

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12th July, 1960.

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*); Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER; Mr. C. E. TALMA; Mr. C. B. SEARLES and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr Bryan and Mr. TUDOR entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on 21st June, 1960, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause.*) There being no objection, those Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Honourable the Legislative Council the following:-

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL TO THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable House of Assembly the Bill to amend the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Enquiry) Act, 1939, which has been passed with amendments which are shown written on the Bill.

H. G. MASSIAH.

PRESIDENT.

Legislative Council Chamber,
21st June, 1960.

Mr. SPEAKER: Also I have received from the Other Place a Bill to authorise the sale of Glebe Lands in the parish of Christ Church which has been passed with amendments which are shown written on the Bill.

Mr. CORBIN entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 8) Order, 1960.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1960.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 10) Order, 1960.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 11) Order, 1960.

The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1960.

The Barbados Statistical Service - Selected Monthly Indicators - April, 1960.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados, and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended on the 31st March, 1960, in respect of schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Customs Duties (Materials for the manufacture or repair of machinery) Order, 1960.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1960.

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

The Fishing Industry (Amendment) Regulations, 1960.

Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux - Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Executive Council - 1957-58.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 8) Order, 1960."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1960."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 10) Order, 1960."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 11) Order, 1960."

Resolution to place the sum of \$93,540 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960 - 61, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960 - 61 No. 8, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$471 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960 - 61, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960 - 61 No. 7, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Rules entitled "The Public Trustee (Amendment) Rules, 1960."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1960."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1960."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A Bill to impose duty on bets made by way of pool betting and to provide for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

A Bill to amend the Gaming Act, 1891.

A Bill to amend the Gambling Act, 1917.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: A Bill to amend the Fisheries Regulation Act, 1904.

A Bill to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952.

A Bill to regulate the holding of land by aliens and companies under alien control.

A Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1910.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Notice which I have just given relative to the Bill to regulate the holding of land by aliens and companies under alien control, I am to state that we intend to lay the Bill later on in the day and there is a Clause in it which brings the Bill into operation as from today. I would like that point noted. Copies of this Bill will be distributed to hon. members and I want to make it known that a Clause in the Bill makes the Bill become operative as from today. 12.25 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 33/1960 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John regarding the establishment of a Central Planning Unit is now ready.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the answers to Question No. 34/1960 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John regarding the installation of electricity at St. Margaret's School are now ready.

Also the answers to Questions No. 37/1960 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding the increase of boarding fees for students at U.C.W.J., and No. 38/1960 asked by the same hon. member regarding the provision of text books used by children in Primary and Secondary Modern Schools are now ready.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

PETITIONS

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition on behalf of the Bridgetown City Council to establish a scholarship at the University College of the West Indies known as the Princess Royal Scholarship. It is respectfully worded and I beg that it be taken as read.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to be known as the Princess Royal Scholarship Act to establish a scholarship at the U.C.W.J. by the Bridgetown City Council.

QUESTIONS

Mr. TALMA: To enquire of the Hon. Premier:-

Do the Government contemplate bringing down a Bill having as its object the consolidation of the Income Tax Act, 1921, and its numerous Amending Acts?

2. Will the Government consider the urgency of granting Earned Income Relief at an early date?

3. Will Government consider bringing the Act more in line with modern Income Tax Legislation in the U.K. and many enlightened Colonial territories?

Mr. TUDOR: Oral Question No. 48/1960

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

Will the Minister state what decision, if any, he has reached with respect to 5th Form pupils of St. Michael Girls' School who did not write the London Chamber of Commerce Examinations in July, 1960?

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

Whether it is true that owners of Fairfield Factory, in the parish of St. Lucy, do not intend operating such as a sugar factory after 1961 or 1962?

2. Will Government take steps forthwith to ascertain whether the said owners will sell to Government for it to be maintained as a sugar factory for purchase and grinding of peasants' and other sugar canes?

3. Is Government aware of the boon it would confer on the peasantry of the Northern parishes?

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

How many displaced coopers are now unemployed?

2. How many have secured alternative employment within each of the last three years, (1957 - 1959)?

3. How much money is now in the fund (raised by way of the levy under the 1953 Act) for granting annual Bonuses to displaced workers?

4. How many displaced coopers have been assisted by Government in securing employment in the U.K. or other places abroad?

5. How many, if any, displaced coopers (over 65 years of age) have been settled on agricultural land in this island and if so, how much land and where?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to impose duty on bets made by way of pool betting and to provide for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith be now read a first time.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, a Bill to amend the Gaming Act, 1891, was read first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, a Bill to amend the Gambling Act, 1917, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, a Bill to amend the Fisheries Regulation Act, 1904, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, a Bill to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, a Bill to regulate the holding of land by aliens and companies under alien control was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, a Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1910, was read a first time.

12.35 p.m.

On motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the Bill to authorise the Council of the City of Bridgetown to establish a scholarship known as the "Princess Royal Scholarship," at the U.C.W.I., was read a first time.

MR. SEARLES GRANTED FOUR WEEKS' LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the business of the House, I want to apply for four weeks' leave of absence as from next Tuesday, 19th July, and at the same time, as I am a member of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, I think it will also be necessary for me to apply for leave to that extent from the business of that Body.

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

STATEMENT re IMPOSITION OF BAN ON SOUTH AFRICAN GOODS

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders are called, I would just like to make two statements. The first is in connection with the banning of South African goods and the statement reads as follows:-

"On the adjournment of the House on 21st June, 1960, I assured hon. members that the Government was actively considering machinery having for its object the imposition of a ban on the importation of South African goods. I am happy to state that after discussions with the Legal Department and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Government is advised that the Governor under section 2 of the Export and Imports (Restriction) Act, 1939, has power to make an order banning the importation of South African Goods. An order giving effect to the above will shortly be made. (Cheers)

Hon. M. E. COX: The second statement is in connection with the statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy in the House of Assembly on the 21st June, last, relative to the importation and sale of unlabelled South African goods at Woolworth's.

I have caused an enquiry to be carried out -

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should not interrupt the hon. member, but the statement which I made on that occasion was not at all relative to the importation of South African goods but to the sale of unlabelled goods.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in the hon. member's speech, he did make mention of South African goods coming in to the Island, and their being sold without labels, and that they were displayed by that particular firm for sale without labels.

Mr. TUDOR: Yes, I did mention that, but I did not say that they were imported by them from South Africa.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to say that the Report revealed that there was no foundation of fact in the allega-

tion that those items were on display at Woolworth unlabelled. As Your Honour will remember, I promised the House on that occasion to investigate the matter; and immediately as I got to my office, I got in touch with the persons concerned. I repeat, that the Report of the enquiry which was carried out revealed that there was no foundation of fact in the allegation.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. WALCOTT rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have some recollection of the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy on this matter on that occasion. The hon. member did request that the Hon. Minister should make an investigation.

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, Sir. As I was saying, Sir, the last part of the Report reveals that there was no foundation of fact in the allegation that the things were imported from South Africa and that those goods were on display at Woolworth.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That is grossly unfair to me because no allegation was made by me that South African goods were imported and that that firm had displayed them. I said that the goods which I saw on sale there were alleged to be goods of South African origin. That is a different thing.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the Statement, it seems to me as if members of this Chamber are going crazy. All that a Statement made by a Minister must contain is something in connection with which the Government has a responsibility. No Order has been made about the importation or the non-importation of goods from South Africa, and I think, with due respect to Your Honour, that the alleged Statement which the Hon. Minister is making is out of place in this House. First of all, it is nothing which concerns the Government and, secondly, the Statement cannot be debated now. The Statement made by the Hon. Minister is supposed to be an answer by the Government to something which was said in a store which was not a Government Department. What is going to be the situation if this is made a precedent and Ministers can come in here week after week -

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not now a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: This falls within the category of a question. The Government is not responsible for any store, neither has any Order been made against the importation or non-importation of South African goods. What statement of fact can that be?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not have been here on the occasion when the hon. senior member for St. Lucy addressed the House, but I do remember that hon. members of this House entrusted the Hon. Minister to make an enquiry into this matter; therefore, the Statement is in order. The Hon. Minister was put in the position to inform the House as to the allegation which the hon. senior member for St. Lucy made reference to.

I am replying to the House and not to any member. I am saying that the Statement by the Hon. Minister is not out of order because it was made at the request of this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: As Your Honour has said, I was not here; but there is nothing in the Rules of this House for the Hon. Minister to make Statements like these. If this is to be regarded as a precedent, any hon. member can get in here and make a Statement about any person in his own private capacity and the Minister can say "I am going to make an investigation and find out if it is a fact."

Mr. SPEAKER: I will never allow that. I certainly remember very well the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy on this matter on the last occasion. The matter was dealt with by other hon. members and the House requested the Hon. Minister to investigate the matter. The only thing which the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has made objection to is the importation, but not the enquiry or otherwise.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not protesting the importation. It is the Government's business to find out if goods are imported because goods can only be imported and come through the Customs; but I am saying that goods which are set up for sale in a store and are not banned should not be subjected to an enquiry and investigation unless such a matter was raised on a substantive motion of this House. The Hon. Minister cannot say as regards the goods on sale at Woolworth that the Government is in a position to carry out an investigation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has now made more than a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Your Honour should protect the Rules of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not breaking any rules. The hon. member must sit. I just want to say that the hon. member was not present when this matter was discussed and when members insisted that I should investigate the matter.
12.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the entire end of the matter. I rule that the Statement is in order; that is my ruling. There can be no discussion on it afterwards.

Mr. WALCOTT: Your Honour allowed the hon. member to make a point of order and asked me to sit down; now you say that I cannot continue to say what I am saying.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter is closed; I have made my ruling.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is gross partiality. If you rise on a point of order

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order; he cannot speak.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am out of order because Your Honour has elected to make this matter a topical one.

Mr. SPEAKER: As soon as the hon. member made his point of order, and even long before that, I told him that it was more than a tacit request of this House that the hon. member should make an investigation. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was not present and he should have been satisfied with that. The hon. member has made a statement 'as if the House is going crazy.'

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot make a request to go into any premises.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member rises again, I will name him. I have been quite tolerant and the hon. member has ignored my ruling more than once. I deem the hon. member's behaviour to be out of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: How could I be out of order when Your Honour has allowed the hon. member to make a speech? You are reducing the House to a farce.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order? (Mr. WALCOTT: The House cannot make a request to go into a private place!) Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter restrain himself so that I can hear the point of order which is being made?

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, what the Hon. Minister has said is so unsatisfactory that I would like him to indicate to me where and at what time the matter can be fully discussed and debated.

Mr. SPEAKER: As soon as the hon. member gives notice to that effect. It does not really concern the Chair until then.

LEAVE TO DEAL WITH AMENDMENTS

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with the amendments to the Bills which have been returned by the Other Place to this Chamber as the First Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to deal with the amendments to the Bills which have been returned by the Other Place.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. I have not received any copies of those amendments; I do not know if they are being prepared or what. I am not therefore in a position to raise objection or to give assent to deal with these amendments unless I am aware of what the proposed amendments are. Perhaps some light may be shed as to whether the amendments are purely verbal ones or copies of the amendments may be distributed around the Table.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to inform the hon. member that one amendment is the use of a full stop in the place of a semicolon at the end of one Section, and the other amendment is the deletion of the words "and Legal" in another Section. That is as far as the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Enquiry) Act, 1939, is concerned.

As to the other Bill, that is a private Bill which concerns the hon. junior member for Christ Church. In that case, the amendment is only the insertion in the marginal column of the words "short title." That is the only amendment.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, in view of the nature of the amendment to that Bill, I would be glad if the House would agree to deal with it forthwith.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to deal with these amendments forthwith and unless any objection is made, leave will be granted. (After a pause.) There being no objection, leave is granted.

RESOLUTION re DEATH OF ANEURIN BEVAN

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before we deal with these amendments, I would like to move the passing of a Resolution in connection with the death of Mr. Aneurin Bevan. On the last occasion on the death of Mr. Ernest Bevin (Mr. WALCOTT: Why did you not do so earlier?) I could not do it earlier when the hon. member was making all of that noise. It was done on the last occasion on the death of Mr. Ernest Bevin. I think it is fitting that this House should place on record its deep sympathy in connection with the death of the Right Honourable Aneurin Bevan.
12.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy at the passing of the Right Honourable Aneurin Bevan, P.C.M.P., and that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his widow."

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary to say much about this gentleman since he is so well known to all of us even though some of us may have different political views. One thing which can be said for him, however, is that he has made a very valuable contribution towards the development and advancement not only of the British Labour Party, but also of these West Indian Islands mainly inhabited by people who are regarded as less fortunate.

I think the last brilliant speech he made, Sir, was on that Hola Camp business when a motion was before the House to reject the Report of the Judge, the Delvin Report, and at that time, no doubt as usual, he championed the cause of those unfortunate Africans who were beaten to death in that Hola Camp episode in Kenya.

Mr. Bevan's work will stand out especially in view of the fact that he was the architect of the British Social Security, National Insurance and things of that sort; he was the first Minister of Health and Housing and no doubt, he has done a remarkably good job; so good he has done that the people in England after achieving so many services free of cost for which they used to pay and for which they could hardly have paid in those days, began to feel that all is over and they need not worry with Labour any more. But as I said earlier, it is unnecessary to say very much at this stage except that we in these parts of the world and the less fortunate people as a whole have lost a very good friend in the late Aneurin Bevan, and we feel sure that his work will live on as a symbol or monument to those who come behind him.

We with deep regret move the passing of this Resolution to his widow, and hope that Almighty God will stimulate her and strengthen her to bear up against these sorrowful times.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in formally seconding this Resolution which I do now, I will say that the Official Opposition shares the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Leader of the House in connection with the loss sustained to Parliament, in particular to the Mother of Parliament, by the death of the late Aneurin Bevan. He was, Sir, a Parliamentarian of the highest order and an orator probably second to none from the Welsh country other than the late David Lloyd George; and after the removal from the House of Commons of Earl Lloyd George, as he became when he went into the Upper Chamber, it was beyond dispute that the most eloquent, the most forceful and the two most impressive speakers in the Mother of Parliament were the former Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill and the late and deeply lamented Mr. Aneurin Bevan.

It is well known, of course, that the Welsh are amongst not only the most musical, but the most eloquent of the people of the British Commonwealth, and the late Mr. Bevan was a celebrated and an outstanding example of his country's great gift for music and his rhetoric *par excellence*.

Perhaps there could be no better, fuller or more comprehensive tribute paid to him than that which appeared in last Sunday's *Trinidad Guardian*—nothing worthwhile reading Mr. Speaker, escapes you so far as I have always been able to gather—under the caption "Bevan the Welsh examiner". That, Mr. Speaker, I commend to all who have not read it and who would like in a short time to read the history of this tempestuous and very sincere and genuine politician and Parliamentarian. I would say, Sir, that we remember him as the principal mover in connection with the National Health Services of Great Britain. Although it may well be said that it was the product of the mind of Sir William Beveridge and the conception of Lord Beveridge, yet it is one thing to conceive and another thing to put into operation; and it was the action, initiative and dynamism of the late Mr. Bevan which caused that Bill which is now on the Statute Book in Great Britain to occupy its present position in the legislation of the Mother Country.

I will commend the late Mr. Bevan to backbenchers of any Parliament, and the mere fact that I look across this Chamber in the direction of my friends opposite is not because I am confining my recommendation of the late Mr. Bevan's parliamentary tactics to the backbenchers at present on that side of the House, but he was a member of a Party who did not hesitate with all the power in his being, when he disagreed with the policy and the practice and the statements of those in power in his own Party, to say that with all the fervour and eloquence of his Welsh spirit. From the time he was the most humble of backbenchers, he was unafraid to get up in the House of Commons and express his mind.
1.05 p.m.

Looking around us, can we see amongst the backbenchers of the Government Party anyone even remotely approximating to the shade of the now deceased, Mr. Aneurin Bevan? If they would study that model of a Parliamentarian and assuming, Mr. Speaker, that they possess his ability

and gift of eloquence, we might well see rising from the seats of the backbenchers of Government someone who as a result of the study of Mr. Bevan's life is beginning, even to a small extent, to benefit from the example and precept of that most outstanding British politician.

Sir, I am sure that when months ago we heard of his illness, our hearts and prayers went out to him. We did hope that he would have survived although we feared that owing to the gravity of his illness, he would not have been able to take his place in the Mother of Parliaments and expound the cause for which he was fighting with his usual fire. It has been decided by the Almighty that he should return to Parliament no more, and it is fitting that in this Parliament of Little England we should express our tribute to one of the most genuine, one of the truest, and one of the most outspoken and frank members that the British people have ever produced in Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I have not had the advantage of personal acquaintance with Mr. Bevan, but at least two of my colleagues who are seated on my immediate right have had that privilege; and I would leave it now to them, if they care, to add their tribute to this great Parliamentarian.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my Party, we would like to associate ourselves with this Resolution. Mr. Bevan was a great Parliamentarian who served the Mother of Parliaments for a great number of years. He was a most courageous personality and we are told that he had a wonderful command of the English language and that there were few who could stand up to his challenge in debate. He goes down in history as the Parliamentarian who put on a proper basis the Health Services of Great Britain. He is responsible for that. When he became Minister of Health after the War, he initiated and saw completed his Social Services scheme, primarily a free Health Service, which today stands out as a wonderful achievement throughout all democratic countries. Of course, it has been amended, but that was only because of a matter of time.

Mr. Bevan's death is not only a loss to the Labour Party in England but it is a loss to his country and to Parliament that he should have died at the early age of sixty-two years of age. Today, when the Labour Party of England is in the minority and is struggling against the Conservative Party which has such a large majority, it would be good for Parliament to have as strong an Opposition as possible in order to keep the Government on its toes. That is what makes a country go forward. That is why I say that the loss is not only a loss to the Labour Party but to Great Britain. Again, Sir, I heartily support the Resolution and I feel keenly the loss of such a great statesman.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there are few men in the world like Mr. Aneurin Bevan in public life and other phases of life. Mr. Bevan was not only a member of Parliament of Great Britain but he was a man who believed in Socialism and he was a man that believed in conscience. Those of us who can remember when Mr. Bevan broke with the Labour Party at one stage will remember that at the time it was felt that he was not joining with the united front of the Labour Party—and that was the feeling of one set of people—and to some other people it was felt that he was going Communist. But I think a man of Mr. Bevan's character is too upright, too bold and too forthright to accept dictatorship; therefore, Communist dictatorship would not have appealed to him although some of the lessons in Marxism—and those of us who have read anything of Karl Marx need not be ashamed to say this, that some of the things laid down by Karl Marx are of some importance to the social life of any country.

