
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 29th August, 1961.

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, Q.C. (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); MR. J. W. CORBIN and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to lay The National Income of Barbados, 1956-59,

And, on my own behalf, The Customs Duties (United Nations) Order, 1961 and the Customs Duties (Materials and Components for the Manufacture of Domestic Electrical Appliances) Order, 1961.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. M. E. COX (On behalf of the Hon. Premier):

Resolution to place the sum of \$785 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1961-62 No. 17 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Resolution to place the sum of \$1 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1961-62, No. 18 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee of a parcel of land at Graves End to the Barbados Light & Power Co. Ltd.

Hon. M. E. COX (On behalf of the Hon. Premier): A Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to change the name of the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh Day Adventists to the Eastern Caribbean Conference of Seventh Day Adventists and for matters incidental thereto.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958, be now read a first time.

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

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

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to change the name of the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh Day Adventists to the Eastern Caribbean Conference of Seventh Day Adventists and for matters incidental thereto, be now read a first time.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 5

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are entered upon, I beg to move that Orders Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

The question that these Orders be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5 was put and resolved without division.

12.25 p.m.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ST. JOSEPH

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of two parcels of land in St. Joseph for the erection of communal baths.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of two parcels of land in the parish of St. Joseph for the erection of communal baths. I think, Sir, that this is now regarded as a formality. In accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, the approval of the Legislature is sought for the compulsory acquisition of two areas of land in St. Joseph for the purposes set out in the Resolution.

As a further comment, one of the communal baths at Horse Hill, St. Joseph is ready for official opening, and the second bath at Lammings, St. Joseph, I think, is under construction.

With those few remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, while I am very glad to see that some effort is being made for the acquisition of these two sites for the erection of these baths, there was another site to be acquired for the purpose of housing, and I am very surprised to see that the Resolution only mentions the two sites for the erection of these baths and not the particular site which has been selected for the purpose of establishing a housing area on the same plantation land in St. Joseph. I know, Sir, that this may not be under the Minister's portfolio, but I hope that the Minister of Communications will be able to let the House know the reason why that land has not been included in this Resolution, since the other two sites are mentioned here. As I said, I do not know if the reason is that Housing does not come under the portfolio of the Minister of Social Services, but I would still like to know whether it is still the intention of the Government to acquire this particular site.

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

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES PENSIONS ACT, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to make further provision for the grant and payment of pensions and gratuities to certain employees of the Government of this Island.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to bring up to date the Public Employees Pensions Act. Members will know that....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister asking leave to deal with this Bill?

Hon. M. E. COX: Since your ruling on the last occasion, Mr. Speaker, you will appreciate that, as you said, if objection is taken that is the end of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, and I am asking if the hon. member is asking leave to deal with it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was not asking leave for two reasons; I do not think it is necessary, because under May's a Minister can take charge of any Bill standing in the name of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is May's, but when a Parliament has its own precedent, that has to be followed. The hon. member will ask leave and then continue.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with Order No. 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to deal with Order No. 2, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I was saying, Sir, that this Bill seeks to bring up to date the Public Employees Act of 1937. As

members will see, the Pensions Act, 1937 is a very short Act and it appears to be out of date since you will see, provision in that Act is made for a few categories of labour. For example, there are artisans, caretakers, cleaners, crews of harbour craft, District foremen, gardeners, labourers, lorry drivers, meter inspectors, porters, Range Wardens, scrubbers, turncocks, watchmen. Since then, Mr. Speaker, a large number of additions has been made to the Pensions Act, and from that point of view alone members will see and I think it is correct to state that persons other than those mentioned in the 1937 Act are entitled to a pension and do get their pensions. Yet at the same time it is felt that there is no point having this Act remain as it stands today when it does not carry out the full intents and purposes and the practice which obtains today so far as the granting of pensions and gratuities are concerned.

12.35 p.m.

I do not think it is necessary that members should go through the background of this 1937 Act, but from a historical review of this setup, they will see that this Pensions Bill is a result of petitions made to the Government at that time. It is a fact that although many of them have done as many years of service as public officers they did not receive pension because, as was pointed out then, they were not regarded as public officers. Subsequently, some move was made to provide for petitions within fairly circumscribed limits.

This Bill, as hon. members will see, seeks to widen that scope and at the same time it deletes from the Schedule "Unestablished Staff" and provides for "Public Employees". Then, Mr. Speaker, as you will see, parts of this Bill are taken from the 1947 Pension Act. You will remember last week we passed a similar Bill to provide for casual employees and parts of that were also taken from the 1947 Pension Act. This Bill contains parts of the 1947 Act which we feel are appropriate to be inserted in it.

I may say in anticipation of a member asking something of this paragraph which states in the Objects and Reasons "as a result much difficulty has been experienced in applying the provisions of this later Act to public employees" that I was not responsible, as Your Honour will appreciate, for this Bill. This is the Premier's Bill but at a late moment since he left the Island I undertook to deal with it. I checked with the Auditor General to find out what the difficulties were and he said that he has not experienced difficulties in administering this Bill.

