reins of Government - though for how much longer none of us can say - and to say that such people who have never been in the position of facing the starter, who have never had the courage to face a

starter, should come along at this beginning and should have the same power to vote as the person who has been through an election, is in my submission the negation of democracy. Of course, members of the Other Place have a right to vote though they are nominated but such is not on all fours with this case. The Other Place must conduct its business somehow, but the position with these Councils is one in which you will have some of the members elected and some chosen; therefore, the latter should not be placed in the same position as the former who have been placed there at the will of the people as a result of a democratic vote.

When it comes to that Clause, naturally, it will have our uncompromising opposition because we feel that there is no justification whatsoever for deleting the word "Councillors" as is proposed and substituting the word "Council". It gives the impression that the elections are apparently going a certain way and there is now the attempt to safeguard the fortune of some person who is hoping or seeking to be the first Mayor by suggesting that the six hand-picked aldermen should have the same rights as the persons who have been elected.

Sir, I have already referred to the unethical action during the course of an election in making an alteration in the law in respect of an exemption, but it is a necessary exemption and there is nothing to preclude it from being made; but one wonders if it was never thought of before. Night after night, we have been raising this point during the course of our campaign. We were all along saying that you should relieve the tax on traders whose taxable income is not more than \$50.

We will support the second reading of this Bill but with the clear understanding that we are very strongly opposed on principle to the change which is contemplated in respect of the voting by Aldermen, that is to say, all members of the Council as distinct from Councillors as set out in the Act of 1958. It is on this Act on which this election was started and nominations made, and in my opinion it is absolutely and completely wrong at this stage during the course of Nomination and Voting Day to make any changes in the law. That should be made before or as soon as you like after the voting has taken place.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I agree substantially with what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said. When I came in here and saw this Bill today I was a bit surprised. Knowing the profession of this Government that they are out to be democratic, I thought that at least they would have postponed such a Bill until after elections, but they are amending an Act just after nominations have taken place and the substance of what is in this Bill has been in many cases part of the electioneering campaign of one side or the other.

While these elections were going on, you have sent valuation lists to people. You have an Information Officer and these things should be explained to people, but the people were not aware of them. I think, Mr. Speaker, it was brought to your attention in my presence that the people were confused as to what these things meant. It was explained to some people that these valuation lists are only an assessment. Hon. members who have seen the Local Government Bill realise it is a voluminous document and the Government must acknowledge that when measures like that come to this Chamber and members plead with them to spend more time or to postpone it so as to give further consideration to it, they should accede to the request; but often they would say: "Oh no, we are not having anything of that."

I am not a candidate in the Local Government Elections. I am not even in the campaign as yet and I do not think I will be drawn into it unless the candidates in St. Peter cause me to be drawn into it to say something. What is serious about this matter is that I have read in the Newspaper that the Hon. Minister of Trade made a speech to the effect that these Aldermen will be elected irrespective of what takes place in the election. Now, the Hon. Minister said that and earlier today he said that he is always

on the side of labour. Yet I know that the Vice-Chairman of that Party was a member of the Executive Council of the Conservative Party in the last elections. He is a Conservative. When he came to this island he joined up with the Party which he thought was the more respectable but now he finds out where the votes are, he is on that side, that is, he is on the side of the Labourites.

Let me ask you this, Sir. Are you going to nullify the elections by doing this? Let us say that you are running an election and it has been divided into party politics. Let us take the municipality of the City of Bridgetown where twelve people have been elected as Councillors. Now, one side gets eight seats. Do you think it is fair that you should nominate six people to nullify what the electorate did? You see, I am adding these six people whom you are nominating to the four others who have got in. That is what they used to do in the old colonial days and we came into power criticising that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in this Bill I see nothing to nullify what has been done already, neither have I in my address said anything to that effect. Nothing I have read in this Bill gives me that feeling; nothing I have heard refers to that unless what the hon. member has just said.

Mr. WALCOTT: This is how it would nullify it. If these six Aldermen can vote and you have the City of Bridgetown where you are going to elect twelve people, and let us take for argument's sake that one party gets eight and the other four, when these six Aldermen are nominated and they sit on the Council, these six Aldermen plus the four from the other party can nullify what the eight can do. Those of us who came along and saw the old colonial system know that the system was one in which the Governor could appoint people whose views were not necessarily in keeping with the views of those people who had been elected by the people.
8.00 p.m.