As I was saying, Mr. Bevan resigned from the Government—and the Government at that time was the Labour Party—when he felt that the Government would not agree to the nutritional scheme of the Health Services Scheme which he had implemented. He had the courage not to look upon £5,000 which he was getting as a Minister as being more than a matter of conscience. He never had the privilege of enjoying any Ministry in the Government again.

I believe that the two outstanding orators in the world are Sir Winston Churchill and the late Mr. "Nye" Bevan. During the War and after, the debates between those two orators were debates which were worth reading, and to those of us who love reading I will counsel them to read them and see that two people of diametrically opposite philosophies when they debated something in Parliament did not debate it in any Sunday School atmosphere but in the way which Parliament allows you to conduct debates.

I think that Mr. Bevan's life - his political life and political philosophy - should be a lesson to those who really have a philosophy. He was a Socialist; and although Socialism was defeated in Great Britain, it did not make him feel that he should depart from Socialism and find a new avenue in which to hide out; he felt that he should remain a Socialist. A man of his outstanding character and of his robust temperament, a man who was called a rebel in his lifetime, is now revered as one of the most outstanding Parliamentarians of this century. It is a pity that he cannot hear the comments and the tributes which are paid to him even from abroad and we know what it is when we get a comment in an American newspaper like the "New York Times", which to me is the best newspaper of that country, paying him the tribute. He was one of the greatest instruments of peace in that he made it clear to a lot of American diplomacy that they should not try to overrun the world and by so doing lead it into another war.

Sir, those of us who feel sincere in this tribute which we are paying to Mr. Bevan will look upon him as I look upon him and that is as a shining example and as someone to emulate. I am not ashamed to say that in my home, I have a book of his "In Place of Fear," which is one of my little treasures; but it is big enough that whenever I have a quiet time at home I take it up to read and, indeed, you can very well appreciate his great literary style when you read that book.

1.15 p.m.

I feel sure that those of us who have Socialist feelings feel that we have lost, not a friend but a brother in the person of "Nye" Bevan who has done so much not only for the Socialist cause but the cause of peace in our country.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in a little village in Letchlade close to the village where the Thames rises there was, some fifteen years ago, an oak tree which was said to be nearly two thousand years old. The pressure of modern traffic regulations directed to the Parish Council that the oak should be removed. The oak tree was not removed on the ground that if it were removed it would alter the whole of the landscape of the entire village. Mr. Speaker, the death of Aneurin Bevan does alter the political landscape of the entire Commonwealth mountain; something which was there, immense, stately and stable is no longer there. It was something which had grown out of the deep roots of the British political tradition and it was a contribution which has been made to the life and times of Great Britain by Wales. And the Welsh tradition which has a particular place in the contours of this land, almost stands foursquare with the temperament and ideals of its people, the hills alternating with the valleys, intellect as well as deep feeling. If the character of the Welsh people has been moulded by the pattern of the land in which they live, "Nye" Bevan was supremely a Welshman; if the Welsh mountains could be compared with the head of the man, the Welsh valleys could be compared with his heart. He was a man in whom the qualities of head and heart were combined and well combined; neither one was more pre-eminent than the other and he drove them as one might drive a pair of horses with a rein which was tight and with a sense of direction which was true. He was a miner by profession and trade; yet he lived long enough to prove the vigour of British democracy by rising to be a member of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council and a member of a Cabinet which contained men who had better opportunities in life than he himself had, but which contained men who were no better either intellectually or morally than he.

You will remember reading of a schoolmaster of whom it was said that his pupils "gazed and gazed and still the wonder grew, that one small head could carry all he knew." "Nye" Bevan's head was not small; it was large, but every

part of it was filled with good things. You would never have known that he was a miner by trade in his early days unless you could look at him closely enough to see that he carried always a reddish tint in his eyes, a legacy of occupational disease caught as a miner. You would only have known that he was a miner as such by the wealth of his allusions and converse culled from the pit face. Anyone who had listened to him sitting in Parliament and remembering that he stood in a Parliament which also contained Sir Winston Churchill, would have been encouraged by the thrust of British political life and the contribution which Mr. Bevan made from his every effort on the Socialist side. Even in this House where we attempt to deplore the bitter Party strife, we certainly have not known it as I and some others have been privileged to see it, in the House of Commons between these two people. I remember in 1944 - and this brings out one aspect of "Nye" Bevan's character - that there had been some public agitation over the fact that a revolt led by the Communists in Greece was assuming alarming proportions; the British Government was forced to intervene and opinion in Great Britain felt that it was not any part of Britain's duties to intervene in a domestic matter. Heading that opinion was "Nye" Bevan and Sir Winston Churchill, then Mr. Churchill, fought to score against Mr. Bevan and his view by trying to make it appear that he was supporting anarchy. Sir Winston Churchill said that democracy was "not an harlot to be picked up in the street with a Tommy gun." And Bevan retorted "neither is she a rich man's kept woman." That illustrates the quickness of his wit.

It is sometimes said that he reserved not a little of his savagery - I use that word advisedly - for members of his own Party. He was not the sort of person who believed that Socialism was a fair weather path; he believed that to be respected you should persecute your opponents. I well remember in 1956 listening to him making a speech which was critical of his own Party and he said among other things that the British Labour Party had got a simple choice before it. "We must either accept the thirty pieces of silver or be prepared to wear the crown of thorns," and he said in typical fashion, "I myself will wear the crown of thorns; I do not want the thirty pieces of silver because they have devalued the pound." We have there not only his quick grasp of essentials but also his ability to see clearly through things.

Mr. Speaker, there are not many men in the British Commonwealth or indeed in any part of this world who possess the range and depth of that man. He was a friend of all persons, both humble and great and the tributes paid by Nehru, Macmillan, President Tito, and others are tributes which are heartfelt. If in politics he was sometimes severe it was that he was led and moved by great convictions, and people who have great convictions cannot afford to trifle with their political opinions. It is perhaps largely to his credit that he reserved a little of the bitterness of which he was sometimes capable even for his own Party; because it was inconceivable to him that people in his own camp should steal away to the camp fires of the enemy in order to warm their hearts at the enemy's hearth.

1.25 p.m.

He was a large man in more ways than one; he made his contribution to English, British and Welsh life and times, the South Wales Miners' Federation in the Tredegar County Council, a patron of Arts and Sciences, an author himself, a lover of music and leader of his Party; best of all as a Parliamentarian in all that brought him to the forefront of national life. In giving our condolence to his widow, Miss Jennie Lee, we should like to say that he has been happily married to a lady who herself was of the working classes; she was a miner's daughter from Scotland and she has made no small contribution. They were ably and equally matched, and she, I think, will derive much comfort from the fact that he has made an outstanding contribution in his life.

I should like to close all this by saying - I mean no disrespect to Her Majesty when I say that Wales has produced many famous people, but at long last and for a long time to come it has produced its own Prince of Wales.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, quite a lot has been said in eulogy of the late Aneurin Bevan on this very sad occasion. I could not allow this tribute to go on the record of the House without myself for very personal reasons adding my small quota in praise of the contribution which he has made to the life of democratic countries, and particularly to the future of what are sometimes called under-developed countries, pre-technological societies or emergent countries, depending upon your choice of terminology.

The first reason why I feel it incumbent on me to say something in addition to what has been so well said already is that I am probably the only member of this Chamber who has been a recipient of the barbed tongue of Mr. Aneurin Bevan. I made the mistake when I was a very callow youth of trying to engage Mr. Bevan in a debate, and at that time I flattered myself that the honours were evenly divided. This was a debate, Mr. Speaker, on the National Health Services which I was very much in favour of and which I supported, but at that time I was called upon to take the role of what is known in the Canon Law as the "Devil's Advocate" instead of the Advocate's Devil," and I had to argue a case against the National Health Services quite early after they had started - within a matter of twelve months after they had been put into operation - and Mr. Nye Bevan was on the other side. I thought I had a point scored off him and at the end of the debate I flattered myself that the honours had been evenly divided, but on sober reflection I now see that I made an utter fool of myself - or Mr. Bevan made an utter fool of me - in the debate. I scored only one point which he came up to me after and said was a very good point, and it is that the Health Services are operating a hardship against the young practitioners and consolidating the position of the people who had well-established practices. I have emerged from that encounter as a sadder and wiser man, and I have learnt something from Mr. Nye Bevan as a result in the art of Parliamentary debate.

The second personal aspect of this matter is that when I got off a train at Sloane Square I had to pass two houses out of about five houses in a place called Eton Terrace or Eton Place; I would not now speak as to the accuracy, but I think it was Eton Place and there were about five or six houses; one had a red door and one had a black door. In one of these houses lived the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Chief Justice Goddard and these portals I was never able to darken with my presence. In the other house lived Mr. Aneurin Bevan and his wife, the former Miss Jennie Lee and one of them, as I said earlier, had a red door. When I had to pay a call to these premises, I immediately went to the house with the red door to find out that the Lord Chief Justice of England lived behind those portals, and the house with the black door which had a very decorous Georgian facade and a brass-knocker was the edifice which was occupied by the late Mr. Aneurin Bevan, and, I believe, was occupied by him up to the time of his death. That is to show how much one can be misled by outward appearances, and it shows how one can jump to conclusions about people and not realise their true potentialities until you get to know them.

Mr. Bevan has been much maligned not only by the Conservative opposition throughout the Commonwealth - I am not referring to the Barbados Opposition - but even by his fellow-Socialists as being too much in a hurry and wanting to turn everything up-side-down overnight. I think that a lot of that criticism has been grounded on the fact that he had a singleness of purpose which is unfortunately lacking in the world today, especially among people who formerly aligned themselves to the cause of Socialism. After the Labour Party went out of power some years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists attacked Mr. Bevan on the ground that he was causing disruption and that he was a rebel. It is only now that it is appreciated that the policy of compromise can only redound to the credit of the people who want to maintain their status quo.

On a Saturday night, Mr. Speaker, - I think you will recall this - some eight years ago when Mr. Bevan was at the height of his unpopularity, the Leader of the Government, as he then was, in Barbados referred to me in the presence of the Hon. Norman Manley as being the Nye Bevan of Barbados politics. At that time it was hurled as

an accusation and a term of abuse. I would not like to say that he was abusing me on the occasion but it was an attempt to show that I was a disruptive element because I was like Mr. Nye Bevan. Anyhow, I was referred to so far as I can remember on that Saturday night at Seawell Airport, as the Nye Bevan of Barbados politics.

1.35 p.m.

If when the Great Reaper calls me and my turn comes to answer that call on that great day of judgment I find that it is written on my tomb stone "The Nye Bevan of Barbados Politics" I would be more than thankful; I would be profoundly grateful.

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

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AMENDMENTS re TRADE DISPUTES (ARBITRATION AND ENQUIRY ACT, 1960

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with the amendments by the Other Place to the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Enquiry) Act, first. As I pointed out earlier, there are two small amendments; one is a typographical error which occurs in Clause 2 which amends Section 10 of the Principal Act, a ";" instead of a "." and in Section 3 of the Bill the words "and Legal" are to be deleted.

I beg to move that the amendments be dealt with forthwith.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE in each case, the amendments were read a first and second time and agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AMENDMENTS re SALE OF CHRIST CHURCH GLEBE LANDS ACT, 1960.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, there is another lot of amendments. They are to do with the Sale of Christ Church Glebe Land Act, 1960.

Mr. GODDARD: This is a very small amendment which has come from the Other Place to this Act. The amendment is to provide that a Short Title be added in the marginal column against the title of the Act.

I beg to move that this amendment be dealt with.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is quite known to the entire House because it was passed around. It is just an insertion of a Short Title in the marginal Column against Section 1 of the Act.

I beg to move that this amendment be now read a first time.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

On separate motions of Mr. GODDARD, seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO SANCTION CUSTOMS TARIFF (CONDITIONS FOR SPECIAL EXEMPTION FROM DUTY) (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) REGULATIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade: To move the passing

of the following Resolution:- Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Customs Tariff (Conditions for Special Exemption from Duty) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1960."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is to sanction Regulations entitled the Customs Tariff (Conditions for Special Exemption from Duty) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1960. Hon. members will see from the Addendum that this seeks to amend the Customs Regulations to allow certain items — unfinished stockings and socks — to be imported into the Island duty free.

Sometime ago representation was made to the Ministry in connection with the importation of these items. It was pointed out then, and no doubt you all know very well, that a considerable number of socks and stockings are imported into this island from Hong Kong and elsewhere. We have in this island an industry which does a considerable amount of that business and which employs quite a few of our workers.

Government felt that it would be in the interest of Barbados and the people as a whole to allow these unfinished articles to come into the island duty free, in view of the fact that a considerable number of persons are employed in finishing them. These articles will come in, in the shape of socks and stockings as mentioned in the Addendum, and then they will be passed on to the various hands to be finished, dyed and packed and everything else. As I have said, it would be a means of employing quite a few of our people. At present, the material itself — and that has been so for a long time — is allowed into the island duty free but unfinished stockings and socks are not allowed in duty free.

I discovered that it would cost a considerable amount of money to bring down machines to make these hose and weave them, and in addition to the considerable amount of money it would cost for these machines, I also discovered that these machines could be operated by one individual and that individual who would be so employed more than likely would be a stranger who would know something of the operation of these machines.

1.45 p.m.

Therefore, Sir, realising that it would be of little or no benefit to us if we allowed the machines to come in to manufacture these stockings and so on, we felt that the better thing to do would be to agree to allow this unfinished stuff to come in.

It was represented at the same time that this concern would employ something like forty people and it would turn out something like 800 dozen pairs per week. Two hundred dozen of them would be consumed locally and another 800 dozen would be exported. Therefore, Sir, we have decided to bring down this Resolution to allow these items to be brought in duty free so as to reduce the number of stockings and socks which are imported from Hong Kong and have them supplied to the local market as well as for export. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, normally these Customs amendments and duty free things seem to be very innocent. The Minister makes speeches in order to impress you that these things are done on an employment basis. He said that these people will employ about forty people but he does not state what approximately are the wages. I do not know if this was an enquiry of his which he made so as to find out what are the kind of minimum wages which they are about to pay. For example, we have shirts being manufactured here and there is the ridiculous situation in Barbados where a Wages Council made a recommendation for the payment of \$5.00 a week. For what reason are you having family planning? A girl who is working for \$5.00 a week is exposed to men. And you have family planning! The family is bound to increase because you are exposing a girl to all the disadvantages to which she can be exposed since you are paying \$5.00 a week. This is not a question of removing all duties so as to allow things to come in duty free; this is a question of giving certain industries the right to have certain things built up, and the Hon. Minister knows, if

he says that he is doing these things as regards the Hong Kong restrictions, that he is putting restrictions on items from Hong Kong. If that were not so, then there would be no point in giving this concession and allowing the items from Hong Kong to come in. That is understandable.

I am not against having these safeguards because as to Hong Kong, the way in which the Chinese work and the way in which the Japanese work, we do not live that kind of life and therefore you have some sweat shops in Hong Kong and in Japan as well. But some of these sweat shops are also in Barbados where the total amount which some of the girls work for is less than what one of the owners would receive. I do not know what assurance the Hon. Minister is going to give us that he has carried out an investigation. Moreover it is true that the Government apparently is not against the Trade Union Organisation but the Minister himself has made such a strong anti-trade union speech on one occasion to the effect that he is not

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I do not know what is wrong with the hon. member; I do not know what Israel did for him. When did I ever make any strong speech against the Trade Union? Let the hon. member say what I said.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, do I look like a man with whom something is wrong? The Speaker does give you a lot of latitude and I know why.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has said that I give the Hon. Minister a certain amount of latitude and he knows why. I regard that as a personal attack upon me as Speaker, or an attempt to attack me as Speaker. I think that every hon. member of this House knows that at some time or other I have given him some latitude and that includes the hon. member who has made some references to me. I have given every member of this House on frequent occasions much latitude; there is no member of this Honourable Chamber who could say that I grant him any sort of latitude that I have not given to any other hon. member, and no hon. member can say that I single out any hon. member to give him latitude. I ask the hon. member to desist from making that sort of remark or I will rule him out of order. I am not taking any part. The hon. Minister simply asked a question on a point of order and the least the hon. member could do is to answer and continue his speech. I would ask the hon. member to desist from using my name in this debate.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member rose on a point of order and what did he say? He misquoted me and that is why I said what I did say. The hon. member rose on a point of order previously and I was told to sit down; I was endeavouring to repeat what I was saying when I was crossed by Your Honour. What more can I say then other than that he gets the indulgence of the Chair and I know why? He knows that the Speaker is *persona grata* with the hon. member

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to remind the hon. member that I have been unanimously elected to the office of Speaker of this House. If the hon. member will remember, he did not oppose that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will say that the hon. member supported you as Speaker and I supported you also. That is why I said that.

1.55 p.m.

The hon. member rose on a point of order and said that he wanted to know when he made that statement. It is true that he does not listen when I am speaking; so if he ignores what I am saying he cannot rise on a point of order. If he is ignoring what I am saying, let him ignore it completely. What I said was — and I was very cautious to phrase it this way — that the Government is not unfavourable to the formation of Trade Unions, though the Minister has made a strong anti-Trade Union speech in here. The hon. member asked me to repeat it and I said that he made a strong anti-Trade Union speech in here.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like the hon. member to say what I said against the Trade Union in the anti-Trade Union speech which I made.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not understand the context of my language because he wants me to say what he said about the Trade Union. I said that he made an anti-Trade Union speech. You do not have to speak against the Transport and General Workers' Union, but a Bill was introduced here for peaceful picketing at homes similar to the one which operates in Great Britain and the hon. member said it was the most outrageous, villanous and wicked thing that any person could think about in this House, and if you want a more anti-Trade Union speech

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, that is misleading in its vilest form. I have never used such language and you can check the debates, because I have quoted the debates already on a similar occasion in May or June last year to show what I said then; so the hon. member is deliberately misleading this House and making false imputations and accusations against me.