One thing can be said and that is that the public employees had no opportunity whatsoever to elect or to choose as to whether or not they were prepared to remain under the 1925, 1937 or 1947 Pension Acts. In other words, under the 1937 Act an employee could not choose whether he would retire at 60 years or 65 years of age. When the 1947 Act came into force, employees were allowed to elect or to choose whether they would retire at 60 years, 65 years of age or as the case may be. That was an advantage which did not apply under the 1937 Act to unestablished persons.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any more important aspect of this Bill. I think the important aspects have been already mentioned by me and if in case hon. members would like any further information on this Bill I should be willing to give that information.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in essence, this Bill is consolidating certain things which we owe pensioned employees: but I think I will take this opportunity to say that many changes have taken place in Barbados since the old Pension Bill was passed and the Government has undertaken more services and quasi-Government Departments since then. I would like to know what is the Government's policy in relation to workers employed by the Natural Gas Corporation and to the people working at the Transport Board. I know that something has taken place recently with the Housing Authority and something has been done with the Marketing Corporation. There are other bodies which are

working in the Public Service and there should be a clear and distinct policy as regards pensions, gratuities, and conditions of service for such persons.

This Bill also contains, Mr. Speaker, a number of days for qualification of employees. I think there should be a review. In this Bill, it is stated that 220 working days must be put in to qualify. That seems to be computed on the basis of working five and a half days per week for 50 weeks and 25 days a month. It must be borne in mind that employees only work for 50 weeks per year; the other two, in accordance with the Holiday with Pay Act, are granted to them. When you really think of it, for these workers to put in 220 days, that is something high. It connotes permanent employment working on a day to day basis.

There is also this matter which is not really connected with the Pension Bill but one which has to be made clear. The Government should set an example here and now to guarantee any man or woman working in the Police Service a week's work, and as regards the question of granting pension to them through qualification it should be laid down that as long as they are available and report for work, those days which they do not work should be counted. You also have this idea of not paying a man for a bank-holiday. That is archaic. Any man who works immediately before or after a bank-holiday should be paid for the bank-holiday. I do not see how it is fair to a man working in the Public Works Department alongside a man who is employed permanently, when a bank-holiday comes along, that the man who is permanently employed is paid for the bank-holiday but the one who is not permanent is not paid. What is the logic in that? I feel if all of these workers were given the privilege that any week in which they work is regarded as a full week even though a bank holiday may intervene, it will go a long way to enhance their pension commitments because it would mean that every day of the year that the worker works plus these days that come in between like a bank-holiday, would be put to his credit and help him to qualify in putting in the number of days. In private industries though pensions are not paid in the same way to the employees, conditions of employment include bank holidays, and no deduction is made for them. I do think the idea of not paying for bank-holidays is not only unreasonable but it is not up-to-date with the trends of modern working. If some of these things can be rectified, it can really and truly bring this Bill up-to-date with present methods.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the point raised by the hon. member, dealing with these quasi-Governmental Departments, I would like to inform the House that as soon as the decision was taken to provide pensions and gratuities for casual employees of the Government, the various quasi-Governmental Departments were informed, that is to say, the Housing Board, etc.

12.45 p.m.

That is the policy of the Government. This Government is a Socialist Government and its thinking is more advanced socialistically than any other place in the world. What we have provided for in our legislation last week relative to pensions for casual employees does not exist in any other part of the world. Therefore, I repeat that we were the first to bring the provision for Holidays with Pay and so on into operation. We did not copy from anybody else; this idea originated with us and so has this Pension Bill in connection with casual employees. That provision did not come from any other brains. Our policy is, as far as Government Departments or quasi-Government Departments are concerned, that those persons should enjoy the same pension rights as those which are enjoyed by persons in the Government Departments. It is now for private enterprise to follow suit.

The other point mentioned by the hon. member was the question relating to bank-holidays. I presume that the hon. member knows that, on the last occasion, although the Bank Holiday in respect of Federation Day is included in the Act and it is not one of those bank holidays which are declared spasmodically, as it were, the workers were paid for that Bank Holiday. That Bank Holiday was included in the Act which made it a usual or statutory bank holiday. It was the custom not to pay workers for those bank holidays which are fixed bank holidays like those at Christmas, Easter

and so on. As I have said, the Government has broken new ground, so to speak, in paying people for the Federation Day Bank Holiday. As regards the general principle or policy of paying for bank holidays, that matter was discussed almost a year or over a year now, and it was submitted to the Civil Service Association or the Whitley Council for their views. If hon. members want to know the Government's views on that matter, they are that as long as one is expected to work either the day before or the day after a bank holiday, that individual should be paid for that bank holiday. These are matters which are taken up with the representative bodies of Government employees, casual employees notwithstanding. Just as other matters which do not come within the ambit of the Government are more or less decided between the Trade Union and the employer, just as the Trade Union is representative or supposedly representative of the workers outside of Government employees, so does the Government recognise the Whitley Council. I am sure that the hon. member knows that because at one time he used to serve on that Committee. The Government submits these matters which affect these Government workers to the Whitley Council. I am afraid that we have not received the views of the Whitley Council.