It is just like in our circumstances; why have we changed the system here? The fact is that members are elected to this Chamber in order to show who should be the controlling factor. Gradually we have removed the old system and therefore you cannot work on the same system which you have destroyed. The Governor-in-Executive Committee is the Governor. The Hon. Minister of Trade said in a speech that it does not matter for whom the people vote, it would not make any difference to the people whom they nominate. I do not believe in any nominated system on the basis that you are giving a nominated person the right to have the vote. You have to be practical in these things. This is the first occasion on which you are having a system as you are having in these elections, and the biggest issue will be on the basis of the Mayor. Let us make the comparison of the Mayor with the Speaker of this Chamber; instead of electing the Speaker as a member of this Assembly do you have a hotch-potch system that you go to the Other Place and vote for the Speaker too? I feel that we should be particular about this matter. This is an amendment to the election which is now going on; people have already been nominated and the elections are taking place on the 5th March. From what I have read in the newspaper that the Ministers have said, I think that the members of this Government should dissociate themselves from such a statement in principle because it is bad for a democracy and it is bad for us.

I do not think that anything should be done to nullify an election. If you are going to have an election and the voice of the people is going to be supreme, then you should act in accordance with that voice; you should not try to nullify it. You are running for election on a Party basis - and this has just happened in Trinidad and some other place. If the Labour Party wants to get the most seats in any Local Government Council this would be improper; but the Government is participating in an election. The Government in Trinidad nominated persons but now you find the same Party which is participating in the elections will be nominating the other people; I want to say that the dice are

all in your favour. You have an election and still you can nullify the election; you are telling the electorate this: "It does not matter how you vote; even if you vote for all of these people this is what we will do - run the same Council in which you have this Council of elected people". Can you then have any faith in this? I would prefer to see this Bill amended in such a way that, in the first instance, the Aldermen should not take any part in the election of the Mayor or the Councillors; there should be a free election and they can function after that has taken place. I am surprised to see that the Government members have fallen for a system which is diametrically opposed to all that in which we, as Socialists, believe. We have never believed in the nominated system; we perpetuated it in the Other Place because we came and found it.

You are asking people to choose and after they have chosen you are going to say: "No matter what you have done, this is what I am going to do now". Well, I do not believe in that; this is something which will have a very serious rebound. As I said before, the Secretary of State for the Colonies has no right to do anything which is against the will of the people in Barbados; if we make a decision in Parliament he should carry it out. Would it be fair that you are elected unopposed, and you are going to nominate four people as against the other person's three? I say that when the election is finished and you see for whom the electorate has voted - well, the gentlemen over there are Ministers of this country on the basis that the Party they represent has the most seats in this Assembly and therefore they run the Government; but because they have ten or fourteen seats should we ask six other people to out-vote them? As a Party you are participating in the elections and the Ministers speak at elections, but it will be the same elections for you to say who are the Aldermen. I do not like that system; I hear people talk about corruptions and this is a system which will lead to corruption. When I hear the hon. member say that he has always been a Labourite I would ask him if he thinks that one of the persons whom he is running could face up as a Labourite, a man in respect of whom all his associations have been with the Conservatives; but they will have the face to get up in public and say that this man has always been a Labourite.

I am not voting for this Bill as it stands, as a matter of principle. I am not against the specific amendment to give people the right to have the exemption from taxation; I believe that it is the Government's business to see that that is done, but at the same time it seems to me that when legislation comes here and you point out anything it is said that the Crown Law Officer has done it. Well, they cannot now claim that the Crown Law Officer has done it and I feel that the Government in the interest of fairplay, in its own interest and in the interest of self-government - if you believe in self-government you have to believe in the dictum that the majority must rule and not the minority. I hope that hon. members has taken to heart the lessons about Cyprus.

8.10 p.m.

After many years of blood-shed, they have come down to the brutal fact that what the British wanted done in Cyprus could not be done, that is, to have 100,000 Turkish Cypriots telling 400,000 Greek Cypriots what they must do. They had to come to the decision to give self-determination and freedom to the country because the majority are Greek Cypriots, and if the majority are Greek Cypriots there is nothing wrong. We are the majority in this island; democracy has transformed this Assembly to what it is; giving every person over twenty-one the right to vote has transformed this Assembly, because the people whom we represent sent us here, and they are not in the minority. Anybody can appeal to them, but after appealing to them, do you think it is right for any Government, Secretary of State or Head of the Administration to come and nullify the will of the people by nominating people to the Other Place? We pass measures in this House and they are kicked out in the Other Place.