Mr. WALCOTT: How could I be making misleading statements? The hon. member said it was an obnoxious Bill. Can you use any stronger word against a Bill than that it is obnoxious? He was the most surprised man when I could read his speech from 1949 to show that he supported the Bill and criticised the hon. senior member for the City who then in my opinion made a speech opposing it; so he made two different speeches on the same Bill; when I brought the Bill last year he criticised it. Now the hon. member said that he did not say that it was obnoxious. Do you want a more anti-Trade Union speech than that if the present Minister of Labour in a Socialist Government does not support lock, stock and barrel a Bill for peaceful picketing by saying that it is obnoxious
(Hon. M. E. COX: Go and read the debates.) It is for you to read the debates; I am going to read them when the elections are coming off.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, the hon. member referred to me as making a speech against peaceful picketing. I made a speech against peaceful picketing at private persons' homes and I make no apology for that and I am sticking to that throughout my life as long as I am in Barbados and in here, and I will agree with that all the time because you may get a big dog or a shot.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

On resumption,

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

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

NEW POST OFFICE AT ST. LUCY

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 30 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister of Works:

Will Government take all necessary steps this year to implement its promise to erect a new and centrally situated Post Office in the parish of St. Lucy?

Mr. SPEAKER: I observe that the Hon. Minister is not in his seat, and I understand that he is not in the precincts of the House.

Mr. BRANCKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only deprecate the actions of the Minister at this material time, and I would then have to ask leave to defer putting the Question until the Hon. Minister sees fit to be present in this Chamber and do his duty.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to defer the putting of his Question, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTRAL PLANNING UNIT

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 33 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. BARROW: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Finance: Whether in view of the present functioning of the Island's financial departments and the level of unemployment in the Island the Minister will consider the establishment of a Central Planning Unit?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that on the 8th March, 1960, this Hon. House was informed that it was the intention of the Government to set up a planning unit during the year. An Order has been laid and a Resolution introduced seeking approval of this Order.

Mr. BARROW: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Minister state by whom this information was given to the House and in the course of what debate?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This information was given to the House in my Budget Speech.

Mr. BARROW: Would the Minister of Finance state in what portion of the Budget Speech this information was given to the House?
2.35 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The whole of the Budget Speech is there. I believe it is printed. Surely, the hon. member can find that out.

COST OF STUDENT BOARDING AT U.C.W.I.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 37, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

I observe that the hon. member is not in his place and I will go on to Question No. 38 which is again asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. TUDOR: If Your Honour will permit me, I will ask Question No. 37.

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

Is the Minister aware that the cost of student boarding at the U.C.W.I. has increased by £35 per annum?

2. Is he further aware that scholars and exhibitioners from this territory have not yet received the increases which were to assist in defraying this added expenditure.

3. Will he undertake to arrange for the early dispatch of these funds to those students who are entitled to them?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: The answer to the first part of that question is: "As from October 1959, Guild fees and fees for boarding and simple medical attention at U.C.W.I. were increased from \$648 to \$720 per annum. This increase of \$72 is the only increase of which we have been informed by the University authorities."

The answer to the second part of that Question is: "No, Sir. Increased allowances for payment of the difference were authorised for Barbados Government Exhibitioners as from October 1959 after supplementary provision of funds to meet this purpose had been granted by the Legislature in July, 1959."

In reply to part three, "The Barbados Scholarship provision was sufficient for each scholar to bear the increase except for certain years of the medical course. The Government Scholarships and Exhibitions (Value and Allowances) Regulations, 1960 will allow for adjustment of the Barbados Scholarship allowances during the current financial year. The Regulations were laid in the House of Assembly on the 26th April, 1960."

"No further action will be necessary and the authorities of the University College have been informed."

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, out of those answers, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister this supplementary. Arising out of what he said, first of all, when were the increases of which he spoke authorised? Certainly, by the end of April this year it was not known whether they would be increased. Secondly, when were the authorities of the U.C.W.J. informed?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: In reply to that question, I would say that I have not got the file with me but I can assure the hon. member that they were informed immediately after.

Mr. TUDOR: Would the Hon. Minister say immediately after what?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Immediately after the Resolution was brought to the House.

Mr. TUDOR: I do not quite understand. Will he say when?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I say immediately after the Resolution which was brought to the House had been agreed to.

Mr. TUDOR: There is further difficulty. I would like to know when did the students receive theirs, if either before or immediately after.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I cannot say when they did receive theirs. All I can say is that the authorities of the U.C.W.J. were informed. I do not know what would have transpired after that.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, what I really want to get from the Hon. Minister is whether the Accountant-General has authorised the payment of these increases, and if so, when has he done so?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I shall promise the hon. member to get that information for him. I did not think it was necessary for me to go into all of that; therefore, I have not got that information.

Mr. TUDOR: It is necessary for me to tell the Hon. Minister that some students have not got theirs. I wonder whether he is aware of that. Certainly that was so at the time of my putting the questions to the Ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister said that he would carry out further investigations. Will you do that?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I am quite willing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 38.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

"Will the Minister state whether it is Government's policy that textbooks used by children in Primary and Secondary Modern schools must be provided by their parents?

2. Will he state what these textbooks are, and their respective prices per copy?

3. Will he further state whether this policy, is to be a permanent feature of Government's Primary and Secondary Modern schools' policy?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first part of the question, I would like to say that it is not Government's policy that textbooks used by children in the Primary and Secondary Modern schools must be provided by their parents.

The answer to the second part of the question is that some parents give their children additional exercise books

and may also supply them with certain textbooks. That practice is not discouraged.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the Hon. Minister is replying very unsatisfactorily. As I understand it, the policy of Government to all parents buying textbooks is one which is not discouraged but at the same time Government does not make them buy. Will the Hon. Minister state now, categorically, why does Government allow parents to buy textbooks if it is not the Government's policy that they should buy them?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is so clear that I am wondering whether the hon. senior member for St. Lucy really wants an answer. The hon. member knows well enough that when a pupil has his own textbooks which he can take away to his home he can put in a lot of work by himself; but if he is using books provided for him, he cannot hope to take them away. That is the reason why I would not advocate that any parent or guardian who is able to provide these things for his or her charge should desist from so doing.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, again, the answer by the Hon. Minister is unsatisfactory. Is it Government's policy that children attending elementary and secondary modern schools should buy books? The Hon. Minister said that it is not so. I should like the Minister to answer this. What is to be done with those children whose parents cannot buy textbooks for their children?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: The reply to that is that it is Government's duty to provide books for children.
2.45 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to ask a supplementary question to that. I do not like the literal by-play which is going on between the two hon. members; I would like to ask a direct question. Would the Hon. Minister tell the House whether it is the policy of the Government to buy books for children who are attending the Elementary and Secondary Schools, and if so, whether it is the policy of the Government to allow children to take home these books? I would like to ask if it is not yet considered that these children will be at a disadvantage in preparing their home work as compared with those who can afford to buy their books.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: In answering that question, Mr. Speaker, I would say this; it is the Government's policy to provide a sufficient number of text books at the individual schools for the use of pupils. That is the Government's policy; it is the Government's policy to supply textbooks and equipment as far as possible in adequate quantities for the use of the children. You will agree with me that that does not mean that because the Government buys the textbooks in the schools the children can take them away *ad lib*. If the parent or guardian is in a position to augment the supply by giving his children their own books, why should the Government not advocate that? That is to the children's advantage.

Mr. BARROW: I think that the Hon. Minister has answered the first part of my question. He says that it is the Government's policy to provide a sufficient number of textbooks in these schools. I am quite satisfied with that, but my second question is whether the children are allowed to take home books in order to do their home work. If they are not allowed to do so, does the Minister not consider that the children whose parents can afford to provide them with books and who are thereby better off, would have an unfair advantage over those who are not so well off?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: That is very obvious. A child who has his own things has an advantage over those children who have not got theirs. As far as allowing children to take home books is concerned, I am prepared to say that no such directive has been issued to schools whereby teachers can allow children to take home school books. That is something which we will have to consider; that is not the practice just now.

Mr. BARROW: I hope the hon. member realises the implications in what he is saying in respect of the question of unfair advantage. Is he aware that members of the public including the school - children are allowed to take home books provided by the Government to read? If that is the case, why can't school children be allowed to take home textbooks?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: As I have already said, I do not know of any directive issued to the effect which admits of that sort of thing being done. I do not say that it should not be done or that I am opposed to having it done.

Mr. BARROW: Will the Minister give the House an assurance that he will see to it that such a directive will be given to the effect that school children will be allowed to take home textbooks so as to prepare their homework?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: That is a different question altogether.

Mr. BARROW: Is the Hon. Minister refusing to answer my question? I know it is a different question; otherwise Your Honour would have ruled me out of order for repetition.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before my colleague intervened in this matter I intended to raise another supplementary question. I am wondering whether the Minister will take steps to discourage the purchase of books by parents and to supplement from the Education Department the provision of books which he now says is inadequate and which will be augmented.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I cannot give the hon. member any undertaking that I would try to discourage parents from getting their own equipment for their children, but I would certainly like to inform him that I am doing the utmost in my power to increase the number of textbooks for use by the children.

ERECTION OF NEW POST OFFICE IN ST. LUCY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question ready to be dealt with now is Question No. 30, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to put the question again now that I observe that the Hon. Minister is in his place, the question is as follows:-

To enquire of the Minister of Works:-

Will the Government take all necessary steps this year to implement its promise to erect a new and centrally situated Post Office in the parish of St. Lucy?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

"Provision for the erection of a new District Post Office in St. Lucy on the present site, which is owned by the Government, will be made in the Development Plan 1960-65."

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any supplementary question to that?

Mr. BRANCKER: If I understood the hon. member correctly, he has said that provision will be made for the erection of a new Post Office in St. Lucy on the present site. Did he say that?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Yes, Sir.

Mr. BRANCKER: Well, is the hon. member aware that the present site, in spite of the ownership of the land, is not regarded as being central for the people of the parish of St. Lucy? It is certainly not central as compared with Nestfield or some such other locality as that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. BRANCKER: Is the Hon. Minister aware that the question of locality and centrality is a matter of geography? It is not a matter of personal opinion or predilection which has nothing to do with the ownership of property.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has phrased that question rather academically, I think.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hint that it is over the head of the Minister who is addressed.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: It is a question of geography. I am sure that the hon. member is quite aware of the geography of the parish of St. Lucy as well as of the geography of the island of Barbados. It is a matter of opinion as to what you would regard as central. Lawyers differ on interpretation; what the hon. member may term as geography somebody else may not term it as that.
2.55 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, is the Hon. Minister aware that that which is central is in the middle? Has his attention ever been drawn to a circle?

Mr. SPEAKER: I should not request the Hon. Minister to answer that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Perhaps Your Honour feels that that is Geometry rather than Geography.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that if we go on like this, we would get out of the range of the Post Office.

ELECTRICITY IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 34 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. BARROW: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

Whether he is aware that there is no Electricity supply installed on the premises of St. Margaret's School in the parish of Saint John?

2. In view of the extra-curricular activities which are carried on in the said school and which are beneficial to the inhabitants of the district, will the Minister take the necessary steps to make Electric Light and Power available in the said school and in all similar public Elementary Schools in the parish of Saint John?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is fully aware of the fact that there is not existent in this particular school electric light.

In reply to the second question, I would like to say that at the time when these Replies were drafted, the answer would have been that consideration is being given to the establishment of an Evening Institute Centre at St. Margaret's School and the supply of electricity to the area will be investigated. I know that my colleague will be happy to learn that the Evening Institute classes have been started and we are investigating the supply of electricity.

In connection with the installation of electricity at other schools in the parish of St. John, I am to say that the only schools which are without this facility are the Hotherstal Primary and the Welches Village Primary Schools, mainly because of the fact that these schools are not used for evening activities.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to thank the Hon. Minister for departing from the usual practice of not giving adequate replies, not by himself, but by other of his colleagues, but I would like to ask the Minister whether he does not consider that some extra curricular activities should be started at Hotherstal and Welches Village Schools in view of the isolated nature of the two districts.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the hon. member and I would like to assure him that

that matter is being thoroughly investigated with a view to starting activities there. In point of fact, certain extensions are being made to the Hothersal Primary School, and he well knows that it is his constituency and mine and that we would be prepared to do all we can.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the end of Question Time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I see that the hon. junior member for St Lucy is not in his seat and with the House's permission, I would like to ask that Order No. 2 standing in my name under Private Members' Business be taken as Order No. 1.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to take Order No. 2 under Private Members' Business as the first Order under Private Members' Business, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

BILL TO INCORPORATE THE UNITED HOLY CHURCH OF AMERICA (BARBADOS DISTRICT)

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, the Report of the Select Committee has been laid. There are only two or three minor amendments mainly typographical, and I beg to move that the Report be adopted with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House aware of these amendments?

Mr. BRYAN: They have been printed and circulated.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I beg to second that.

The question that the Report be adopted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, the amendments are as follows:-

- (a) In Clause 2, insert the word "to" after the word "given" appearing in the eighteenth line thereof;
- (b) in Clause 3 delete the word "names" where it first appears in line 4 thereof and substitute therefor the word "name";
- (c) in Clause 3 insert the word "further" after the word "any" in the last line of the said Clause.

I beg to move that the Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill do now pass.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION re LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy: To move the passing of a Resolution re lack of confidence in the Ministry of Communications.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, the next matter on the Order Paper is a motion standing in my name to move the passing of the following Resolution:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House has no confidence in the policy of the Ministry of Communications as to its administration of -

- (a) Public Passenger Transport, including its present attitude towards motor vans known as 'pick-ups';

- (b) Seawell Airport; and
- (c) Generally."

3.05 p.m.

This is, Mr. Speaker, what is known in British parliamentary practice and procedure as a "no confidence" motion and the purpose of such a motion is to indicate in the strongest, clearest and most unmistakable terms what the meaning of the mover and his supporters is towards the policy of the Minister and of the Ministry to which the motion relates.

It is well known, Mr. Speaker, certainly in the House of Commons where these motions have been moved from time to time, session after session from time immemorial, that if the motion is successful and a majority votes in its favour, that there is no alternative according to the convention of the British Constitution and the convention of the Mother of Parliaments but that either the Government resign if the matter is one affecting the Government entirely, or that the Minister resign if it is a matter peculiarly affecting the Minister and the particular Ministry, and, as a matter of fact, I know that at the last Parliament of the House of Commons before the present general elections, when such an incident arose, the Minister voluntarily tendered his resignation to the Prime Minister who accepted it and the vacancy created by the resignation of the Minister was filled by another member of the majority party in that same Government.

I know because of the novelty of such a motion in the Parliament of this country that there are certain persons uninformed as to the precedent of such a motion and as to the frequency with which such a motion occurs in the Parliament from which we derive almost all our usage, practice and procedure. There is not a session which passes in the House of Commons without their having a motion of "no confidence". In the session immediately after the War when the Labour Party was returned with a majority of comparative insignificance, you will remember how often did the then Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition, Sir Winston Churchill, initiate a motion of censure or "no confidence" against the Government of that day. It is the most highly recognised method of parliamentary procedure whereby the Opposition may show their violent, complete and unconditional and uncompromising opposition to the policy of the Government or to the policy of a particular Minister.

Although there are persons in this island, Mr. Speaker, who are somewhat squeamish as to the result which the motion should have, if it succeeds and if the Minister were really to resign, what would he do, how would he get on with a decreased or diminished emolument, let me say that that sort of thing does not apply at all. That is not considered in the Parliament in England and it should not arise here. It is just a question of whether a man may be lucky to be drawn or selected as a Minister. It is unfortunate if such a man is one who does not satisfy the public eye or fulfil the demands of the Ministry as to give the public the service which it is entitled to expect and to benefit from and which should certainly accrue from the proper running of the particular Ministry to which one has been attached. The personal element does not matter, just as it does not matter in my case who the individual happens to be. It is a question purely of policy.

This is a motion on behalf of the Official Opposition deprecating and condemning the policy of this particular Ministry in respect of transport to the extent of making the most serious attack that is possible under the rules of Parliament to make on the policy which is associated with it and in respect of which the Minister is personally responsible. Personally, it does not matter who the Minister is. That is immaterial. Personal forms do not count; it is not a matter which should be considered; the only thing which is for us in this Chamber to determine is whether the present policy of the Ministry of Communications is such as finds favour with the majority of this House.

Of course, it may well be said, and one may be reminded, that it is a question of party politics and every

member is expected to support his Party, and that applies to the most diffident backbenchers; therefore, when it comes for a member to vote on a motion of "no confidence" it is expected that he must abide by the Party whip. But that is immaterial. "No confidence" motions are proper motions to bring in order to indicate the extreme dissatisfaction in respect of the policy pursued by the Ministry which is the subject of the vote of "no confidence". So importantly are these motions as you will know, Mr. Speaker, regarded in the House of Commons that it is felt that at the very earliest possible time the opportunity must be provided by the Government to have such a motion debated even though the motion is hitting against the Government as a whole or part of the Government.

If I may quote a short passage from the 14th Edition of Sir Erskine May on the law, usage and privileges of Parliament in respect of a motion for a vote of censure - it can be found on page two, paragraph four, and it reads as follows:-

"By established convention the Government never fails to accede to a demand from the Leader of the Opposition to allot a day for the discussion of a motion expressing lack of confidence in the Government - a 'vote of censure' as it is called. In allotting a day for this purpose the Government are entitled to have regard to the exigencies of their own business, but a reasonably early day is invariably found. Few Sessions fail to provide examples of such motions.

"This convention is due to the recognised and responsible position of the leader of the Opposition as a potential alternative Government - a position which guarantees the seriousness of such an interruption of the normal course of business. For their part, the Government have everything to gain by meeting such a direct challenge to their authority at the earliest possible moment."

Mr. Speaker, I think that is enough said to indicate how important such a motion as this is regarded in the Mother of Parliaments to whom we look for precedence and whose guidance we follow to the extent that whenever the opportunity avails itself we make provision for members of this Chamber to go on a visit and to observe the workings of that Parliament.
3.15 p.m.

That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, because the Official Opposition is profoundly disturbed by the policy of the Ministry of Communications particularly with regard to transport; that is the reason why we have chosen this method of bringing this matter for discussion in this Chamber today.

Now, Sir, in dealing with paragraph (a) of the Resolution which is the most important part of the motion - "Public Passenger Transport, including its present attitude towards motor vans, known as 'pick-ups'". I think it is meet that I should first deal with the question of 'pick-ups', not because I regard that as the most important question, but because I regard that issue as even more urgent than any other aspect of this matter of public passenger transport. I regard it as even more urgent than the rest, although the rest is more important, because of certain documents which have been issued from the office of the Department of Highways and Transport bearing what purports to be the signature of the Director himself to the "Pick-up" owners dated 5th May, this year in connection with the continuance on the roads of these vans which in general parlance are known as 'pick-ups'.