Perhaps I could go as far as to say that whether the views of the Whitley Council are consonant with the views of the Government or not, the Government will, no doubt, implement what I have just mentioned, that is, that we will see to it that although a worker may be a casual worker - I may say at this point that this Bill does not deal with casual employees; it deals with public employees who are regarded as pensionable employees before that Bill was passed in this House last week. We have already dealt with the casual employees and this Bill now deals with public employees who are entitled to a pension under the Act, and in whose case bank holidays make absolutely no difference because they are regarded as permanent employees and are paid so much per week, whether they work for seven days of the week or on no day at all.

The hon. member dealt with something which is not really in the Bill but which, perhaps, can be regarded as something congruous to the Bill, and that is why I said what I have just said. The Government's policy is this; for example, if a man is working on a job, Saturday comes and Monday is a bank holiday, but if it had not been for that bank holiday that man would have gone to work, he will be paid for that day. That, I repeat, is the Government's policy. If, for example, he starts to work on a Monday and a bank holiday comes in during the week in which case the man would normally have gone to work, the Government's policy is to pay him for that day. I do hope that what I have said will satisfy the hon. member.

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

12.55 p.m.

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive, were called and passed.

Clause 7 was called. It reads as follows:-

7. A pension, gratuity, or other allowance shall not be granted under this Act to any public employee except on his retirement from the public service in one of the following cases -

- (a) on or after attaining the age of fifty-five years;
- (b) on medical evidence to the satisfaction of the Governor that he is incapable by reason of any infirmity of mind or body of discharging the duties of his of-

office and that such infirmity is likely to be permanent.

- (c) on becoming unfit in the opinion of the Governor for the discharge of the duties of his office, although not suffering from any particular illness or infirmity likely to be permanent, if such unfitness is not attributable to his own misconduct or gross negligence, and if the Governor considers that the special circumstances of the case justify the grant to him of a pension or gratuity as the case may be.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, there is just a typographical error which should be corrected here. In the third line of sub-clause (b) I think the word should be "infirmity" instead of "informity".

Hon. M. E. COX: I thank the hon. member. It is a typographical error.

The question that Clause 7 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 8 to 13 inclusive, were called and passed.

Clause 14 was called. It reads as follows:-

14.(1) Where any person to whom a pension or other allowance has been granted under this Act is adjudicated bankrupt or is declared insolvent by judgment of any competent court, then such pension or other allowance shall forthwith cease.

(2) Where any person is adjudicated bankrupt or declared insolvent as aforesaid either -

- (a) after retirement in circumstances in which he is eligible for pension or other allowance under this Act but before any pension or other allowance is granted; or
- (b) before such retirement, and he has not obtained his discharge from bankruptcy or insolvency at the date of retirement,

then, in the former case any pension or other allowance eventually granted to him shall cease as from the date of adjudication or declaration, as the case may be, and in the latter case, the pension or other allowance may be granted, but shall cease forthwith and shall not become payable.

(3) Where a pension or other allowance ceases by reason of this section, it shall be lawful for the Governor, from time to time during the remainder of such person's life, or during such shorter period or periods, either continuous or discontinuous, as the Governor thinks fit, to direct all or any part of the moneys to which such person would have been entitled by way of pension or other allowance, had he not become bankrupt or insolvent, to be paid to, or applied for the maintenance or benefit of all, or any to the exclusion of the other or others, of the following, that is to say, such person and any wife, child or children of his in such proportions and manner as the Governor thinks proper, and such moneys shall be paid or applied accordingly.

(4) Moneys applied for the discharge of the debts of the person whose pension or other allowance has ceased by reason of this section shall, for the purposes of this section, be regarded as applied for his benefit.

(5) Where a person whose pension or other allowance has ceased by reason of this section obtains his discharge from bankruptcy or insolvency, it shall be lawful for the Governor to direct that the pension or other allowance shall be restored as from the date of such discharge or any later date, and the pension or other allowance shall be restored accordingly.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 14 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this is a regular big-time Clause, but I did not think anybody would put a small man in Bankruptcy Court if he becomes insolvent. The Section says "where any person to whom a pension or other allowance has been granted under this Act is adjudicated bankrupt or is declared insolvent by judgment of any competent Court, then such pension or other allowance shall forthwith cease". I would say that though the Act earlier states that a pension is not an absolute right, it is something you have worked for and earned already, and a pension is not more than a delayed payment and the hon. member says that here is the only place in the world where pensions are paid to Government employees.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I never said that at all, I said to casual employees.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member's world may be very small like the "small world", because I do not know if the hon. member has ever acquainted himself with the legislation that is passed throughout the world, and I would invite him some day to ask the Labour Commissioner to send up copies of I.L.O. ratifications, and he would see that the world is not the British World. There are places like Mexico, Latin America, there are 21 Republics in South America, then there is the whole of Europe, places behind the Iron Curtain, Yugoslavia and places like that. The hon. member should read some of the legislation that is passed in these places and not say that we are the only people who pay pensions to casual employees. I think that in the British Government they pay separate pensions to people whom they do not regard as being on the established clerical staff; they put them in a different category and they are provided for by a Provident Fund and the like.