The Governor-in-Executive Committee means the Government; and the Government though participating in the election at the same time, will be nominating Aldermen. The Minister said on a platform that they are going to

appoint people who have sympathy towards the working classes. That is not all! Your pretensions would be to appoint people who are sympathetic to the working classes, but you have to appoint people who are sympathetic to the majority which has got in; that is going to be the position. You cannot appoint people who are unsympathetic to the ones who have been elected. If the Labour Party wins, the Government cannot appoint people who are opposed to them; similarly I do not think it could be fair, if the other side won for you to appoint people who are diametrically opposed to it. If the hon. senior member for the City is the Hon. Minister's arch-enemy, we must take it that the Minister is his Gabriel and that he loves the Minister; but it is unlikely that if the Minister has the power to appoint people he is going to choose people agreeable to the hon. senior member for the City if he has out of his mouth said that he is his arch enemy. They can correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I think there are twelve seats and I understand you can appoint six Aldermen. If it is working on a Party system and the Labour Party won the majority of seats, would it be wrong to put sympathisers of the Labour Party as Aldermen? Could you ask them to go to the other side and put in their sympathisers? If you have been elected in 1956 and in the Local Government elections people vote for a Party opposed to yours, do you think it is right to appoint your members as Aldermen? That is why I say I cannot vote for the amendment because that would be instituting something they could not defend.

I have always been against the nominated system which can nullify an election system. Elections must be supreme. The people who voted during the 1956 elections are the people who are going to vote in the Local Government elections. Are you suggesting that if any group in the Local Government elections enjoys the same thing which the Government enjoyed from the people in 1956 it should not be dealt with in the same way and that the Governor should not call on that group to form a Party? Should you find some other means to circumvent the will of the people? If you are a Socialist you cannot believe in that. That is why I say that if another Party won the elections and you have to appoint Aldermen, you should appoint men who are sympathetic to the other side. Even then there would be no guarantee as to how they would vote, but you would have the criterion where in having a new system of Government based on adult suffrage the will of the people would be supreme through these votes. We fought against the nominated system but you want to bring it back here. You should let them face the electorate like any of us; you should let them get through there, and if they cannot get through the horn-pipe, then they should not sit there. If you used to nominate members in here, do you know how many people would come here on the side without showing any sympathy? It is easy to get in the Other Place; you just have to get on like a yard fowl. To get in here you have to go out into the highways and hedges and get mixed up in political campaigns.

I do not believe in the nominated system anyhow; I believe in the will of the people. I believe the people should govern, and when they do they must be satisfied with wrong Government. Nobody is qualified to run this Government better than I can because he is nominated. If you want to help run this country, you must get in the mill. I believe in a single Chamber with elected members, but we have two Chambers; we are very English and therefore my voice is like a voice in the wilderness on this matter. That is my firm opinion and as long as I live in a democracy I can express it. What the Minister is reported to have said has infuriated me, because making a statement like that with an election going on is sort of threatening the electorate that regardless of what it does, there is a gap or method through which you can do what you feel like doing. It is a good thing that some Governors or the Colonial Office do not get on with that stupidity which the Minister expressed. You have an example of what happened in Singapore, and more recently in Trinidad when the P.N.M. won the election, people were nominated on the basis that they could run the country. If you cannot nominate men who are sympathetic to a particular Party, then get rid of them. I am not concerned with which side wins in the Local Government election, because speaking in my own personal capacity - with all respect to those who are running - the

Local Government is a little too local for me in that it is too narrow and circumscribed.

8.20 p.m.

But it is good training for people and it serves a good purpose. However, I cannot at this stage of my life merely deal with matters such as poor relief and scavenging. That is not sufficiently challenging for me as a politician. However, what is dangerous about this system is that this system is being perpetuated by people who have been in the vanguard in their fight against these systems. They have been in the vanguard in their fight with others against a nominated system which was likely to nullify the elected system. Even in countries like Antigua and St. Kitts you will find that in recent days the Administrators and Governors of those territories have come around to the idea, when they find a certain section of people have succeeded in gaining the majority of seats in an election to nominate a certain number of persons whose views are in keeping with those elected. You get the position where when the electorate has expressed itself, you get the Governor nominating people who must act in accordance with the wishes of the electorate. If you are going to nominate people to this Council and without giving thought to those elected - and it can happen that the Labour Party can get four seats while another party gets eight - and you nominate six people to vote against eight, you can well see that the Labour Party force will be much stronger though they have not won at the election and that to my mind is the antithesis to an election.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate that these amendments should come to us in the middle of a campaign and why I say that is because the amendments of this Bill are very material in principle and nature; and although they may be interpreted in certain circumstances as being electioneering stunts I know they are not and that they are strictly necessary.