Mr. Speaker, issuing on that date from this Department were a number of circulars and these circulars read as follows: I have a facsimile of one bearing the name of the person to whom it was addressed, and it may be that it will be desired to have it become a document of the House as I will be quoting from it. There is a block cut out from the paper, but yet it is an exact copy of that which was received by several 'pick-up' owners, and which came to me after these circulars were sent out. This one reads as follows:-

Department of Highways & Transport,
Pine,
St. Michael.
5th May or 8th May, 1960.

Dear Sir,

I have been directed to inform you that after the 31st July, 1960, your permit for carrying passengers in van No-- will not be renewed in view of the fact that the conditions set out in the permit have not been observed.

Yours faithfully,

Department of Highways and Transport.
And at the bottom of the letter are the initials "GA/AP".

Now, Sir, when these documents were brought to me by certain "pick-up" owners, I said that the correct procedure is for you to reply by registered post to this circular letter and state that in view of the fact that the conditions set out in the permit have not been observed as stated in the circular, would you please, Mr. Director, state what are the conditions set out in the permit which I have not observed. You are charging individual "pick-up" owners separately with not having observed the conditions in the permit, so what the 'pick-up' owner does is to write and send it by registered letter so that it will be difficult to deny the receipt thereof; else the Minister for the Post Office would be in a very difficult position if registered letters were not delivered, having been posted in Barbados to be delivered in Barbados. I said that the right procedure would be for the "pick-up" owner to reply to the letter and enquire what are the particular conditions in the permit which the Director claims have not been observed.

I have not yet been shown a single letter in reply to the "pick-up" owners setting out the condition or conditions in the permit which have not been observed; therefore, Mr. Speaker, it would look as if that phrase was just put in there through the lack of something better to say or as a result of the absence of ingenuity or resource on the part of the person responsible for the issuing of these circulars, that he has not been able to reply to say that the conditions which you have not complied with are as follows- (a), (b), (c), (d) or that you have broken the law and you have so many convictions. If it happens that one "pick-up" owner has "X" convictions and several other "pick-up" owners have no convictions, it could not be fair to have all of them lumped together with one who may have convictions, and all of them be told that "after the 31st July this year your permit for carrying passengers in your van will not be renewed." Every case should be treated on its own merits, and in every instance in which, after that circular went out to the "pick-up" owners, no fault could be found or no record could be discovered against any particular "pick-up" owner, this letter should have been cancelled and the "pick-up" owner notified that he might carry on and have his permit renewed as from the 31st July, 1960.

Mr. Speaker, there was recently a bye-election in the parish of St. Peter for a seat of a Councillor. During that campaign "pick-up" owners came to me and told me - because Your Honour will realise that this is a parish in which you and your colleague would know how important "pick-ups" are regarded, as well as in the parish of St. Lucy.
3.25 p.m.

During that campaign pickup owners told me that some officials of the Department of Highways and Transport did not put it in writing but let them know - during the campaign when votes were important, vital and urgent and after the votes were cast it would not matter to some people how they were acquired or what caused them to be cast in the manner in which they were - that they were taking the circulars too seriously as they were only sent out as a matter of form. These owners were asked what they were worrying about, that they could go ahead and that they would not hear any more about them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the campaign is over and since then there has been no document counteracting this written circular of 5.5. 60. There has been no intimation that after 31st July of this year the pick-ups will not be prohibited from continuing on the roads of this island in filling a want

which up to now not only is not being supplied otherwise, but there is apparently no prospect of it being supplied by any other source.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are different aspects of this question of pickups which we have to consider, and not the least, Mr. Speaker, is the aspect of throwing out of work and depriving of a means of earning a livelihood a section of the community which came to the rescue of the public at a time when they could not have been more needed or more necessary. It is true that they were doing it as a means of earning a living; it is true that they sought to make a profit out of it. Well, that is inseparable from the pursuit of private enterprise. Everybody who runs a business of his own tries to keep his head above water and tries to achieve a certain reasonable amount of profit. Some people, I readily admit, try to achieve an excessive amount of profit out of their businesses; but, Sir, there is a feeling that the reason for the banning of these pickups is not so much because conditions have not been complied with, particularly as the Department does not seem able to supply further and better vehicular transportation - they were not to the best of my information supplied with information on the conditions set out in the permit which these individuals have not observed - but we understand and we will be interested to hear from the Hon. Minister when he replies to this aspect of my remarks whether the real, the fundamental reason why it is proposed to run these pickups out of business, to sign the death warrant of these pickups as from 31st of the instant month is because it is expected thereby that the persons who now travel by pickups will travel on Government buses, and as a result Government buses may begin to show reduced losses - I would not say, to show a profit. But you would bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Government buses on peak hours and outside of peak hours are run full; despite the fact that new ones have arrived, pick-ups are running full, and your car and my car and everybody's car and some donkey carts and mule carts are helping to collect these people who are standing at the omnibus stopping poles for transportation to and from the City; so even with the pickups which are on the road together with the augmented bus service there is not enough available transportation to take all the people who are in need of same, and who are standing by on the roads sometimes. It is my experience, if I am coming to the City about 8.30 a.m. to 8.45 a.m. to meet some people on the road at stop poles and I stop and offer them a lift, and time and again I have been told they are most grateful as they had been waiting there for about an hour. I have been told that by secondary school teachers, by elementary school teachers, by working people and by people who work in offices. People in Government offices do not have to mind very much because they have a first-class excuse that they are waiting on the Government bus, but other people who are employed privately do not have an excuse for the private employer which is so acceptable and so palatable, and they are quite justly worried about what may happen to their jobs sooner or later if they continue arriving late for work through no fault of their own.

Mr. Speaker, although I propose later to analyse very fully a statement made in this House on 16th June by the Hon. Minister of Communications, I will just refer now to a particular passage, paragraph 5 in that which is headed "Statement of Government's policy on the Future of the Transport Service of the Island", and that penultimate paragraph reads as follows: -

"Other passenger-carrying vehicles will not be allowed to compete with licensed bus services on routes that are adequately serviced."

Other passenger-carrying vehicles obviously refer to passenger-carrying vehicles other than motor vehicles, and it would be interesting to hear the Hon. Minister and I am looking forward to have him present us with a list when he replies in this debate, of the routes which in his opinion and to his knowledge are today adequately serviced. I make bold to say that there is not today one adequately serviced bus route in this island, certainly not on any of the routes served by the Transport Board. I cannot conceive of any route being less adequately serviced than Route 1, that is the one on the Leeward Coast, but certainly there is not

any route which is serviced by the Transport Board which people on that route - truthful, knowledgeable people - will tell you is adequately serviced.

3.35 p.m.

If that sentence is correct and sound - and I have no hesitation in submitting that it is correct and sound, that there is no adequately serviced route - then there is no justification for stopping or for refusing to allow other passenger carrying vehicles to compete with the licensed bus service. You know, Mr. Speaker, that is really no doubt the true explanation to the attitude of the Government in this matter. They either believe or do not believe it. They set it out in the Minister's statement of Government's policy that certain routes are adequately serviced and other passenger carrying vehicles will not be allowed to compete with the licensed bus services on those routes. You will bear this out, Mr. Speaker, that this statement no doubt advisedly headed "Statement of Government's Policy on the future of the Transport Service of this Island" is a statement of the policy of the Ministry of Communications. But it goes further than that. They say it is a statement of the Government's policy on the future of the transport service of this island.

If I may just remind this Chamber of the debate which took place in here in 1955 when the present Leader of the House was the Minister of Communications, he piloted certain legislation which is now on the Statute Book. You must really commend him for doing so and for his foresight in that session for being responsible for this legislation being placed on the Statute Book, and not now finding himself in the unenviable position which the present Minister of Communications is in in having to justify the working of that legislation. The theory is there and it is the creation of the now Hon. Minister of Trade that in 1955 in the teeth of strenuous opposition from this side of the House the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1955, were placed on the Statute Book of this island. Mr. Speaker, you will recall the terrific struggle we had in this Chamber in respect of the passing of those Regulations. You will remember how my colleague from St. Lucy, and a former member of this House who certainly did not lose his seat as a result of this but due to other circumstances, strongly opposed and how late at night we fought in our attempt to dissuade the Minister from going on with the motion which was then before the House that these Regulations do now pass and they were regulations by which these passenger-carrying vans were to be controlled. You may recall that there is in those Regulations, 52 A, a paragraph which says that no person shall use or keep for use a motor vehicle having seating accommodation for any number of persons unless he first obtains a permit from the Director in such form as the Director may decide. Then it goes on to say that a permit may be granted by the Director for such period and on such terms and conditions as he may see fit and may be revoked at any time.

A permit shall be carried on the motor vehicle in respect of which it is issued and shall be produced to any member of the Police Force on request or to any person authorised by the Director.

Any person using or keeping for use any motor vehicle in respect of which a permit has been issued by the Director under this regulation who fails to comply with any of the terms or conditions of the permit shall be guilty of an offence.

For the purpose of paragraph (1) of this regulation "seating accommodation" means any contrivance (whether or not attached to the vehicle or any part of the vehicle and whether provided by the owner or any other person) capable of being used for seating one or more persons, but shall not include accommodation for the driver of the vehicle or any person sitting beside the driver."

So, Mr. Speaker, it is clear from 52A which can be found on page 169 that the Director of Highways and Transport issues the permit under these regulations and he may grant it for such a period and on such terms and conditions as he may see fit and he can revoke it at any time. It is clear that if there is any breach of the terms and conditions

under which it is granted he has the power of revocation at any time; he does not have to wait until 31st July; therefore, if he had seen any improved condition on any route which was serviced with the licensed bus service, he would be in power to call in any pick-up owner who was doing a service on that route and notify him that he is going to revoke his permit. But the mere fact that these people whom I have in mind have not been called in and the Director has not made any attempt to revoke the permits granted to those people — that to my mind is a clear indication that the terms and conditions under which the permit was granted have not been violated and the Director would not feel justified in calling in a van owner and telling him that he has revoked his permit for the non-fulfilment and non-compliance of the terms and conditions when he would not have been able to establish such a charge.

It is because of the feeling that the losses of the Transport Board have been so monstrous, so unprecedented, so costly and have so surpassed the wildest anticipation of any member of this community, and certainly that of every taxpayer, that the Ministry via the Transport Board or the Department of Highways and Transport, both of which are under that Ministry, has decided and tried, by however damnable a way it may be, to reduce if possible some of these losses, even if it be at the expense of the comfort and convenience of the most humble section of the public, the people who use the pick-ups more often than anybody else, and at the expense of the economy of those people who invested all their savings, who mortgaged their properties, in order to become owners of pick-ups just in the hope, I submit just a hope, of working for a living. And now the Ministry is throwing these people out of business and their vehicles off the roads so that the Transport Board would be able to show an appreciable reduction in its annual losses!

3.45 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as taxpayers, I am sure that we would all like to see that Board reduce its losses. We are looking forward to the day when it can produce its Annual Report which shows that it has just been able to keep its head above water; it does not matter whether a Government Department makes a profit since the purpose of a Government Department is to supply the needs of the people, but it should be so run, if it can be so run; and this Board can be so run if the Ministry were capable of seeing it being properly run, without any losses or at least no spectacular or considerable losses would be shown on the balance sheet of this Board year after year as it continues to function. If I might just conclude my observation on this particular aspect, not the most important aspect of the whole public passenger transport business, but an aspect which is urgent, and that is why I am dealing with it first because if what is stated in all these circulars is upheld, after the 31st July of this year there would not be any renewal of permits and there would be no "pick-ups" on the road. There will be, as a result, more people waiting for buses, waiting for "lifts" or walking back to their homes. Here is the source of the authority and power of the Director of Highways and Transport in respect of these vans; this is the legislation which was passed by this House or ratified by this Chamber in 1955 when the entire majority of the Government supported the placing of these Regulations on the Statute Book sanctioning the passing of this Resolution.

As to that part of the matter, what the Opposition says to the Ministry of Communications or to the Department of Highways and Transport in relation to these "pick-ups" is that you have issued this circular, and you are required to withdraw it — it might only be a trial balloon — and you should recognise or realise how unwise and impracticable it would be to prevent these "pick-ups" from carrying on after the 31st of this month. After these vehicles have passed their normal inspection, they should be allowed to continue being on the roads until it can be clearly demonstrated that all of the routes are adequately serviced. It is one thing, Mr. Speaker, to put on paper or to imply that the routes are adequately serviced, but it is quite another thing to persuade anybody who travels on the streets of this island that such routes are properly serviced, and that people are not being kept, at the busy time when they have to get to work, waiting minute after minute and sometimes for a whole hour for a bus which, when it comes, is

absolutely filled, being kept waiting for the favour of a "lift" which may not at that particular morning eventuate.

Mr. Speaker, we are urging that the Government issue instructions through the Ministry immediately to the Department of Highways and Transport to withdraw this directive and renew these permits for at least one more year. It will not take less than one year, at the present rate of progress with this transport problem, for the routes to be adequately serviced. It is all very well for people who have their private motor transport not to worry about matters of this kind, but those of us who have a responsibility to a considerable section of the public have to be concerned, even if we were not otherwise charitably disposed, as to the fate of these people whose businesses are at stake, whose jobs may be at stake because of their inability to get to work at a proper time.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I am afraid I have missed one point in the hon. member's remarks. Did he implore us to renew the permits for just one year?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I said until at least one year. During that time the position can be reconsidered as to if the routes are then adequately serviced, if they are then adequately serviced; but Mr. Speaker, as I said, I do not envisage that, with the present rate of progress with the Transport Board, within a year from now there will be any route which is adequately serviced. I do not mean in the opinion of the members of the Board, none of whom have ever perhaps travelled in a bus, in the opinion of the Minister or other persons whom one sees travelling in Vauxhalls or luxurious American cars. I am not concerned with that sort of people; I am concerned with the people whose only means of transport is either the omnibus or the "pick-up". There is another aspect of these "pick-ups". (Asides) Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister seems to be anxious to speak, but when I am finished with him he will not be anxious to speak. He will be as far away from the House as he was when we re-assembled this afternoon. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that we could not ever find the Minister this afternoon and he might have been getting courage from some source; but what he really needed was wisdom. It is not only a question of passenger transport; it is a question of the luggage which persons have to transport and which they cannot risk allowing to be transported without being accompanied by the persons themselves.

3.55 p.m.

Would the Transport Board for instance, be willing to allow people to travel on omnibuses with the luggage which they have now to carry with them on the pickups? I presume not; that would occupy some of the passenger space of the omnibuses on the road.

The pickup today fills a gap in the transportation life of this community which it would be very difficult to replace and which at the moment one cannot conceive any means of replacing if the pickups were forced off the road. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, how much care and how much expense are being expended by the owners of these pickups to make them look presentable, to keep them in good condition and to make them not only useful but so far as possible ornamental on the roads of this island.

There is another aspect of the matter, Sir, apart from the servicing of bus routes by omnibuses and the exclusion of pickups from routes which can be established to be adequately serviced provided, Mr. Speaker, that adequate bus service would also ensure accommodation whether on the roof of the bus or underneath the bus for the luggage which now can be transported on the pickups or the luggage vans of the people, however they may be described. There is also this other aspect of it: only recently I attended a funeral in a Windward parish and I saw two pickups with mourners arriving at the Cemetery. That is a function which the pickups perform which one cannot envisage a large passenger-carrying bus licensed to carry 50 or 60 or whatever the number is — I do not profess to know the number — perform. At dances, Mr. Speaker, you find a pickup supplies a want. People are taken at hours when the bus service is over or before the bus service is restarted to and from dances. They are absolutely necessary and indispensable

in the life of this community today to private transport for the people for whom the bus service is inadequate, and inadequate may apply to the numbers the buses carry and it may also apply to the times of the service which they run.

A service may be inadequate in respect of the demand for service if it stops at 11 O'clock, because people may want to go to a mid-night dance or leave a dance at 3 a.m. or 4 a.m. A bus service is inadequate if it cannot cope with such contingencies, and it must be in this community when it is well known that it is the alternative to the privately owned car or the taxi. It is idle to suggest that the average patron - I do not in that include the political patron of the Silver Beach Casino or places of that kind - can afford to hire a taxi to go to a dance and to leave at 3 a.m. or 4 a.m. These persons have to rely on bicycles and in some cases the better of them will hire a car or put some gas in a friend's car, but the majority has to depend on transportation by pickup, and they are the people who will be most unfairly, severely and hardly hit if pickups are put off the road. It is the largest section of the community which has for so long learnt to depend and rely on that particular form of transportation; it will be unfair, unjust and immoral to put these pickups off the road, and there is no justification for it, even along the lines on which the Transport Board and the Ministry apparently would attempt to justify it by implying that omnibus routes are adequately serviced. As I said earlier, there is not one such omnibus route today in this island which can come within the category of being adequately serviced; that is why I say we rule out that entirely; and in respect of this cancellation of permits or refusal to renew permits after 31st July, the thing to do now and immediately is to cancel those letters and revoke that prohibition, let the people come in and after their vehicles have been examined and passed as being road-worthy, let them renew for at least a year as from now until 31st July, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, in the case even of school children, I know some of them have to depend on travelling to and from school by pickup. For those children who have to travel from Highway 1 to Lancaster in St. James, their only means of travelling up Trents Hill, unless they are fortunate enough to get a lift, is by a pickup. There is no bus there and there are no means of getting home at the end of a day tired from work and play other than by pickup. Now and again travelling on that Trents Road, I have seen some of the children who are fortunate enough to get a lift in an animal-drawn cart, but I have regularly seen children going from Highway 1, the Holetown main road, up towards Orange Hill on a pickup bearing the letter "S" and a number; so you will see, Mr. Speaker, that a clear case can be made out for the cancellation of these prohibitions or these circulars of prohibition in the interest of school children, in the interest of people who are going to work and coming from work and of people who are paying their last tributes to the dead, of people who are seeking pleasure, as there must be relaxation and pleasure at times especially to relieve the drabness of the lives of certainly the least fortunate members of the community, and they are as entitled as anybody else even though they do not own their own cars and even though they cannot afford to hire taxis.

There is not one section of the community which is not affected by the threat to take pickups off the road. Do you realise the inconvenience now which people suffer who are going to Church outings?

4.05 p.m.