I would also like to know if the hon. member can say anything about the Widows and Orphans Fund and whether these people would be asked to make a compulsory contribution to it. I do not know if this Government has ever given any consideration to the contributions made under the Widows and Orphans Fund and whether this Fund has anything to offer these people, or if they are putting more money into it than they are getting. I understand that some of the workers in the Public Service are required to pay as much as 4% of their salaries into the Widows and Orphans Fund. Four percent is a very high amount to pay, because even in the United States you only pay 3-3/4% into the Old Age and Survivors Pensions Fund from your salary at a certain point. I have no brief for anybody who would not pay his debts, but I would like to know what is the underlying reason for making a man become ineligible for having his pension. For some given reason he may invest his pension or gratuity in something which fails and is declared a bankrupt, and it looks to me hard-cut to ask that man to lose what he has already earned.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Before the Minister replies, I should like to know whether it is not possible to make arrangements by which a man's pension itself may be exempt from any provisions of the Bankruptcy Act or whatever it is. 1.05 p.m.

I do not know the particular Act under which that would come, but the reason is, I think, that Government would not want pensions which they are paying out to go towards paying anybody who would find themselves in bankruptcy or to any person in bankruptcy. I wonder if it were not possible for pensions to be exempted although I know that the granting of a pension is not an absolute right before you give it to him: but after he retires you give him that pension and you therefore agree that he should be given a pension. Therefore, I would consider that the fact that a man gets into bankruptcy or if anything happens after his retirement is something extraneous to his pension rights.

We are actually saying here that even though you put in service to get a pension and the Government has agreed to grant it, something can happen to the individual after his service to stop him from getting it. I would like an interpretation given that though the granting of a pension is right, it has greater force before the employee retires;

but after he retires and gets a pension it seems as if you are forcing the point to say that he should not get it by what you are doing here. I am wondering whether pensions should not be exempted from bankruptcy. I do not see any provision for a person who is a bankrupt getting around it. There might be some way in making a provision in which you may take advantage of the Act.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member wants to know if it is possible to get around it, I would say "yes, it is possible". The House of Assembly can pass any law it wants but, as far as I can see, it would be totally undesirable to have such a law passed.

What is the position? The theory behind it is that even though you are a retired man, you must set a high standard of behaviour in the community as a Civil Servant. You retire and it does not necessarily mean that after you retire that you should live a life of a spendthrift, that you should incur debts and pay nobody and then everybody can say: "Look! he was in the Government Service for all these years getting a salary and now he gets a pension and just would not pay Mr. X or Mr. Y". Even though he retires he has got to set a high standard of behaviour and a pattern which people would follow. That is the theory behind it.

Look through the 1947 Pension Act and you will see it. Even when a man dies and contributions are to be made under the Act it means that the widow or his legal representative should also be of good character and conduct.

I can see absolutely nothing wrong with it and I support it one hundred percent because, after all, you are drawing the taxpayers' money and a Civil Servant should set a high example. You should not go all about and get people's things and do not pay for them. You must learn to live within a certain limit and to lead a life which others should follow. That is the theory behind it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am very thankful to the Hon. Minister. I can call the name of a man who is holding a high position as an example of what I am trying to say. Do not let us talk about this thing in that way. Do not get this idea of saying that a person lives above their means. I know the Hon. Minister is aware of what I am saying. Do not let us say that. The Hon. Minister says that he agrees one hundred per cent with it. He should not say that because when this Bill was worked out, he was nowhere in here.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order, Sir. This applies to the 1947 Pension Act and I was a member of this House in 1944.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, the Pension Act went back further than 1947. The idea of granting a pension to a Government employee is something that was done before you came in here. In 1947, you made an amendment to the Pension Act. That was not the first Pension Act which was passed. We are amending the Pension Act now. Are you suggesting that anybody coming in the House in 1961 is providing pensions for Government employees?

I do not think the Hon. Minister paid any attention to what I have said. You say that you are passing an Act to provide pensions for public employees and not people working for high salaries. Public employees are the kind of men who are bound to live above their means.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member is a bit confused as regards who are public employees. Public employees can work for a bigger salary than a public officer. All it means is that public employees do not hold a particular office. A public employee does not hold a particular office.

Mr. WALCOTT: There is a Schedule at the back of the Bill. When you look at the Schedule you see that it means people in the Agricultural Credit Bank, the Housing Authority and then it says: apprentice, attendant, blacksmith, blacksmith striker, boatman, boatswain, butler, cantonnier, caretaker, carpenter, charge hand, checker, chlorination assistant, cleaner, cook, coxswain, crew - fisheries' boat,

district workman, driver, fitter, fireman, foreman, fumigating hand, gardener, gauger, labourer, laboratory worker, loader, etc.