I agree with many of the points raised by the hon. member who has just sat down and I agree entirely with the view that the will of the electorate should be represented in the appointments made by way of Aldermen; in other words, there should be proportionate representation of the parties as to how they win at the election. Owing to this party system, there should be proportionate representation based on the results of the elections in the appointing of Aldermen. I agree with that because the will of the people should be the predominant and the decisive factor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in a way these amendments are timely in that great confusion has been caused in the minds of the electorate generally and the people of this Island as a whole through the receipt of those assessment forms. These assessment forms are designed to rate owners of property, whether it be land or property such as house and land, or even in the case of chattel houses, irrespective of the value of the chattel house or whether that chattel house is habitable or not, and as a result, great confusion has been caused in the minds of these small chattel house owners and the people of Barbados generally - I refer to the underprivileged ones - with the result that at these elections a certain amount of frustration has been created.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to draw to the attention of the hon. member that in these amendments nothing is said about chattel houses. I am afraid he may be getting mixed up with what the amendment drives at, that is, to ease small traders and not the owners of chattel houses.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I am not at all mixed up; I am just prefacing my remarks. I will come to my point. I am well aware that the last of these amendments deals with the poor trader; but I am saying that at certain electioneering meetings it has been said by certain members of the Labour Party that one should ignore these rateable forms and that they do not mean anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a bit besides the point. The amendment as the hon. member can see from the Bill deals with small traders and these slips of paper which were

sent out to people deal with the valuation of hereditaments; therefore, I think the hon. member should get back to the subject. Although he will be allowed to make an analogy, I do not see where he is making an analogy now.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I appreciate your ruling. These amendments are timely and necessary because of the omissions which were made in the original Bill whereby small traders were not exempted in the original Bill and will be exempted now, thus bringing the Act into line with the exemptions given under the Vestry Act whereby poor traders who made profits not exceeding \$50 were given exemption. I am saying that it is a great pity now that the Labour Party has seen fit to bring into line more or less these small traders that they have failed to realise the necessity in an amendment so as to exempt small chattel house owners whose rateable valuation is \$50 or less. I do not see how my saying that is besides the point. It is exemptions with which we are dealing and I am saying when we are dealing with the exemptions to let us have comprehensive exemptions and to have the average chattel house owner whose valuation is \$50 or less exempted from taxation. Why should we be caught in this trap and then say we have adult suffrage? Surely we do not have representation without taxation; it is a question of representation and taxation because the majority of people whom we call upon to vote will be paying a tax of some sort - either rates or taxes. I am saying that just as the Government has seen fit to exempt small traders according to this amendment, I hope that certain explanations which were given at meetings that the white paper did not mean anything and that the people should ignore those slips of paper will mean that such a thing as I have mentioned will be taken care of in an amendment to the Act. I was surprised, when I saw these amendments that neither of them covered the point which I was making after hearing those explanations.

8.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the amendment and I am saying that I would like the Minister or the Premier or the Cabinet to look into this question of exemptions again and see whether anything further can be done for the people of this Island, more especially for the small chattel house owner who has not paid taxes in the past, who in the future will be called upon to pay taxes of some sort and whose protection is afforded under the Vestry Act but has been omitted in the Local Government Act on account of inadvertence. I do not blame the Government, but rather the Legal Draughtsman who omitted these provisions dealing with traders. I am asking the Labour Government to see whether, instead of granting remission of taxes and causing the Department of Inland Revenue to have any amount of work - I am asking the Government or the Cabinet, if at some point they would not grant exemption from taxation in the case of chattel houses. In other words, if you have a chattel house which is worth about \$150.00 but in which people of necessity still live.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. member that he can make reference by way of analogy dealing with taxation of property or relief from taxation on property, but as far as this amendment is concerned he cannot make it a special point in his argument. It is only by analogy that he is allowed to make reference to taxation because this Bill has absolutely nothing to do with taxation of property. The hon. member has been allowed to make reference to that matter and I have absolutely no intention of stifling his argument; but I am only allowing him to make an analogy. If the hon. member wants to make that a special point in his argument, he must desist from that, because it is not before the House at the moment. That is crystal clear.

Mr. TALMA: The amendment with which I am dealing is an omission which was made in the Local Government Act of 1958.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 8.30 p.m., of the clock, no opposed business may continue after this time.

Hon. M. E. COX: As far as I gather, Sir, the hon. member says that he is in favour of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: And another hon. member has said that he is not in favour of the Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard the Government as to the burden of my opposition to this Bill and therefore I cannot say that I am not opposed to it. You have heard the reason why I am opposed to it - it is on the basis of the method of the election of the Aldermen and what these Aldermen can do. I have not heard the Government on that point.

Mr. TALMA: May I continue to speak Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill is opposed and I cannot grant any permission for the suspension of the Rules.

Hon. M. E. COX: I regret that I cannot reply at this stage especially to some of the remarks which have been made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 26th 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 Thursday, 26th February, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.40 p.m.