I do not mean the big Church outings; but when the Church members, let me say the members of a particular Church of St. Lucy, have to go to attend a Harvest Festival at some other Church in, say, the parish of St. Philip, they can use a certain number of pick-ups. In the past, they used to use a lorry with a platform especially built up for that purpose. A lorry now is unable to perform that service because of the stringent provisions of that Regulation - 52A - which this Chamber sanctioned in the year 1955 and which Regulation I have just read out. The pick-ups have to go to the rescue of these people now and what one lorry did in the past, two or three pick-ups are doing now.

Sir, I think it should be clear that at this present stage in this island there can hardly be a greater wrong to be perpetrated on the poorest classes of this community than to deprive them of the services of the pick-up to which they have become accustomed and without which they would not be able, at least in the foreseeable future, to attend their funerals, dances, or to go to school, to go to work and come back from all these things. The only instance which I can recall that the pick-ups are not resorted to for use is for conveying people to a wedding. Certainly, it is a common thing at funerals and I do not think that anyone who is cognisant of the needs of the poor people of this community and of their travelling ease can seriously condone this circular of the Department of Highways and Transport. No one can do so even under the specious reason that there are adequately serviced routes and that the quicker you get the pick-ups off the routes, the quicker the Transport Board will show a reduced loss.

I think I have dealt sufficiently with that aspect of the pick-ups. That particular aspect I have dealt with first because it is of such urgency. I have also referred to the losses of the Transport Board and I saw a little earlier just glancing through some of our Barbados Estimates something in respect to the amount of losses of the Transport Board. Under Head XXXVI, Transport Services, you will recall that this year we were asked to vote, and we did vote, \$180,000 to provide for a deficiency in the operation of the Transport Service. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that last year we were asked to vote for a total of \$50,000 for a similar deficiency and that this year there is expected to be an increase of that amount by \$130,000.

It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that in the year 1958-59, the Legislature voted for this service \$259,662 and it will be recalled that the year before, 1957-58, Parliament provided a supply to the extent for this service of \$451,976. It will be interesting to have all these figures added up so as to get the sum total. The year before they were granted supply during the passage of the Colonial Estimates of 1956-57, a sum to the extent of \$121,550; so it will be clear, Mr. Speaker, that a lot will have to be done besides putting these pick-ups off the routes in order to reduce that deficit to any substantial extent.

Sir, that is not the solution. In order that the Transport Board should reduce its losses, the signing of the death warrant to pick-ups is no panacea to this ill. It is something more fundamental with the running of the Transport Board, with the administration of the Transport Board, with the over-riding guidance of the Ministry of Communications and Housing. That, Mr. Speaker, is the source of our trouble; that is the fountain of all this evil. It starts with the Ministry of Communications and the Minister constitutes the *fons et origo* of the transport problem of this island. That is why we feel that we will be doing less than justice to this particular matter if we brought it before Parliament in any way other than by this way of a vote of censure to indicate the strength, the depth and the profound sincerity of our feelings that this Ministry is being mis-handled and being run inefficiently and being incompetent, and that there is no hope, so long as it is run as it is being run now, of any improvement in the vexed question of public passenger transport in this island.

Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that when bus fares were increased, the increases were substantial. I do not think any Government would have been so hard-headed as to attempt to increase them above the figures which the private concessionaires asked that they be increased to. It is known that the increases which the concessionaires asked were high enough and it must be borne in mind that the concessionaires then were shrewd businessmen. They knew what they were doing. They made a lot of money out of it during the War. They did so with their superior knowledge, superior to what any imported Manager can have of what conditions are in Barbados. Do you think that Mr. Bowen can tell us how to run a bus service as well as what some of those hard-headed Barbadian bus owners - people like Mr. Alleyne, Mr. Birch, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Dowding, Mrs. Weatherhead, Mr. Trotman and people like that - can tell us?

4.15 p.m.

No Mr. Bowen could come to Barbados and show you how to run the bus service as well as these people would know from their experience of running this service; and under no pretext or condition should the Government make or sanction any increase of bus fares which would exceed the amount which the private concessionaires said they would do with when the Government said that these private concessionaires were not justified in asking for the increases for which they had asked. The whole thing seems to me to be very logical; they put their heads together, these wary hard-headed, shrewd, astute Barbadian men and women whose lives have been spent in the bus business and consecrated to passenger transport, and they said that they could run the bus service with new buses and charge so much; the Government said: "We will get in new buses, but we are charging so much more. The bus owners presumably made a profit." What has become of the money paid by travellers in the buses of the Transport Board? Who gets it? The taxpayers are not getting it back. One or two people seem to be getting rich overnight - I mean persons who are not unconnected with that Board.

With the present state of affairs, with the Government being able to purchase at a cheaper rate than any private individual could purchase, and the Government buying in larger numbers than any private individual, they should be able to run their business better than any private concessionaire could do it. You can see the condition as to the efficiency with the private buses as compared with the buses operated by the Transport Board. One just has to drive through the streets and compare the buses of the Federal Bus Company or of the Progressive Bus Company with the condition of the buses run by the Transport Board. I anticipate it will be said that the private concessionaires, for whom I have no brief, are underpaying their employees and they can make a profit because they are exacting long working periods from them. If that is so, it would be a sad reflection on the activities of the Ministry of Labour of this island and at the same time it would also be a sad reflection on the activities of the Barbados Workers' Union, unless the Transport workers are not unionised. If these workers are not unionised, then they do not deserve to receive any help. You see what is happening in Trinidad with the Texaco employers; they have to go up and up and eventually they will have to meet the employees more than half way. If it is a fact that the private bus owners can only show a profit because they are underpaying their employees and working them for heavy periods, well then it is high time that the Government cause an investigation to be made into the running of these concessions so as to make sure that advantage is not being taken of this most essential and law-abiding class of workers. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if the Government attempts to suggest that the reason why these private concessionaires are able to show a profit - because obviously they are making a profit; otherwise they would not be carrying on the transport service - if the reason is that those private concessionaires are underpaying and overworking their employees, why then does the Government in its Statement of policy as to the future of the transport service of the island say that it is at least considering or might consider what can be offered by alternative operators in the way of service to the community and at what cost to the public?

Mr. Speaker, the only alternative operators would be the private concessionaires and it would be a question of handing back the buses to the private concessionaires. In paragraph 3 of the Statement of the Government's policy on the future of the Transport service of the island, this is what is stated:-

"Whether the Island's services are integrated into one concession and a unified system to be operated by the Transport Board or by a privately-owned concern will depend on the outcome of these steps and the success of these efforts. A recent survey of Omnibus Operations in this Island is now being studied. Any future decision will be made on the basis of what can be offered by alternative operators in the way of services to the community and at what cost to the public."

What does that mean? It means that the Government after toying with this matter of public passenger transport,

sees another future decision which it could make. I wonder how many of us will live to see that future decision. I cannot help feeling that the Minister, who is responsible for transport, realises that he will not be in this Chamber in the near future when the decision is going to be made, and that future decision will be a matter which he might learn or read of in some part other than in this particular circle. Mr. Speaker, if after so many years the Ministry is still telling you that the continuation of the present service, or the circumstances under which there will be the continuation of the service or the extensive knowledge of the service depends on the continuation - well, if the Minister does not make up his mind, will he ever be able to make it up? But the most pertinent question is: Has he got a mind to make up? But if he cannot make up his mind within the foreseeable future of the lifetime of this Parliament or in his lifetime, is it not clear, personalities entirely aside, that it is beyond the scope of this Minister's capacity and the quota of his responsibility exceeds the standard of his capacity?

4.25 p.m.

I think that would very fairly and adequately describe the present issue. The quota of his responsibility exceeds the standard of his capacity, and it is either a question of him asking the Hon. Premier, his close colleague, to relieve him of that particular Ministry and let him perhaps render some assistance in the Ministry of Health where help is greatly needed and very urgently so or to retire to the shades of the backbenchers where I am sure, Mr. Speaker, he will find someone readily forthcoming to take his place on the Ministerial benches.

One can anticipate the shape of things at least in certain backbenchers' minds when one sometimes sees how they shift their seats and how they go closer and closer so that at least their admiring friends in the Gallery can say they saw so and so and at least he appeared to be close to the Minister and perhaps he was advising him how to reply to the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I am practically at the end of this particular paragraph, so in the two minutes left it would not be worthwhile for me to start to embark a new trend of thought. Mr. Speaker, may I just in two minutes intimate to the Minister, you being an old schoolmaster - I do not mean old in years - two questions being asked in the current examinations at "A" level. Children are being asked to examine the circumstances in which a Minister may render his resignation. Of course that is a high level, the level of Sixth Formers, and there is another question which the examinees are being asked in the current examinations, and it is "In the British Constitution indicate briefly three causes, advantages, and disadvantages of Cabinet reshuffle."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is now time for me to desist and to carry on next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member had better continue until the Bell chimes.

Mr. BRANCKER: I just throw out that idea so that between now and next Tuesday the Premier might make a Cabinet shuffle in the event of no resignation forthcoming.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 o'clock p.m., this House will now revert to Government Business.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

THE CUSTOMS TARIFF (CONDITIONS FOR SPECIAL EXEMPTION FROM DUTY) (AMENDMENT)

(No. 2) REGULATIONS, 1960

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, when the sitting was suspended, I made a statement that infuriated the Minister of Labour, and during the Suspension, I got not only his speech which was anti-Trade Union but those of members of the Government who possess anti-Trade Union views. In the interim you heard some of them making the statement that an Act that was passed in 1906, kicked out

by the Conservative Government in 1927 and returned by the Labour Government in 1945 they regard as obnoxious legislation in so far as peaceful picketing is concerned, but within the same Government confines and within the same Ministerial benches they can write in their newspaper telling the workers what they should have as sugar workers after the Union put forward its own views. What we say is that you must have initiative and originality to work on behalf of the workers and do as we have done, that is, see after their interests. When they come down with this outrageous \$5 a week, this Government would support a \$5 a week Wages Council just as they supported the low wage for shop assistants, but we rejected it.

The Hon. Minister said that they are going to employ 40 people; but we want to know at how much per week. We know that the anti-Trade Union speeches which they have been making for political purposes have only buttressed some of the employers into putting their heads against walls, because when they come up against us as in the sugar industry affair, we do not have to ask them any favours, neither do we have to ask Government any favours. What do you have to show for all this? A few shirts at Bay Street, a factory making a few bottles of beer and the Knitting Mills; and when you talk about the Knitting Mills to whom you give pioneer industry, you set up a Wages Council and the Council sets a minimum of \$5 a week for employees. If you are going to encourage industry, by all means do so. I have said here on many occasions and I repeat now that I am not a believer in customs duties as a means of raising revenue, but it is one of the things you have with you, and therefore you cannot easily exchange a customs duty item and replace it by something else. What I do know is that if the Minister is making this statement, one of the reasons he is doing this is because it is going to employ 40 people. We want to have some indication about facts and figures. At what rate are you going to employ these 40 people.

I will tell you more, Mr. Speaker. The Minister must be able to make a bold statement in these things if it is known that any of these people resist the formation of the Union or joining the Union, because what do you find? They say they have nothing against the workers joining the Union, but when you join they want to know who is the ring-leader or who is the person that goes to Mr. Walcott or the Union. One of the Ministers has gone out but I wanted to say something for his benefit. If any Minister thinks that he is going to ring from the Ministerial Buildings and tell some employer how he is going to work, he cannot do that to me. He will have to come down and do it himself because he will have a rude awakening. I have had many clashes with the Minister of Labour on the true relation and his duty as Minister to the Trade Union in the last analysis where there is any question of a dispute. I think I have made myself clear on that and I do not think I have to repeat it.

I do not want to see us becoming a little China, and in Barbados already - I do not know how the Ministers feel - there is a terrific, uneven society in which at one level you can get people drawing \$900 a month and they seem to have no qualm of conscience about them and at another level within the same community you get people working for \$5 a week in a 40-hour week, and people feel that is something God seems to decree; it is some divine dispensation. We must have enough socialist conscience to begin to equate this unevenness and not believe that we can perpetuate a system where somebody can say you were not working before and this is going to provide employment, or that employment at subsistence level is better than no employment at all. I am sure no socialist Government would want that. 4.35 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister goes on with red herrings. Well, I do not like to catch at red herrings. I told him at the time when peaceful picketing was debated. He said it was obnoxious.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to say to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that we have long passed the stage

when we discussed that piece of legislation. Perhaps we may be soon discussing it again, but we should try to avoid bringing into this Resolution anything like that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you are intelligent enough to know that in Parliament you cannot discuss anything intelligently unless you make intelligent analogies.

Mr. SPEAKER: But you need not re-emphasise analogies.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sometimes you have to emphasise and re-emphasise them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Every hon. member of this Chamber has heard and re-heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter on that point. The hon. member certainly has forgotten that he spoke on it before the luncheon interval.

Mr. WALCOTT: I spoke for just about five minutes before lunch.

Mr. SPEAKER: And we heard it then.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, I did not emphasise it sufficiently. I hope it is not uncomfortable to Your Honour if I say that it was dealt with at Trade Union level and you have Trade Union training.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member has not that impression.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not have that impression. It would be the last impression I would ever think should come from you, but what is strange about it is that I never expected to hear it even from that side; and when I heard that, not in ordinary language, but in real language, it seemed to me very belligerent and that is why I say in relation to these things that it is out of these things that you get strikes.

It is when you get these sweat shops that your only remedy is to bring these employers to their knees by using any constitutional method which you have; and if the Legislature does not give the Union the constitutional methods and regard such methods as pugnacious to these people, then, you are only left to use other unconstitutional methods which are available or can be used. That is the reason why I am using that analogy. I repeat, all of these things are only hunting grounds for the rapacious man who is looking for a cheap woman because all that these poor women are working for is low wages and down-to-the-earth wages. It is from these low wages that you get your family planning problem and all your other problems springing. The majority of these people who are penalised are girls - not women - who are looking for help and because they come from a redundant population, we should protect them against those people who open these type of businesses. I am going to defend these poor girls to the hilt. I will not be subscribing to any legislation which means low wages or subsistence wages.

In all these shirt factories, they pay pitiable wages. To my way of thinking, we have to reorganise the people to see this whole thing, and if it means that we must stop socks and stockings from coming in from Hong Kong so as to permit more trade here, let us do it. Lots of these people who make these things cannot even purchase them. I can produce a budget to show that the level of the wages which are earned by these people who work in these places is such that they cannot buy the things which they produce. Go to the Court and you will see how many cases you have of petty larceny. Consider the reason why those people are driven to commit such an offence. One of the reasons is this low wage earning. I am not going to sit here in this House and agree to legislation which will make people feel that they can come here and employ people and pay them what they like.

It should shock any hon. member of this House when the Hon. Minister of Trade read out that the Wages Council investigated the wages of workers in the shirt industry and came out with a recommendation to pay them a minimum wage of \$5 a week. That is scandalous. That is the sort of wages which we are paying in a protective industry - one to which we have given pioneer status. The Trade Union asked the Hon. Minister of Trade and the Minister refused to see that that figure should not be the minimum wage. We said that the minimum wage for a man doing any kind of work should be \$3.00 a day. The Minister's reply was that he did not think that we should do it. In the United States of America there was the minimum wage of \$1 an hour. That has been raised to \$1.25 now. Below that, you cannot have anything.

What I told the Hon. Minister is this and this has nothing to do with the negotiations. There are some communities where you have a minimum wage and Your Honour knows very well how our Trade Union has fought for getting wages above the minimum.

Sir, you can really see that at employment places like shirt factories, knitting mills and places of that nature where you have pioneer status, you should not have a minimum wage for anybody. A man should be paid not less than \$18 a week in such places and that is what we of the Trade Union say. That is the lowest wage which anybody should receive but you get some people saying that they cannot pay that; they are too small. I do not know if members of the Government run these businesses or are interested in some of these businesses, but they too seem at some times to defend these things on the basis that they say or they think that you should not state these things. I want to be very clear on this matter. If you are going to make legislation to protect trade, I am in favour of it; but if you are going to say today that these people who are working in these things, should not get protection from you, let me say to you that I am not asking you to do a job which somebody else should be doing. Barbados is small and has a lot of people looking for work. It is of a size that anyone can exploit the poor working man because it is a community in which lots of people are looking for work. Because of that, the Government must see to it when these people come asking for concessions that they give the Government some indication of what they are about to pay to their employees so that the Minister can say to us that the reason why we are granting this concession to this firm or to these people is because of the fact that not only are they employing some of our people, but we have some indication that they are going to employ people at reasonable wages.

4.45 p.m.

In all of these things in the process of time, the proper organisation will be able to deal with them. I say that because I was very alarmed when I read of this recommendation and the Minister knows the Union's view as to Wages Councils. We have made it clear that we do not agree with them, but in some instances rather than have people without any sort of representation, we agreed to the establishment of Wages Councils. It is for that reason that we have said we will agree to have these Wages Councils. On this occasion, I do hope, and mine is only a hope, that the Minister will be able to assure me that not only are these people employing forty people but also that they are employing these people and he has some assurance that the wages which these forty people are likely to receive will not be regarded as unreasonable wages.

I feel that we have reached the stage - and I would put this point to the Minister - not only as regards this bit of legislation which we are now considering, but I am of the considered opinion that just as the Minister has spoken about employment within this context, the time has come when the Government should set up a Committee to go into all aspects of this question of the employment situation relative to the industries which have pioneer status. It is time that since pioneer status has

been granted, since Customs Tariff exemptions have been given, an investigation should be made into all of these industries to see what is taking place so that the public will have a true evaluation of the financial and economic situation within these industries. I do not think that this is any period when we should waste time and not know what is taking place in these industries. We should know that such-and-such are the general wage packets, that this is what is going on, so that you will be satisfied with the concessions which you are giving the people, because the wages should be good wages as compared with those of the general community. I do not think that anybody could regard what I have said as being unreasonable. I think that Barbados is going through such a period of change that before we go on - as my colleague has said, we should not have to tell the Government what they should do, but I think we should make it our duty to attempt to harness what potential there is and have an over-all Committee to investigate the effect of these technological and other changes so that we will be able to make some future plan to help the employment situation. We want to examine things and see what is the present position.