Now, which of these people in the Second Schedule works for a big lot of money? These are people who are working for 35 cents and 40 cents an hour. The Hon. Minister has expressed the view that he is one hundred percent in favour of the section and that these people should live within their means.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order. I did not say that they should live within their means. I said that they should not go all about and incur debts and then do not pay them. Everybody at some time or other, except perhaps the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for the City, has to incur debts or live above their salaries, but you should not live too far above it so that you cannot make an adjustment when the time comes. 1.15 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. What did I hear the hon. member say? Did I hear him say that I live above my salary? I want to say that if the hon. member refers to me as a millionaire, that was said about me in Queen's Park and on the next day the people gave way to me on the side walk. Therefore that does not worry me.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister says that he did not put it in the way in which I put it; but I put it as I heard it from him. I quite agree with this general code of behaviour, that people should live within their means. All I was doing was enumerating the list of people and I was explaining the matter to the hon. member. I was appealing to the hon. member's conscience and pointing out that when such persons get a little gratuity, they will take their gratuity and try to invest it and perhaps they will open rum shops. A man such as that gets a pension, his wife might be selling a little balled starch, seaeggs or okras and there is the possibility that an occasion such as I have mentioned will occur. You are not suggesting that a man who has worked for all of his years and acquired pension should be treated in such a way that you will take away that pension from him.

Another point is this: I do not agree that a man should pay income tax on his pension. We should have a law removing the payment of income tax on a pension. I am not in that category; therefore, I am not asking for anything for myself. In the United States of America there is legislation whereby you do not include income tax in a man's pension. You should at that stage be working free wheel with what you are taking home. You want to be progressive in your thinking in order to keep up with modern trends. Here a man will lose his pension if he is put in Court and declared insolvent. When the Pension Act was brought forward in 1925 that is the sort of thinking which was in vogue. I want to say that bankruptcy does not connote that you are corrupt; you must have a Bankruptcy Act so as to protect people because they will credit. At the same time, if a pension is the only means of a man's living and he loses it, then he goes on public assistance.

I have just mentioned these things to the Minister in order to show that these may be things in respect of which you will ask the Governor-in-Executive Committee to have a say. You want to give people protection instead of making things too harsh for them. I do not think that one should be precluded from getting a pension subsequent to his eligibility for such pension. You want to protect the public from people who feel that they are eligible for pensions, that they can do as they like and you still have to give them their pensions as of right. After you have your pension I am a believer in that if you go to prison your pension should be there until after you come out of prison. Suppose you give a man a gratuity! Are you going back and say that he must give back that gratuity because he has been to prison? If you paid this money in a lumpsum you cannot get it back from the man. In the old days it was proved that a lumpsum payment was not in the best interest of the people. In 1925 some people got lumpsums and they elected - I may say that a man in my position was asked whether he would accept money under the new system or under the old system and some people elected to draw out all the money. I am only

drawing to the Minister's attention that it is not a matter of my being against having a law to protect people from themselves; all I am saying is that if a man is qualified to draw his pension there is room and scope for discretion to be used so that in certain cases he would not lose his pension. It would seem to me to be a harsh law to preclude a man from something when he is already eligible for it.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question I would like the Hon. Minister to explain what is meant by the words: "Where any person to whom a pension or other allowance has been granted under this Act is adjudicated bankrupt or is declared insolvent by judgment of any competent Court." I would like to draw to the Minister's attention that it is not uncommon to find many people who are sued for debt but who have no property on which to levy and the debt has to be collected on a Judgment Summons. I want to know if such a pensioner would be declared insolvent. I would like to know whether, in the Civil Court, where a debt of under \$250 is sued for and the judgment debtor has nothing to levy against and is brought up by a judgment summons and is ordered to pay so much a month — I am asking whether in view of the fact that a debt of £50 and over can cause a person to be adjudged a bankrupt, and whether in a case like that, he can be regarded as insolvent by the judgment of any competent court.

1.25 p.m.

I would like to hear what the Legislature has in mind. We should not leave this open and blank because when a Bill is being dealt with that is the time when some clear definition should be given on certain points of this nature. It may be possible, Mr. Chairman, for a pensioner to have many small debts which, when lumped together, may amount to \$240, and that is the amount on which he can be adjudged bankrupt. I want to know if a person whose debt amounts to \$240 can be declared as being insolvent by judgment of any competent Court. This is a dangerous piece of legislation and is fashioned on the old Conservative type of legislation. It is fashioned on the Pensions Act of 1947 and the Pensions Act of 1925. Although you have the two Pensions Acts on the Statute Book, and although you claim to be Socialists, in passing Socialist legislation in the Year of Grace, 1961 which you claim is to assist public employees in the lower income bracket, you are modelling the legislation along the lines of the Tory Government of 1925.

In my opinion, Sir, the very spirit of the legislation is destroyed in that whereas you appear to be helping the public employees in the lower bracket who have been permanently employed in the various Departments or quasi-Departments of Government, yet in reality you are putting them in an awkward position, because with the high cost of living it is very easy for a man who is in receipt of an income of \$40 a week and who gets as a pension rate two-thirds of that amount to fall into some arrears. I am therefore asking the Minister to explain precisely what is meant by "or is declared insolvent by judgment of any competent Court." I want to know which Court is a competent Court, whether the Police Magistrate's Court, the Civil Court or the Supreme Court.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, in the first place when I replied to the hon. member just now, I should have reminded him that as far as the Public employees are concerned they are not called upon to make a contribution to the Widows and Orphans Fund. These people are carpenters, masons, etc. as I read just now from the Schedule. I believe though, that members apparently have lost sight of the spirit of this Section, and if they look back to the 1925 Act to which I referred, they will see that absolutely no provision for a pension was made for people like these. There was no question of a pension in those days at all. This Bill is copied word for word from the 1947 Act, and although the hon. senior member for Christ Church who has just sat down talked about Conservative legislation, I think I am correct in saying that the member was a member of this House at that time, and it was not then regarded as Conservative. This is what the 1947 Act says:-