Mr. TALMA: (Cheers) Mr. Speaker, while agreeing in principle with what appears to be the motive in this Bill, yet I feel that the time has come when the Schedule of the Customs Tariff Act should be consolidated and put on a proper footing. It is really one of a whole series of amendments, and if we go on like this we will hardly know what the Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act really is. It is not a question of amending the Act and the Schedule over and over again, but rather having one Act which will be comprehensive and which will embrace all the numerous amendments. On the face of this Resolution, the principle appears to be good and, generally speaking, provided that three guarantees are assured one can hardly find much fault with it. When I speak about three guarantees or assurances I refer, in the first place as the hon. member who has just sat down has done, to the employment opportunities which the hon. member has already mentioned and on which I may not touch again speaking so soon after him. However, I will say that as far as the employment opportunities are concerned, there should be a reasonable living wage in contradistinction to the pitiable wage which is paid in certain parts of this City and more especially in the Swan Street area or in any such undertakings or factories or quasi-factories where one hears reports to the effect that certain girls who work in these factories are required to sign the payment for \$10.00 a week whereas the actual salary is only \$6.00 or \$7.00 and the other considerations attached thereto, not to mention. When one considers that, one can see that full advantage is being taken of our working-class girls in particular. However, I will leave that point for further elaboration by my colleagues who are more competent to deal with that phase of the issue than I am.

As to the assurances or guarantees, what I feel is that commodities should be of good quality - I refer to the socks, stockings or whatever is to be produced. A commodity should be of good quality and it should be sold at a reasonable price and at a reduced price, because, unless the public at large stands to benefit from the sale of these commodities which have a duty-free exemption, I do not see what absolute benefit would be derived. The article should be of merchantable quality and it should be sold at a reduced price. What comes to my mind most readily is the price of ladies' stockings and men's socks in the U. K. and other places where the prices are very reasonable. You can secure good quality stockings for six shillings a pair as compared with three dollars here and excellent socks for three shillings or three and sixpence a pair.

4.55 p.m.

The question is whether by granting this exemption from duty any practical benefit will be derived by the public at large. If the Minister has in mind assisting the public and putting a cheaper article but of just as good quality at the disposal of the public and seeing after the mark-ups, because that is where the Government's function is, all well and good. The Government may have good inten-

at times, but then certain things are not performed. Unless the mark-up is enforced and the Price Control Inspectors actually do their job, what might have appeared a good scheme on paper ends up with no practical benefits to the public at large and you eventually succeed in creating another monopoly; so I hope that this venture or this exemption in allowing unfinished, undyed, unbleached and unpointed stockings and unfinished, undyed, unbleached socks to come in partly finished, so to speak, will succeed. The whole scheme of the matter is that you are allowing socks and stockings to come in partly finished, you exempt them from duty and then the finishing touches are put on in Barbados by these girls who are employed at a cheaper rate; therefore you leave a greater margin of profit for the business man or the manufacturer. This is a means of allowing a bigger margin of profit to be made, and if a bigger margin of profit can be made, it means a proportionate reduction in the price of the commodity can be made provided Government sees fit to take the appropriate steps at the right time not only to appoint Price Control Inspectors but to see that the mark-up is made in such a way that when in force it will redound to the benefit of the public who have suffered too long in this island in buying essential commodities - not foodstuffs, but clothing.

In Barbados, the price of clothing, whether it is a tie, a pair of socks, women's garments or dress material, is 100% higher than in Trinidad which is just next door, and it is time that we sat up and did something. The Minister of Trade has travelled enough to realise that the public of Barbados is suffering from high mark-ups in wearing apparel whether it be socks, stockings, ties, suit lengths, dresses or skirts. The time has come to take a trip to Trinidad and compare prices, not to mention Puerto Rico and other places.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to support this amendment to the Customs Tariff Act. Obviously, every hon. member realises that we have for so long advocated encouraging industries in this country that we in our Party can ill afford not to support this Resolution. But I should like the Hon. Minister to listen very carefully to what I have to say. I am congratulating the hon. senior member for St. Peter on his speech, because in my day to day business and in my political life in the municipality, I have had on several occasions to send people over to his Union whom we proved as a fact had been receiving around \$4 a week in established industries which have priority in this country, and I say that it is nothing but scandalous to this country, more especially when it is within the knowledge of members of a Government who supposedly are Socialists.

I am supporting this Resolution; but the Hon. Minister must give us some facts without which I am going to move that it go to Select Committee. It is all very well to say that you are going to employ 40 people. What do we have here? This is an amendment to allow socks and stockings not finished to be brought into Barbados to be finished, and it is going to employ 40 people. Now if the Hon. Minister believes what the Trade Unionist has said, he is bound to give us the facts which we need. Can he really tell us in actual figures - I am talking of money - when he allows socks and stockings to come into this country free of duty what it is going to cost us by way of duty and stamps? Actually you must tell us that today. Any Minister coming here should be able to tell us that, and I am sure that the Hon. Minister who has shown signs of taking great pains with his work will be able to tell us. We want to know actually what we are getting now in customs duty as a result of stockings and socks coming into Barbados, and if you come here with an amendment like this, you must be able to tell us that. You should not underrate your Opposition. We want to know how much this exemption will cost the Treasury of this island. Side by side with that, if you are really employing 40 people at \$5 a week, that is only \$10,000 a year in wages. When you compare what you are going to give up from the Treasury with what would be paid out to the 40 people who are employed, then we are entitled to know if we are really getting any benefit at all, because although

we are encouraging and are here to support the encouragement of industries, we must look at things in a factual manner.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no point in giving up \$25,000 to give \$10,000 to people; you had better take the \$10,000 and give it out in dole, because you are giving \$15,000 to somebody who comes here and puts up a small business. It is not good enough to say that priority status is given to these stockings and socks people because they are going to employ 40 people. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter said, it is not merely employing 40 people, but are you going to employ them at living wages? I say now with the fullest sense of responsibility that a great number of these industries in Bridgetown are employing people at around \$4 a week, and when the Public Assistance Board had to ask the question, they were told that the work is done by the piece and they can make more. They are now doing here what was done in England some years ago, but some will have to work from 7 a.m. until 10 p.m. to make \$6 a week and you do not have to be a Trade Unionist to know that.
5.05 p.m.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter is absolutely correct. You only have to be a human being to see that people are not exploited like that. I hear some hon. member from over there saying "hear, hear!" Let me say that somebody from the *Beacon* came to me and said that the foreman is getting only \$10.00 a week. There are people who are starving there. It is no wonder that they want us to come in here and pass it without giving us any figures. I repeat, a woman came to me recently with seven children and said that her husband was working as the foreman of the *Beacon* newspaper for only \$10.00 a week. Some people, as long as they get \$900 per month, do not mind; they would employ people and don't care a damn how much these other people get. (A VOICE: Order.) Order what? (*More asides.*) What I am saying is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member need not deal with asides.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But they are directed to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sometimes I hear asides and sometimes I do not hear them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am saying that the Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution should be able to give us the necessary facts, but for fear that he is not going to give us today, I am moving that this Resolution be sent to Select Committee. If the Hon. Minister cannot give us the information I think we should postpone it. However, I think he should be able to give us what we have asked. As I have said, we should have the actual facts as regards what it is going to cost us before we vote on it and, therefore, I am going to move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, quite a number of important matters have come up in this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion of the hon. senior member for the City?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Not exactly. I was saying, Sir, that there are many important aspects of this matter. Now, those of us who have been belabouring the Government for its failure to encourage the industrial development of the country would naturally welcome any indication that the Government has at long last endeavoured to promote the economic development of the island; but certainly the points made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for the City are both exceedingly well taken. I think, Sir, that since they have been elaborated upon so well by the previous speakers, the only thing which should be said on that point now is to say that perhaps people who are going to embark on pioneer industries in this country should be compelled to agree to the insertion of a fair wage clause in the contract under which they are going to establish these industries, or maybe, Sir, better still, to simplify the matter,

the application forms for pioneer industrial status should contain a fair wage clause.

When a gentleman comes here and ask for concessions which we offer to new industries, I think it will be a very easy matter to satisfy the Trade Union demand that these new industries do not degenerate into sweat shops by the insertion of a fair wages clause.

However, Sir, the fundamental argument in this debate goes much further than that. It is all very well and good to say, as the hon. senior member for the City has said, that we need the figures giving the amount involved in loss of customs revenue by this Resolution. I agree with him that to a certain extent these figures are important, but over-riding that is the question, do we want to industrialise the country or not? We may still find that in some instances of industrial development we are going to lose revenue in customs duty on a number of particular items, but that has to be weighed against the other points in favour of industrialisation in its broader sense.

I am not going to concern myself here, Mr. Speaker, with any academic reply to the basic principle, the pros and cons to industrial development as against import duties and goods coming in from outside and what not, but I am going to agree with the argument basically advanced by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that if these people are compelled to pay proper wages and as the hon. senior member for Christ Church said, compelled to sell the goods they produce for a reasonable profit, it would be a good thing for the country because the Government will have to examine further the question of concessions to new industries.

That is why some of us on this side of the Table have been saying and repeating that in many respects Jamaica should be leading the Federation because it is the only country in the area with a proper conception of what to do to develop the area. In the matter of economic development, Jamaica is even leading Puerto Rico. What Jamaica has done in the first seven years of its programme for industrial development has now surpassed Puerto Rico, and we all know that in this respect Puerto Rico was the standard for all under-developed countries before. Jamaica has reached the position it has reached because of the vast concessions it is offering, the protection for new industries; and, therefore, if this Government is compelled to tell industrialists that they must pay fair wages, and that they must sell the goods manufactured at the most reasonable profit, it means that the only way the industry can survive is if the Government goes all out in offering protection to the industry established. To my mind, that is the most important question facing the country today. We are doing nothing at all to expedite the industrial development of the island and we cannot catch up with Jamaica - not even Trinidad now - unless we lower some of the barriers we have against new industries coming into the country.

5.15 p.m.

All-out protection should be our watchword. As things are at present, no textile manufacturer will manufacture socks and stockings from imported, unfinished material and be expected to compete with these articles from Hong Kong unless he gets the maximum protection, so that we will have to go the whole hog. We shall have to afford fair wages, competitive prices, protection against dumping and protection against unfair competition from outside. Industries in the West Indies have had to compete with dumping from outside. It is within your knowledge that in big manufacturing territories the tendency is, as soon as one starts to develop, you lower the export price of that commodity and you put it somewhere else in order to prevent the new industries from getting a proper start in the country or countries in which they have started. Jamaica realised that and that is why they sought to protect every industry in the country. We have to provide protection for shirt manufacturers against dumping and against unfair competition in relation to goods in sweat shops in the Far East and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, none of us sitting around this Table, at least none of us on this side of the Table, will be satis-

fied to think that the carrying on of industries in this country is only possible on the basis of the payment of very, very low wages; but there must be a general solution to the entire problem, and we will never get at it by dealing with the matter in a piece-meal fashion. A manufacturer who is coming here to manufacture a new item will exploit the market in every way he can from the point of view of low prices, either in the effort at profiteering (number one), or (number two) to meet competition from outside. But the Government should approach the question in the broadest possible aspect by imposing all the restrictions which should be imposed in a properly-arranged society and laying down the conditions under which every manufacturer can operate in the factory. The Government should lay down proper conditions for the staff and proper wages, and ensure that the manufacturer can do these things and still survive. Then the Government should go and say "We will see that you operate to the standards which we lay down; we will give you all the necessary protection and facilities you want to enable your enterprise to be a success". That is the only way in which you can attract new industries here and compel those industries to pay proper wages and sell the goods they produce at reasonable prices; otherwise you cannot do it.

One of the previous speakers has posed the question as to whether it will pay these people to import the unfinished material and finish the manufacture of socks and stockings here. My experience of the only textile plant in this country - Barbados Knitting and Spinning Mills - is that it pays them better to import the yarn from the East and convert this yarn into underwear and so on, than to go and buy sea island cotton from Grenada and spin the cotton here in the old plant. In any case, most countries which are embarking on an industrial programme, begin with this sort of thing. They begin by assembling articles just as how most of the industries in Puerto Rico were started. In the case of aluminium bars and windows, you import the parts and assemble them in the area. It is open to an industrialist, if he wants to feel his way in the community, to begin half way by importing unfinished material and converting it into the finished material and even importing the basic raw material in this process of manufacturing on the spot.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree that there is anything basically wrong in importing unfinished material and converting it on the spot in the early stages; but I feel that hon. members would do well to view this matter in its entire aspect and insist not only on the maintenance of wages for the staff but also on the best possible atmosphere to protect manufacturers who are coming into this country. If we are all agreed that our primary consideration now is to attract every possible investor to the area, well then, I submit that we must view this matter in all of its aspects; otherwise we will find that our second position will be in a worse state than the first.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, all parties of the House have, from time to time, expressed themselves in very strong terms as to their willingness and great desire to encourage industries into this island; and we should not on every occasion on which there is an amendment to the particular Act, be repeating these very things. This Government should have these facts and figures ready and available. In presenting this Resolution, the Minister should have told us all that we want to know in advance. Industrialists who are attracted here with the capital and the know-how and with machinery ready to come in, can be very easily scared away. As the last speaker has said, we should be at one in this matter of industrialisation because we have expressed ourselves in the matter over and over again. We have been so far behind in the race with Jamaica and Trinidad that we cannot afford to throw away these opportunities which present themselves to us every now and again.

5.25 p.m.

Now this is a small industry; it may be an attachment of one that is already existing in Barbados, probably the Knitting Mills; but the importance of these industries is that if we can encourage them here on our domestic

market and encourage them to go further and expand and then export business, it is very much better. That is what we should look for. It is important to embark on ready-made articles but it is much better if we can encourage these industries to export their goods because new money would be coming in and we would become manufacturers for the consumers in other territories. That is what our sights should be focused on, and I am sorry that the Minister did not rise after the others because he should have risen then to answer the question and criticisms levelled at the Government from over here. In the absence of that reply I will have to second the motion for the postponement of this Resolution made by the hon. senior member for the City. I am doing that not with any intention of killing the Resolution, but so that Government can come out and answer the criticisms that have been levelled at them today.

Mr. Speaker, to establish industries and give encouragement to industries that are only paying \$5 a week is so wrong and should be so discouraged from the outset that the Minister should be able to get up and say that any industry coming here must pay a proper living wage in Barbados. We have to protect these industries, and once they get a footing as we have seen with other industries, and you give them one concession, after they go and try, they come back and say that is not enough and we amend it to give them further encouragement. We have done it and that is how you encourage people, but in the first instance all that investigation should take place. I should like to know if the Development Board has passed this industry. Have they investigated the potentialities of this industry as a suitable one for Barbados? That is their job and there should be proper investigation. It is the duty of the Development Board in Barbados if they are doing their job to make investigations at the bottom and then advise Government whether it is an industry of value to the island, as soon as they have made up their minds one way or another.

I should like to add to the questions put to the Minister by asking whether the Development Board has investigated this industry and have pronounced favourably on it and what were their comments; but the greatest criticism of all today is to see that an industry such as this can come in here and pay such wages as \$5 a week. If we are to encourage industries which can only pay that, I think our sights are too low and we should look up a little higher. We want our unemployment relieved but not at so low a cost, and I do hope that in his reply the Minister can assure the House that better wages will be paid and other conditions can be made; but in the absence of that I am at this stage seconding the motion for the postponement.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in respect of this Resolution. I have listened to the various speakers and I know that pioneer industries in this island are good. If industries are coming to this island to manufacture certain materials, the Government should first of all know whether the inhabitants of Barbados would have to pay less for those items than if they came from abroad. If we have to pay the same amount of money for these items that are manufactured here, it would be better for us to go on bringing in the items from outside and the Government would be receiving a greater duty from them. There are a lot of people who come to this country and start small industries, and I am saying that instead of it being good for the people, it is ruinous to them through the small wages they are receiving. These small wages throughout the world have caused riots, strife and strikes and the only solution for that is to pay better wages.

Sir, I remember some years ago that the Government arranged to send a certain quantity of soap into this country and I understood from a reliable source that we would have got that soap cheaper from the United States of America than if it were manufactured here in this country. What is the use of this Government allowing industrialists to bring in their machinery free of duty making us believe that they are trying to help us by

employing a few people here and there but then the wages are so small that the poor people are crying daily? Some of them are working night and day and are still hungry, naked, starving and desolate through the low wages they are receiving today from some of these pioneer industries.

I pass through Swan Street and I see these poor girls, and I am sorry that I am not in a position to employ some of them. (*Laughter*)

Sir, when I see these poor girls taking lunch and they sit next to me, let me tell you what I see them eating: a loaf of bread for 3 ¢ and a Coke, and the only thing they have to polish it off with is a powder puff. I have seen them walking hungry along the street, and these industrialists should consider these poor people who have to work for them, because every now and then you will see these same people opening a large factory somewhere else; they just come in with 3 ¢ and soon after can open a factory for \$3 million and the poor people who work for them are hungry and desolate. Government should look into these matters and have somebody to investigate them, have a look at their wage books and see what the poor people are working for and get better conditions for them. As I said before, the only way to keep away from strife, strikes and riots is when people are getting good wages.

5.35 p.m.

Small wages even cause war, as far as I see. People in this island are working and making bricks without straw. What I would like the Government to do, Sir, is, any time anyone comes here to manufacture any kind of material, to get and arrange with that person beforehand. Ask him: "Are you prepared to sell us the material cheaper than what we are paying now? We want to know, if you manufacture the material here, whether we would be able to purchase it cheaper than if it comes here ready made." That is something you should do before you allow these people to come in. As I have said before, industry is good for Barbados; but not if one man is making all the money out of it and the other people who are working in it are getting nothing.

It is the duty of Government to look into these industries and to see that the poor people get better wages. I think the Government should set forth an example for others to follow. Sir, I hope that when the Government tables any measure in this House for debate, it would be properly worded and no Minister would have to get up and run to telephone this Department or the other to get information to come back in here and give us. Everything should be done in order and with decency. I think the Ministers need shaking up; they are sleeping. Arouse those who are sleeping and let them do their duty. The Ministers need shaking up and the time is coming when they will be sorry because they are neglecting their duty to the poor people of Barbados. It is true to say that they are trying to help them one way, but the important thing is to help them to get money and food. I hope that the Government will look after these industries and see to it that they are organised on a proper basis and that they would be able to sell cheaper and better materials.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for the City has moved that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. I would not like to say that I am the only person, but I do say that I was the foremost person, without in any way trying to blow my own trumpet, and it is a historical fact that I have on every occasion that the Government has come in here with a schedule to amend the Customs Act asked the Hon. Minister of Trade to supply Customs of this House with certain information as regards the impact and long term effect which the exemptions would have on the overall revenue of this colony; and as I am the person who has time and again deplored the fact that we have never been supplied with this information, I must support the motion made by the hon. senior member for the City. It maybe quite true that the volume of these commodities which would be coming in may be in no way commensurate with the exemptions granted from time to time during the past three years. It may be that the value of these com-

modities which are exempted may be exceedingly small. I am not in a position to know because this particular Resolution has taken us completely by surprise, and it is not part of the policy set out in the Government's statements from time to time to consider the manufacture of socks or stockings, bleached, dyed or undyed, to be a part of their way to help the economy of the country; therefore, I have had no opportunity to investigate the long term effect of such an exemption on the resources of this island.

However, Sir, I certainly consider that it is the duty of the Minister of Labour not only to supply members of the House with the information which was asked for, but to tell the House something further than that. They should tell the House what is the total effect on the revenue of this colony of all the Customs Tariff amendments granting exemptions which have been passed, say, during the past three years. I say that because no Minister in his right senses, knowing his job, would continue to come to the Legislature asking for exemptions for this and that unless he was able to examine carefully the matter to see what effect it would have on the economy of the island if he granted you this exemption. I do not care how many people a particular industry may employ; it certainly will have a deleterious effect on the revenue of the colony, particularly in this year when we are budgeting for a deficit of \$500,000. So contemptuous are they getting that despite the fact that they have budgeted for a deficit this year, they are coming to this House week after week, with monotonous regularity, with Resolutions which would have the effect, not of swelling the resources which lie in the coffers of the Treasury, but of further diminishing and depleting the resources which we have there. It is all the more passing strange in this year of grace, when they can least afford it, when it is not part of their deliberate policy to set up industries of this sort, that they come for this. There are some members of this House who employ more than six persons in their domestic household and those members do not get any exemptions for the stockings and shoes which their gardeners, maids or chauffeurs wear from day to day. Therefore, what kind of factory is this which would employ six persons?

I do not think it is treating the House with courtesy if we do not have a Financial Department or a Secretary who can work out these things for the Minister if the Minister is not capable of doing it himself. I think it is high time we get a Financial Secretary who is able to do it. We have recently appointed a Government Statistician and have set up an office for him without any kind of equipment or machines whatsoever. I do not want to say anything more about that for obvious reasons because somebody would think that I have a brief for some public servant. Long before we had this Department which deals out these little missiles, we have had a Financial Secretary with a big Department with Aides and Assistants and we have never for once been treated with the courtesy of having the statistics on the impact of the revenue of this island that these duty free commodities are costing us. We need those statistics and we consider them necessary, and they are all the more necessary because the Government is budgeting for a deficit this year. We hope we will get them in the near future.

I want to issue a word of warning following up on what the hon. senior member for St. Peter said. This particular industry is notoriously one of the sweated industries of the world. Mr. Speaker, as an active Trade Unionist, you will appreciate what I am saying. The tailoring trade and the garment industry are the two industries which even in highly industrial countries with well organised Trade Unions are notorious as the only sweated industries.

5.45 p.m.

That is so in the Eastern seaboard and in the New York City; it is so in Manchester and even in Puerto Rico and Jamaica; and it is worse than in any other place under the sun in Barbados. It is a matter of common and general knowledge to those who are interested in the welfare of the workers that you have two shirt factories where people are getting only \$2.82 per week - married women with children. I challenge any hon. member here to deny that that is so. The Government has set up Wages Councils Orders which say that the minimum wage, as far as I remember, is to be \$5.00 per week; but you cannot guarantee when you are using the piece-work system and the take-home system that

a person will get \$5.00 a week's worth of work. You can only enforce that Order when a person is working within a factory. You have a Labour Department and you have people going into other people's kitchen drinking tea and deciding disputes between domestic servants and the mistresses. I was very pleased to see an Officer of the Labour Department in Court prosecuting a case for non-payment of holiday pay under the Holidays With Pay Act against a former aspirant to political honours in this Chamber who spent an hour and a half addressing the Court telling the Magistrate how he had done everything possible to provide people with employment and this is the thanks which he gets. Now he has closed down his business he is prosecuted although he did not employ anybody at all. I repeat that this person was an aspirant to political honours in this Chamber; I will not call his name.

I have mentioned that particular case because it appears to me that the attitude of the Government of Barbados is that they do not care what wages will be paid or what kind of work will be done or how long people have got to work because we will not spend the taxpayers' money in enforcing Orders. I have my reasons for saying that. I remember raising a question in this House about the treatment of Barbadian workers in the United States of America now some three years ago; this matter has been raised at Federal level and people are now beginning to take notice of it. The hon. senior member for St. Michael said that you cannot fly in the face of these American employers which you have.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. When did I ever make any such statement? Of course, misstatements just roll off the hon. member's tongue like water.

Mr. BARROW: It is in the debates of this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, if you give me permission to speak again, I will read it word for word. When I talked about these firms and about workers who were unceremoniously deported from the country because they complained about the conditions, the attitude of the hon. senior member for St. Michael was that we have to take it so because these people can provide work for us. I am speaking about the hon. senior member for St. Michael, I am not talking in parables; it is only now that the matter has been raised at Federal level that people are taking notice of it. The workers were complaining about weevils being in the rice and so on.

I come further down. We have a beautiful factory in Bay Street; but when you go behind the facade of that factory - the Elite Shirt Factory - and you ask the workers what was their take-home pay last week you will find that the majority of them will be talking about \$4.00 and \$4.50. If you are establishing pioneer industries, let us examine the people who are bringing in these industries. Some years ago the Government of Puerto Rico with some assistance made every concession to American industrialists and the result was that Puerto Rico with an illiteracy of about 60% to 65% blossomed overnight into an industrial power. As many as four hundred and fifty factories, let us say, were put down; they came from ownership by Government's sponsorship to private enterprise and in the Caribbean they have come to the position of allowing private enterprise to come into the colonies in the interest of providing employment for the people of the area. That is the rationale which was adopted, and that is the *rationale* which is used by Governments in the Caribbean. But some Governments are more dumb than others. What do they do? People say that they are going to provide work, but the basis on which that employment is going to be given is not carefully scrutinised by these Governments. In particular I am talking about the Barbados Government.

5.55 p.m.

Let us go back to Puerto Rico. After a time when they had exhausted their pioneer status, they started shifting over to Jamaica. Let us not deceive ourselves that the tremendous rate of industrial growth in Jamaica is attributable either to the personality of the Prime Minister or the erudition of the higher echelons of the P.N.P. or the Bustamante Party; it is a question of natural changes taking place, and shifting of allocation of industry when they have exhausted their welcome in a particular territory; so when the members of the Barbados Government get up and say

they have succeeded in setting up something here, it is not necessarily a feather in the Government's cap, because when they have exhausted their welcome now through duty free and income tax free vacation or holiday in Jamaica, they will naturally start flooding down to the Lesser Antilles of which Barbados does not always recognise herself to be one, from a geographical point of view.

Here in Barbados you have all the pre-conditions of successful industrial development as was stated by the now Principal of the University College of the West Indies over fourteen years ago, but the sponsor of the Government Party is now plagiarising and making speeches about it, calling no names at this juncture. We all know whom we mean; they will know so well that they will be ringing up the gentleman and saying I slandered him in the House of Assembly. All I am saying is that they are plagiarising the work of Professor Arthur Lewis although some of us on this side of the House were asking Government to scrutinise the recommendations made by Professor Arthur Lewis at the time when they were taking about birth control and all the neo-Malthusian nonsense they were getting on with for the last five years after we had the pre-conditions of industrial expansion here in Barbados. Professor Lewis said they were 160 thousand first line jobs which could be provided, and using the multiplier of two or three we could get three or four hundred thousand people employed not only at secondary level, but in services and supplies and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I only mentioned that to try to emphasise the point I am making now. The mentality of those so-called pioneer manufacturers is to get the highest profit in the shortest possible time; and therefore if the Government wants to safeguard the welfare of the working force of the island, the Government will have to do what the hon. senior member for St. Peter and other members have suggested in seeing that a fair wages Clause is inserted into all these contracts as a pre-condition of their getting exemption from customs duty or pioneer status. Let us not delude ourselves that this is an exceptional instance in the industrial life of this island, because the chances are that more and more of these smallman shows, just large enough to be manipulated properly by one man or small group of men, not calling for public subscription or public support, will come in like buccaneers or pirates, make a raid on the Treasury just like somebody going into the Treasury Department and putting their hands on the notes, because when you ask for pioneer status and customs exemption, you are depriving Government revenue of something they would have got if you did not come with this particular venture. In other words, socks are not going to be coming into Barbados for the first time. It is true we have a large number of bare-footed people walking about Barbados, myself included at times, but by and large every Barbadian wears a pair of socks at some time of the year, so it is not an innovation; it is not a technical change; it is not a social change; it is a shifting of emphasis from importing these commodities to manufacturing or finishing off the commodities here in Barbados.

Now the first question I would like to put to the Hon. Minister of Trade is this: where are the semi-finished goods coming from? That is the first question I would like the Minister to answer. The Minister has given us some figures. He has given us some figures. He made a slight mistake when he said there will be 800 dozen pairs - I cannot remember whether he said in a week or month - 200 dozen pairs for the local market and 800 dozen - I believe he meant 600 dozen for the export market. (Hon. M. E. COX: I mean exactly what I said.) I am sorry the Minister said he meant exactly what he said, therefore eight and two are eight. A total of 800 dozen pairs would be manufactured over a certain period, 200 dozen pairs would go for Barbados and the other 800 dozen would be for the export market. He says eight and two are eight, and I would have to accept his arithmetic for the time being, because I do not have to waste time over that. If the hon. member had listened to what I was saying, he would have heard me say that he did not intend to say 200 for the local market and the other 800 for the export market; that is what I am drawing to his attention, but he still says that eight

and two are eight. You can read back the debates; it is very easy. If the Minister is in doubt he can ask the Reporter, but I credit him with at least simple addition and subtraction; so I do not think he could have said that in earnest.

Now what I want to know is this: whatever the figure is, whether it is 600 leaving the other 200, or 800 out of 800 after taking away the 200, where is the surplus, that is not going to be consumed or taken off by the local market, going to? Where is the raw material coming from, and where is the finished product going? Those are answers I feel we ought to know, because it may very well turn out, Mr. Speaker, that now that we are federating, we may be purchasing raw materials or allowing our raw materials to be purchased free of customs duty from a source outside the Commonwealth.....

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

We may be encouraging a situation in which raw materials - and I say raw materials, and some finished materials will come in the same classification - are coming from outside the Commonwealth area to be finished off here in Barbados in the West Indies Federation, and sold to other Units in the West Indies Federation to compete with products wholly manufactured within the West Indies Federation. Now I have been very careful in my choice of words. I said "we may be; the Minister has not given us the information. In other words, listen to what I am putting to you: if we are importing semi-finished goods from Hong Kong and finishing them off here and giving them a British or Barbados label or stamp, they will then go to Trinidad in a preferential tariff, until we get customs union, to compete with Trinidad workers who are doing all the different stages of manufacture, from raw material to the finished product in Trinidad, under-selling them and thereby causing unemployment in Trinidad.

6.05 p.m.

I say that is one of the things, if I had to answer an examination paper on the possible repercussions of the exemption of duty, which I would feel myself constrained to put down in my answer. When you consider that Jamaica, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is manufacturing these same commodities from the raw material stage to the finished product, surely, you must wonder, as I am really wondering, whether we are not encouraging - I do not want my words to be misunderstood - by helping some refugee who is hiding from income tax in another British colony to come into Barbados and create under-employment.

This is not as simple a matter as the Hon. Minister of Trade would have us to believe. This is something which anyone should have an assurance from the Minister on. I want the assurance to come from him. I do not want to say that this is a man who has been thrown out of a country. I am not saying that it is so, but it is possible for such a situation to exist. Let us take it in another way. Let us suppose a gentleman was coming in from Venezuela. Let us examine that possibility. There is a lot of seared capital coming from within Venezuela and by Venezuelans outside who have the capital but who cannot go back to Venezuela because they would have to face a firing squad. It is the fact that there is a lot of money from Venezuela which is invested in British West Indian Colonies. We are only too glad to have it. Of course, it may be a question that you want to get as many of these factories set up before the elections so as to bring you votes; but, as I was saying, there is a lot of money which belongs to people of Venezuela which is invested in the British West Indian Colonies because the people from there have come into these parts as political refugees. That is a question of fact. I have not said that any particular person has done it, but it is a fact that there are some people in Barbados who cannot go back to Venezuela because they would be shot at dawn. However, that is no concern of mine because one cannot be too squeamish, when one has a country to run, as to question where the capital comes from. However, you may have a situation in which somebody who is a millionaire would come from Venezuela and set up a factory of this kind with the assurance being given him that wages here are low and substantially below what they are in

Venezuela, and the Government may even go as far as to say to that person that everything will be done to see that those wages do not rise in the immediate future so as to make it uneconomical for you to operate your plant. By permitting industrialists to come in and do that kind of thing and with the island also giving them customs exemptions, we may be attacking the standard of living of the people in Jamaica and Trinidad. They are the two islands in the Federation which manufacture this commodity.

I personally feel that when anyone approaches the Government with a proposition such as this, the Government should not get a private detective agency to help them, but should make enquiries from the country from which the person came not only as regards his credit rating but also as regards the standard of his factory. That should be done because it may be found out that such a person is one who as soon as his tax holiday is over would shut down the factory and clear out and give you some excuse. Of course, you cannot put him in Court for that; but if you find that out, you can tell the people of the other islands that that person is only going to operate for the time which you grant him as tax holiday.

Sir, I can see these things and I see the writing on the wall. I do not know the particular person who has approached the Government on this particular problem, but these are considerations which must be borne in mind. I would like some assurance from the Government that there is no possibility of our depleting the resources of the Treasury in this particular matter. We should not embark on this only to find that in a couple of years' time, the factory which is manufacturing these textiles will be folding up its tent like a parasol and stealing away.

It is true that the Government in its anxiety to demonstrate that it is providing us with a few factories may not be scrutinising these things with the care which they should be taking. You should not just because somebody comes along and says "I want to put up a factory" especially when he is asking for concessions also, grant him pioneer status without his giving you the correlative guarantees which we feel should be forthcoming before the guarantees which you give him.

When it comes to granting these concessions, I hope the Minister does not have in mind that he can give a person the assurance that the concession would be granted by the Legislature. Let no Minister sit there and think that he can have conversations at cocktail parties with these potential industrialists and make promises to them and expect us to rubber-stamp the promises which they have made, especially when such promises may have been made in a moment of rashness, especially when they are made over wine which is too red. Of course, that is how big business operates. Big business operates through cocktail parties or a drive in the country. I see that the Hon. Minister of Communications wishes to talk. He had better not talk because I have in my possession a letter which says that the best way to deal with the hon. member is in a corner where nobody sees him. I hear an aside coming from the hon. member and I will show that letter to the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Sir, we have to face facts. That is the way the capitalists operate today. They lobby; they entertain; and for that they provide entertainment allowances. If they want something done they are usually prepared to pay for it. That is what I am saying and everybody knows that to be an absolute fact. If what is here in this Resolution were an inspiration on the part of the Government, if somebody had not lobbied them for getting this concession, they would have had it in their manifesto. They would have carried out a survey of the stocking making industry and would have found out that that industry would be a profit making industry for Barbados. You say that the Government does all of these things. We know that there are people who do approach the Government, who lobby them, invite them out and use pressure on them and that is how you get this Customs tariff amendment. We know that.

6.15 p.m.

On the other side of the scale, it may be argued for them, well, do not mind that we may be making a concession for an individual; the over-all good counter-balances that. Sir Archibald Cuke said that Government is the government of the most effective lobbyists, those who can lobby the best; it is a question of who lobbies the best. We, on this side of the House, know that these things are going on and that is how economic measures are introduced into the Legislature. A lobbyist is a one-sided person, one who will not take into consideration all the pros and cons of the matter which he is approaching. We know that that goes on and we have to accept it for the time being, and only for the time being; therefore, I am asking the Minister to give me an answer to this question. Do not think that any kind of employment is good enough in Barbados. The hon. senior member for St. Peter, as a Trade Unionist, has told you what he thinks about this matter. It is not a question that some employment is better than no employment at all, because there is some employment which is really unemployment. Our slogan is not "employment at any price, but employment at the best price."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you put the question, I am sure that you realise that the Government would have to reply to some of the criticisms which have been made, and perhaps more particularly to the remarks made by the last speaker. I would just like to say from the outset that, as far as the hon. senior member for St. Peter is concerned, he had a lot of cheering from the other side; they hailed the speech which he made. Well, to me, it was a harangue, not a speech at all because the hon. member started off by attacking me on a matter which is quite irrelevant to the issue under discussion. While I do not want to go back on what was said, I merely want to say at this stage that what I said as regards the Trade Union (Amendment) Bill which the hon. member brought before the House, I will say now or at any place or at any time; that is, that I will never support any Bill which has for its object picketing at the private residence of people. (Mr. WALCOTT: You supported it in 1949.) Picketing at any man's work place, but when you come to a person's residence to intimidate.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. If the hon. member knows what he is saying, peaceful picketing is not intimidation; peaceful picketing is law. It is illegal to intimidate.

Hon. M. E. COX: I want to say that a man's house is his castle and when he goes there he must be in peace and quiet.

Mr. WALCOTT: Therefore you were a hypocrite in 1949.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am bound to make my position clear. It was I who made that speech in here and kept back this House for about two hours on it. The hon. member gave me hell then. (Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER knocked the gavel.) I am sorry, Sir, I said that nobody should picket at a person's private residence, but when I said that, the hon. member said "No".

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: The debate is still within the precincts of this House and anything that I said ten years ago is there. If I said something ten years ago and I am in a position to modify what I said then, I can do so. After all, is it that I have not got any more experience or anything like that? Has the Trade Union not got a better hold on the employers today than it had 10 years ago? Would the hon. member say that the position has not been improved? If that is not so, then you may as well shut down shop. However, I do not want to dwell on that.

What is the position? As it is now, hon. members, with the exception of the hon. senior member for St. Philip, were not discussing the merits of this Resolution which is before the House; even the hon. senior member for St. Philip was not doing that. They cannot criticise the merits of this Resolution because time and again they have been criticising this Government for not offering similar con-

cessions to industrialists so that they could come to this country and industrialise it. They cannot criticise this Resolution on its merits, but perhaps some of them think that the Election may be a few months off and they start off campaigning. The hon. senior member for St. Peter who calls himself an independent, which is really no man's land.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will allow me to say this.....