"If any person to whom a pension or other allowance has been granted under this Act is adjudicated bankrupt or is declared insolvent by judgment of any competent Court, then such pension or allowance shall forthwith cease." But

it does not stop there. I am sorry, as I said, that the hon. member did not see the spirit of the thing; the spirit is to put a brake upon a pensioner who would disgrace the whole Service. Although he is not a member of the Service, he was a member of the Service and there can be reflections and repercussions in these cases. Let us go a little further on and read subclause (3) of Clause 14. It reads as follows:-

"Where a pension or other allowance ceases by reason of this section it shall be lawful for the Governor, from time to time, during the remainder of such person's life or during such shorter period or periods either continuous or discontinuous as the Governor thinks fit, to direct all or any part of the moneys to which such person would have been entitled by way of pension or other allowance, had he not become bankrupt or insolvent, to be paid to, or applied for the maintenance or benefit of, all or any to the exclusion of other or others, of the following, that is to say, such person and any wife, child or children of his in such proportions and manner as the Governor thinks proper, and such moneys shall be paid or applied accordingly."

In other words, you put a brake on the man, but then there are discretionary powers provided for in the Bill where the Governor says that despite the fact that the pension ceases because of your being a bankrupt, he will yet give that pension to your wife, your child or children, as the case may be. I will go on now to subclause (5) of the same section which reads as follows:-

"Where a person whose pension or other allowance has ceased by reason of this section obtains his discharge from bankruptcy or insolvency, it shall be lawful for the Governor to direct that the pension or other allowance shall be restored as from the date of such discharge or any later day, and the pension or other allowance shall be restored accordingly."

Mr. WALCOTT: What the hon. member has just said is in connection with a person who obtains his discharge from bankruptcy or insolvency. I do not pretend to be a legal man, but the first part seems to be that if the man has a wife or people dependent on him, the Governor would grant the pension to these people and not to the man himself. The Governor shall have the authority to give the pension to his wife or children if he has children going to school. 1.35 p.m.

As I have said, what I am asking is if the Governor has discretion to give it to the man himself. You may not have any children and the Governor will say that since you have no children I would let you go. The same principle behind the granting of pensions is the same principle behind the granting of Holidays with Pay. The House says that even if you steal you are entitled to Holidays with Pay so long as you work the number of days because you have earned it.

We are not saying that this section is not in the Act of 1925 or in the 1947 Act. As a matter of fact, I believe you will put this Section in any Act: but I say that the powers of discretion are bound to arise and you cannot say of all the instances that arise that you will want to be hard on anybody. Some people may get as high as \$14,000 or \$15,000 and they believe that they can make almost that sum on what they invest in the next year and they go and throw the money they invested away. In the case of a bankrupt as a result of a man failing in business, it is not that he walked about and credited from people and would not pay; it is a question that he failed in his business venture. Some people fail in a business venture and then come back and do well. Sir, this is not anything which we are quarrelling about. All we are suggesting is that powers of discretion should be wide enough to cover all eventualities.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I can assure the hon. member that the power is that wide. This is really a protection for the man's wife and children. Had it not been for this, that pension would have to be paid into the Bankruptcy Court. Where the Governor has power to grant that pension, the Governor will give that pension to the man's wife or his children. Another instance is that the money can be seized by the Court. There are so many points in this and I must confess, in the first place, it serves as a brake on the individual in

public. It prevents a man from being rash, indifferent, wild and so on and, in another case, it protects his family because as soon as he gets into a lapse, there can be nothing for the family if there was not this protection. Since you have this protection, the Governor can, although you are bankrupt and insolvent, pay this pension which you would get to your wife and children. As a matter of fact, this is not really taking it away from the pensioner because if this pension is paid to his wife, he would eat and drink out of it.

As regards the point raised by the hon. junior member for Christ Church such insolvency, I do not know if he has a different interpretation than that of mine, but as far as I have been able to understand, insolvency is when a man's liabilities exceed his assets. He might not have been declared by the Court to be insolvent because he has not reached the Court, yet he owes away more than he is worth.

The hon. members enquires about the phrase "competent court." That is a common phrase which is used all along. In some cases, as hon. members know, some people go into liquidation which is known as voluntary liquidation, that is to say, you are not quite broke; yet you say: "Let me get rid of some things now and get out of this business."

The question that Clause 14 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 15 and 16 were called separately and passed.

Clause 17 was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, there is a typographical error in paragraph (vi) of this Clause. It reads as follows:-

"If the deceased employee does not leave a widow or a mother, or if a pension is not granted to his widow or mother, and if his father was holding or mainly dependent on him for his support, ..."

You will see that the words "of if" occur after "widow or mother". It should be "or if". With that amendment, I beg to move that Clause 17 stand part.