Hon. M. E. COX: All right, Sir, I withdraw that. 6.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: All I am saying is that this whole debate is centred around wages, on conditions of work and not the merit of whether or not the people concerned should be allowed to import into this country the various items which are set out here.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, the hon. member must not say that. I said that far from agreeing to that, I am not a believer in customs duty at all; but as we have customs duty with us, we have to retain it. It is not a question that I was against them doing that. What I said in addition to my criticism was that if we give these concessions to these employers, it is the duty of the Government also to see that we get a *quid pro quo*, and I drew to the hon. member's attention the question of wages; so it is not a question of principle; there is no principle involved in the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: As far as the member is concerned, he is only one individual and he is an Independent. As long as I happen to be a member of this House.....

Mr. WALCOTT: What is the hon. member saying? I am one person in this House but all members speak as a single person. Is not what I said a fact?

Hon. M. E. COX: I was saying that ever since the Customs Tariff Act of 1921, which is a little after I was born, was passed, it allowed or provided for these things. To admit duty free certain items, you put them under the second Schedule of the Act and allow them to be imported into the island. Is the hon. member saying he does not agree with that? This House as late as last year passed an amending Bill giving the Governor-in-Executive Committee power by an Order to vary the rates of duty as the case may be, and I would like to tell the hon. senior member for Christ Church when he said we should have something consolidated that you do not consolidate anything like this. The position is that everything must be on its own merits.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that definitely is not true. This is the only island in the West Indies.....

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is only getting up to interrupt me.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member for St. Michael said that an Act like this cannot be consolidated. I am not saying that the member for Christ Church cannot be consolidated, neither am I saying that I cannot be consolidated. I am replying to his statement that this Act could not be consolidated by saying that is not true. This is the only island in the West Indies.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now making a speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is misleading the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can on a point of order say that is not so and give reasons.

Mr. CRAWFORD: May I on a point of explanation explain that it is not true to say that there can be no blanket legislation covering all legislation of this sort? It is not true.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that any legislation of this nature in a proper Legislature would be put into a consolidated Act after a lapse of time.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a lapse of time, and that is injecting something new into the speech.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order, I am saying all the more that there can be consolidation for legislation of this nature. For the Customs Tariff Act of 1921 which has been amended 20, 30 or 40 times, you can make one Schedule and put in all, and you would be able to see

Mr. SPEAKER: All the hon. member is saying is that it can be consolidated, but he cannot even make a speech.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am only pointing out that provisions are made under the Act, and I repeat that the 1959 Act which we passed here specifically gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to vary the rates of duty by Orders; therefore every time you want to vary the rates of duty, you have to have an Order for it. They are only trying to break the trend of my speech. What I am saying is that the discussion is centred around wages and not really the Resolution as before us.

Now the hon. senior member for St. Peter quite rightly drew to the attention of the House the inadequate wages which are being paid in these various undertakings. I agree with him, but on whose shoulders must this blame be placed?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member went into that, he too would be making what he calls a mistake in other people and going outside the ambit of the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: But I have to reply to the statement made.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member affirms that the hon. member went out of his way to speak beyond the ambit of the Resolution and criticised that, how can I allow him to make a second statement?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member said when we come with this \$5 a week wage for people working in the shirt industry.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not want the hon. member to waste his time if it is not clear. You will remember that I did not say that they came down here with anything. I said that a Wages Council made a recommendation, but what I would say is that if he wants to attack me, I am ready. What I said and I repeated, Mr. Speaker, and I think you will remember, was that I agreed with all of this, but I took the opportunity to draw to the attention of the Minister and the Government that if they are doing these things for these people, at the same time we have a right in an amendment to change the Bill to make a review of it, and I do not think we are doing anything wrong in so doing.

Hon. M. E. COX: I drew to the attention of the House the position as it stands today, and the hon. member knows it as well as I do. I will go further and say that so far as regulating wages is concerned, that is a matter which is done by two exercises, either by the Trade Union of which he is Secretary, or by the Wages Council as set out in the Act. The Government does not fix wages except for its own workers. If the Trade Union fails to attract these people into its organisation, then something is wrong somewhere; so do not put the blame on us.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members agreed with the Act when it was passed in 1954. Section 3 of the Wages Council Act, 1955, reads as follows:-

"Subject to the provisions of this Part of this Act, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may by order establish a wages council to perform, in relation to the workers

described in the order and their employers, the functions specified in the provision of this Act.

An order establishing a wages council (hereafter in this Act referred to as a "wages council order") may be made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee either -

(a) If he is of the opinion that no adequate machinery exists for the effective regulation of the remuneration of the workers described in the order and that, having regard to the remuneration existing amongst those workers or any of them, it is expedient that such a council should be established; or

(b) In the circumstances hereinafter specified in pursuance of a wages council recommendation made in accordance with the subsequent provisions of this Part of this Act."

6.35 p.m.

Now, what is the position? If these people are regarded as unorganizable or difficult to organise, if the Trade Union, as has been done on several occasions, including the Transport workers before the Government took over the buses, said that these people are difficult to organise, it cannot do anything for them, it therefore, remains that you have to look after them in this way.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Trade Union has never yet in its whole history asked the Government to set up a Wages Council. As a matter of fact, I opposed it. The hon. member should not say that. The hon. member knows that he is wrong. The hon. member knows that there is a letter written to him where we said that we did not agree to the Government setting up Wages Councils. The Hon. Minister must not say in a debate that something was done which was not done. It is not true and he knows that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am pointing out the facts to the House. I repeat again that the position is that if the Government is satisfied that these people are not represented - let me put it this way - in any Union, well then, the Government can set up Wages Councils.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is agreeable.

Hon. M. E. COX: Now, what is the position? I do not want to refer to the nonsense which the hon. junior member for St. John talked, but I am glad to see that even the hon. junior member for St. Andrew realises the unfortunate and unhappy plight of these employees who are employed by big business, the people whom he has been representing and canvassing for all these years. I am glad he realises that these people have been oppressing, and are still oppressing, these workers and causing them to live on starvation wages and, as a result of what he says I look forward to him in the future (A VOICE: Doing what? Canvassing for you?) No, but getting on the side of those who are prepared to force people like the hon. junior member for Christ Church to pay decent wages to the workers.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know of any occasion when I have been forced to pay adequate wages.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said "people like the hon. member".

Mr. GODDARD: When he said people like me, to whom did he refer?

Hon. M. E. COX: I mean rich people.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am speaking to the hon. junior member for Christ Church. The Hon. Minister said "people like the hon. member". He may include the hon. member but that cannot be taken to mean the hon. member. I can understand English.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am aware, Sir, of whatever has been said by the hon. member in respect of not only this particular case in the shirt factories but also of the behaviour of

some of those employers at meetings of the Wages Councils and the reason why the paying of the last recommendation of \$16 a week caused so much fuss. I have so much on that question that they will never be aware of it.

What is the position? All the Government can do, and the Government did so, was to set up Wages Councils to fix wages and conditions of work for these particular people in the shirt business. Now, under the Act, as you will appreciate and hon. members will agree, the Governor sets up this Board which comprised of nine people and a Chairman. Three people are nominated or not less than three by the Union, three by the other side and then there are three independents and a Chairman. (Mr. WALCOTT: You can still see that the odds are against us.) The hon. member says that the odds are against him. (Mr. WALCOTT: It is only a mathematical deduction. If there are only three Trade Unionists on that Board, then there are six members against three.)

I can assure this House that quite a few of the agreements which were agreed to by this Board were unanimous. They reported to me whenever they agreed because I have to take them to the Cabinet after which they would be put to the Executive Committee. This \$5.00 a week, Mr. Speaker, went back to the Board for consideration.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member does not have to say that because the hon. member will see a letter from the Barbados Workers' Union protesting against that.

Hon. M. E. COX: This is the second time this minimum wage of \$5.00 a week went back to the Board. Of course, I may say that this is the minimum and it is based on a certain number of hours' work. An employer cannot pay less than that if the worker puts in a certain number of hours. Let me say that there is nobody who has fought for workers harder than I have and, say what you like, there is nobody whose desire it is to see workers get decent wages on which they can live more than I. This thing came to me and I sent it back. But what is the position? The law lays it down that when these recommendations are made, if the Governor-in-Executive Committee does not agree - well we can approve but we did not approve - therefore, how can you blame us for paying low wages when we sent it back? The recommendation made by the Shops' Council came up too and it came up with \$13 as the maximum and we sent it back.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise again on a point of order. I want the hon. member to know that a protest was made by us. The hon. member knows that the Union protested against the wage. He cannot say that we did not protest. It was a protest made under the Shops' Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member informing the House that a protest was made by the Union?

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir. It was a question of \$16 a week. I am pointing out to the hon. member that a protest was made, but that it was not made on a question of wages, it was a question of shop assistants.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think we should get away from that.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of explanation - - -

Mr. SPEAKER: This is Parliament; this is not a Trade Union meeting.
6.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member has been repeatedly attributing to me that I was opposed to the passing of this Resolution and that this Resolution dealt with the Order. What I said, I will explain again, and I think it is a question of normal intelligence. I was making a statement to the effect that it is well within the province of the Government that when they are granting these concessions to these people - just as the hon. member knows that they are going to employ about forty people - it is within the province of the Government to go and query what the wages are going to be.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid it is getting late and we will not be able to carry on because the matter is controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I should have to draw to the attention of hon. members that they should allow me to hear the hon. member who is addressing the House. I am hearing voices from both sides of the Chair at the moment and I am unable to decipher.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I am not interested in the controversy which is going on between the two hon. members. It is either that the hon. member is accepting the postponement or he has got the facts for which we have asked. Those are the facts which we need.

Hon. M. E. COX: I regret that time does not afford me to give all the information to the House which I would like to give, because these speeches are political speeches (MEMBERS: All speeches are political speeches.) However, Sir, the hon. member asked about revenue. He asked how much do we give up by way of revenue as compared with the number of persons employed and the amount which these people get over a year.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I asked is this: surely the Minister would know that he is amending the Customs Tariff Regulations in respect of unfinished garments. If he is allowing these garments to be finished in Barbados you can see what is going to happen. In actual fact, I am asking what it is going to cost us; what revenue are we losing? What do we import and what do we get relative to socks and stockings over a period of a year? That is really what I want to know.

Hon. M. E. COX: In 1954, the amount was \$5,328. In 1955, \$6,826. In 1956 \$9,205. In 1957 \$10,174. In 1958 \$13,129. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What is that?) It is revenue from the importation of these items.

As far as the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. John is concerned, the items will be imported chiefly from Hong Kong (Mr. MOTTLEY: I thought so.) and from the United States of America. I said in my opening remarks - I do not know where he got the idea from that this concern would employ six people - that it would employ forty people.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member did not understand what I said; I said that if this concern is going to employ forty people, why is it that under the Act which we are now debating you say 'not less than six'? Because that leaves it open for anybody to come in and say that he will employ six people. Why say six if they are going to be as many as forty?

Hon. M. E. COX: When I was introducing the Resolution I said that we would turn out eight hundred dozen, six hundred dozen will be exported and two hundred dozen will be for local consumption.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I pointed out to the hon. member that I was not criticising him, but I thought he had made a mistake. He said two hundred dozen would be for local consumption and the other eight hundred dozen for export. I was really asking him whether the amount was eight hundred dozen or six hundred dozen which would be going out; because eight hundred would have been his slip.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the question was asked as to whether the Development Board had given this matter its blessing. I would like to assure hon. members that in respect of any of these items which we have brought before this House - hon. members will know that we had a Board prior to the coming in of pioneer industries and that Board used to make concessions for applicants. The Development Board has taken the place of that Board now; these applications are submitted from time to time and the Development Board makes recommendations. It is not a question of somebody coming into the Ministry and telling the Minister: 'I want this, that and the other', and the matter is agreed upon in the manner in which the hon. member says.

But the hon. member always likes to sneer. This application was made since the 31st July, 1959, by the Development Board and it was signed by the Manager, Mr. Shepherd, for this concession. Since then we have had letters following and the last letter we received from the same Mr. Shepherd was just a little before the eve of his departure again reminding us of the anxiety of the Knitting Mills people about this question. This letter was written on the 29th September, 1959.

6.55 p.m.

He said that they will subsequently be processing the stockings through the usual knitting, dyeing and sewing machines. They will serve on the local market and for export. I give the assurance that we will employ approximately 40 people.

Those are the type of applications we get, and that is the position and the process through which these things come and not really running to a Minister where a member can feel and say that people lobby the Minister. Not that a person cannot come; the Ministry is open for anybody to come at any time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that he explained the policy of the Board. Could the member say whether it is a fact that if the Board recommends or declines to recommend, the Cabinet can act on its own?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not that I would like to stifle information, but I think it is a most unusual manner for a question of that sort to be put to a Minister when he is replying.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, Sir, the hon. member pointed out in reply how pioneer status is usually given. I understand that, but I wanted to get it clear and for the record, and I am sure the Minister would not object to answering that, if it is a fact that where the Board fails to recommend.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to conduct Parliament according to the Rules. I am the last man to be against the Government giving any member or any group information. I say that a question of that sort cannot be put to a Minister when he is replying. They can be put as asides, but the member will not be allowed to get on his feet and ask those questions because he is actually making another speech and I have to guard against that. The hon. member can debate it but it is not in the Rules of this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member knows but he still makes the mistake.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister made a statement in reply saying how it was done.

Mr. SPEAKER: How is the hon. member speaking now?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Asking a question is not a point of order. The hon. member is out of order, and I must rule. This is Parliament and this sort of thing cannot be allowed to go on.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If Your Honour rules that, I must sit.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not question Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: It cannot be questioned.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It can be, but maybe not in here.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is after 7 o'clock p.m.

The question that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. COREIN; Mr. GODDARD; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. TALMA; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. BARROW; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 8.

NOES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE; Mrs. BOURNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. STRAUGHN; Mr. SMITH and Mr. WALCOTT - 11.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE; Mrs. BOURNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. STRAUGHN; Mr. SMITH; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. TALMA; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. BARROW; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 16.

NOES: Mr. CORBIN; Mr. GODDARD and Mr. MOTTLEY - 3.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 19th July, at 12 noon.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I beg to withdraw that motion.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

7.05 p.m.

On resumption.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I observe that there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1960-61, No. 6

MICROFILMING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, this is not entirely a new matter, but mostly a revote to defray the cost of the microfilming of certain documents. The history of the affair is that for over five years this Government has been trying to secure the services of an expert and the necessary machinery for the purpose of microfilming those very old newspapers and other documents. Year after year the appeal had been kept up until April, 1959, when the application was more or less favoured and the UNESCO people promised to send us down an expert with the necessary equipment to get this work done. As a result of that, this Honourable House saw fit to pass a Resolution for the sum of \$5,420 to defray the cost.

But it so happened that as a result of the demands for this expert he did not reach us until the 25th June, this year, and he has already begun operations. He has started on the microfilming of the Lucas manuscripts and he is using the facilities provided at the Education Department. We have provided him with an assistant who will stand to benefit in that the assistant will be trained in microfilming and we expect that when this bit of work is over this expert would have succeeded in getting a locally trained man to do the work and then it will be up to the Government to buy the equipment.

Hon. members will notice that on this occasion we are only asking for \$5,350 as against the sum of \$5,420 which was asked on the previous occasion, which is a difference of roughly \$70. I would like to account for that. That is due to the fact that the cost of hotel rates in the off season is a little cheaper than in the tourist season. On this occasion, we only have to provide for 161 days at \$7.00 a day while on the first occasion, we had to provide for 161 days, some at \$7.00 a day in the off season and 23 days at \$8.00 a day in the tourist season. On this occasion, we have only days in the off season to provide for and so the difference of \$70 has come in.

I do not think there is anything which I have omitted to tell this Honourable House; yet, if there are matters on which hon. members feel that they have not been given information, I will be only too willing to supply the information. I, therefore, have much pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, one always appreciate how the Hon. Minister of Education introduces any measure into this Chamber. He sets an example to so many of his colleagues that it is a pity that they do not attempt to follow his example. He even tried to anticipate us by giving us the reason for the difference between the amount of \$5,350 which is now asked for as against the amount of \$5,420 which was asked for on the last occasion.

What I do want to say is that it would be good if people who are coming to this island under similar conditions would try to spend most of their time in the off season and thereby save the taxpayers some of our dollars.

I must also say that this Resolution was given notice of on the 21st June, and the Addendum states: "It is now expected that he will arrive during the month of June for a stay of about six months."

One wonders how long before the Resolution was introduced that they knew of this thing. One does not like to refuse to vote an amount if the person is here actually doing the work already. It would be difficult to refuse to vote the funds because the individual is already at work. One wonders if there was any unnecessary delay in introducing the Resolution.

There is only one other thing which I would like to ask. One wonders if the Hon. Minister of Education would ascertain from this expert whether he would be willing, and if so, he would recommend to the appropriate Ministry that this expert do a similar service in the Registry of this island because there is no doubt that there are some ancient documents which would be advantageous to have microfilmed just as is done with these 300 years-and-over newspapers.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I am slightly off the point of the Resolution but I wonder if the Hon. Minister will enquire as to the willingness of the expert to render similar service on the other very important documents in the Registry and if so when he can advise his colleagues that we on this side would support the retention of this gentleman, especially if we get him to finish before the tourist season is on, so as to do some microfilming of those important ancient documents which are very necessary to be done.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, as far as the suggestion which has come from the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, I wish to say that I think this expert will only

be here for six months and he has approximately 100,000 pages of films to be dealt with over that period. I would venture to say that if this job is got through within the time, the gentleman would do that work. If it happens that he cannot stay on to carry out the work, I think that this Government would be in a sort of position to have it done because this expert assures me that if the person whom we have assisting him is apt, he can pass the mark in six months time and it will only be left to the Government to supply the necessary equipment for this assistant to carry on. 7.55 p.m.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, infixing the Order Paper, the first item will be Committee of Supply and the other items will remain the same.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any change under Private Members' Business?

Mr. BRANCKER: A motion for "No Confidence" always takes precedence. (*Laughter.*)

SELECT COMMITTEES DISCHARGED

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to discharge the following Select Committees:— The Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate The United Holy Church of America (Barbados District).

The Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to authorise the sale of Glebe Lands and the Parsonage House of St. Michael.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 19th July, 1960, 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, 19th July, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.00 p.m.