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

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

Clauses 18 to 22 were called separately and passed.

The First Schedule was called and passed.

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

The Third Schedule was called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

1.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

The question that this Bill be now read a third time 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 Bill was passed.

OLD AGE PENSION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Old Age Pension Act, 1937.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a Bill to amend the Old Age Pension Act, 1937. I am anxious to discuss this matter at length. There are a number of things, there are a number of statistics to be given, and I am hoping that hon. members of this House will be willing to make the necessary notes in order that they can be given the necessary answers and be satisfied as to the answers to those questions which would be asked over this lengthy debate. The Government's function - I would be thinking of modern Governments and added to that is the Socialist Government that we have - is to think not only of the responsibility to the working classes but also of the people who are unable to provide for themselves and who will forever remain the responsibility of the State.

The Bill requires very little of Parliament. The basis of it is to increase the rate paid to the Old Age Pensioners from \$1.80 per week to \$2.15 per week. In order to make it work, it will be necessary to increase the "means test" from \$3.00 to \$3.60 per week. It will be necessary at this stage to remind Parliament that although we are sometimes faced with the name and term "old age pension", in truth and in fact this term is only an attempt at adding charity to what is sometimes regarded as unkind, if not uncouth, poor relief. In the very moment that you set up a "means test", that is a form of relief.

The history of all of this is well known. If you want to take a quick look at how things have been changing from 1937, from that time the pensioners got 48 cents and then the Government, in its wisdom and anxiety to satisfy the needy in our community, got the assistance of Professor Richardson who released his Report in 1954. His recommendations, however, are outmoded, if not obsolete. The principles will remain forever and although that can be regarded as a magnificent document, evolution tells us that there is a changing pattern of economic thinking about our financial resources, and over that brief period by a quick look from 1955 it is clear that the country's pattern has changed so that this document is now outmoded and miserably out of date.

In 1953 when Professor Richardson was making a statement of the country's reserves, the Government's estimate of revenue was \$14 million; in 1961 the estimated revenue is over \$24 1/2 million. I think that a good study of these figures would reveal what has happened with our economy and it is for this reason that Professor Richardson's Report can now be regarded as outmoded, and an attempt is being made to bring it up-to-date. Professor Richardson was thinking of stop-gap arrangements, the sort of poor relief which is now being brought into Old Age Pension. Hon. members will remember, if they have made some study of the Report itself and you, Mr. Speaker, had something to do with the Report, that Professor Richardson's recommendation in connection with poor relief was to take the amount to \$2.40. Of course, that was tied to a number of important factors one of which was whether or not the country's financial position would remain favourable. The recommendation was to move from this amount of \$1.80 and then by stages to go up to \$2.40. Now that we are thinking of Old Age Pensions, this must be accepted as the Government's idea. This is not the continuation of the Old Age Pension scheme; this is a question of bringing the idea of the Old Age Pension scheme to an end, and the idea of the increase of 35 cents is only to be accepted as Christian and temporary in every sense of the word, to take care of the interim period until we are in a position (Mr. WALCOTT: To take care of the Election.) Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we should be reminded of the Election; it leaves me sad. Why should the Government be always accused of doing something on the eve of the Election? Should we continue to leave the community dejected, broken down and hungry because of the Election? Should we leave out these people whether there is an Election or not? I want to assure the hon. member that we were never concerned about the Election in bringing forward this matter. I may say that we are not unhappy about the Election. Think of visiting a family unit and seeing all the adults eating around a table and the little children on the other side being unattended.

1.55 p.m.

We know that you cannot ask a child to wait because he is unaware of patience; but we are concerned, and you know only too well that we have appointed a Commissioner and

we are now working with this Salaries Commissioner to increase the salaries of the Service. It is a question now of what we are going to do with Pensioners. Should we ask these old people to wait until all this is decided? The Government has decided on this as an interim measure and since we are working on a full-fledged scheme for social security, I think the House, Parliament and the public generally are all aware that Mr. Stockman is expected to start his work in Barbados two months from now and all the other things indicate where we are going with regard to social security. I take it, and it is my prayer, that this Parliament would accept the decision from this change of \$1.80 like that of the first crack of dawn, the first light in the change in the evolution of what is taking place with social security as against public assistance and Old Age Pensions.

A quick look at the history of this would possibly be so revealing, I believe, that it would probably invoke a number of discussions on this matter, and I am very anxious because it means so much to our country if you will look quickly at the change. It will be remembered, Sir, that I joined the Ministry at the end of December, 1956, and three months later across my desk I was expected to reply to requests from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Lennox-Boyd, on a question asked in the British Parliament by Mr. Frank Allom, Conservative member for South Paddington. This was on 13th March, 1957. The hon. gentleman wanted to know what provision was made in Barbados by the British Government by way of pensions and relief to the needy in our community. He was more or less unaware of our position, not only as a colony and a territory in that age, and he want to find out something about the back ground information.

In our reply to Mr. Lennox-Boyd, the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, we sent him all the information and included a copy of the Report and all the background matter available to us dating back even before the first pension in 1935 was paid at 48 cents a week. It is easy to examine what has been taking place since then. Mr. Lennox-Boyd more or less explained in the House and replied to Mr. Frank Allom.

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 draw to Your Honour's attention that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that there are no answers ready.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Michael is asking to proceed with a short Bill or Resolution of some sort which he says will not take any time.

Mr. SPEAKER: That will have to come after Question Time is over.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Questions:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

How many categories of housing are there in the Six Roads, St. Philip Housing Scheme?

2. What is the total cost of construction of a house in each category?

3. What is the rental per house in each category?

4. How many houses are there occupied and how many unoccupied?

5. What is the total of the arrears in all categories?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that fully fifteen (15) years ago, equipment was acquired with public funds for the purpose of reclaiming the land area known as the Constitution Swamp?

2. Will the Minister please state what has become of the equipment and why it has not yet been utilized for the purpose for which it was purchased?
2.35 p.m.

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that it is now fully seventeen (17) years since both Houses of the Legislature agreed to the construction of the East Coast Road and the cycle track from Thickets?

2. Is the Minister aware that the equipment was actually ordered from England to proceed with it?

3. Is the Minister aware that the Island was offered a free grant of \$288,000 under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, for certain projects including this one?

4. Does the Minister regard the proposal as a major engineering project?

5. Is the Minister aware that since January 1947, the Highway Commissioners of St. Joseph submitted to the Government that if they were provided with the necessary funds they would construct the St. Joseph portion of the road and supply all the rollers and supervision?

6. Is the Minister aware that:

(a) since the abandonment of the railway, there are now 226 acres of land in the East Coast area, lying fallow and being eroded because the owners have no means of getting out their crop?

(b) reclamation of these 226 acres of land would provide work for 140 persons in its cultivation?

(c) wages for cultivation and reaping would put over \$100,000 in circulation annually among the people?

(d) the putting of 226 acres back into cultivation will provide more food and additional revenue for the Island?

(e) the greater part of the expenditure on the road would be on unskilled labour; that on cement, steel and lumber would be relatively small?

(f) the parishioners of St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. Joseph and St. Andrew have forwarded a petition to the Government asking that this road be built?

(g) the Committee appointed to examine and report upon the continuance or otherwise of the railway recommended its abandonment with the specific proviso that it should be replaced by a vehicular roadway?

(h) there are over 40 small holders who own plots in this area ranging in size from less than 1/2 acre, their land, through the closing of the railway, and the future of the Government to provide a roadway, has become of not cultivable use to them?

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Will the Minister please state if the Government proposes to reclaim the Constitution Swamp and construct the East Coast Road?

2. If the answer to No. 1 above be in the affirmative, at what date is it likely, that these individual projects will be started?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Will the Minister make available the figures for each of the years 1955-60 showing:

- (a) the investment of capital,
- (b) the increase, if any, in the net income generated by manufacturing,
- (c) the value of the construction industry,
- (d) the value of investment in factories and equipment,
- (e) the average annual *per capita* income, and
- (f) the increase, if any, in the overall net income of the country's economy.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Private Members' Business.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 2. It is a very short one and then we can proceed with Order No. 1.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has told me that the matter is non-controversial and I have agreed with the understanding that Order No. 1 takes its place as No. 2.

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

BARBADOS PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY (INCORPORATION) BILL, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order taken under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael: Second reading of a Bill to incorporate the Barbados Pharmaceutical Society.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a formal Bill for incorporating an association called the Pharmaceutical Society of Barbados. This Society has been in operation for some time and has been opened to all druggists and druggists' apprentices and I am told that there are now 75 members of that Society.

If hon. members will look at the Petition, they will see the Objects and Reasons are set out and they are:

- (a) To collect and disseminate information relating to Pharmacy and dispensing;
- (b) To promote measures calculated to benefit and protect its members and the interest of Pharmacy in general;
- (c) To do all such lawful things as are incidental or conducive to the attainment of any or all of the above objects.

In other words, the objects and aims are to raise the general standard of druggists in Barbados because for some time now it has been said that the standard as obtains in several islands such as Trinidad and British Guiana is higher than than obtained in Barbados. The various Pharmaceutical Societies in the Units of the Federation are aiming at the formation of a West Indian Pharmaceutical Society so as to bring them to a uniform standard and so that a druggist who now works in Barbados if he travels to Trinidad or British Guiana will be able to perform similar duties there without the necessity of undergoing an examination. This idea has been mooted for some time so that Pharmaceutical Bodies within the area would speak with one voice and so adjust the standard at which they aim. This

Bill, Sir, is not controversial and I now beg to move that it be read a second time.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I appoint the following members to serve on a Select Committee to examine and report on this Bill:-

The hon. junior member for St. Michael (Mr. Bryan); the Hon. Minister of Social Services, (Hon. F. E. Miller); the hon. junior member for St. Joseph (Mr. Straughn); the hon. senior member for Christ Church, (Mr. Talma); and the hon. junior member for the City (Mr. T. W. Miller).

RESOLUTION re SUGAR ENQUIRY COMMISSION

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order taken under Private Members' Business, stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Philip: To resume debate on the following Resolution: Resolution relative to an exhaustive investigation into all phases of the Sugar Industry in Barbados by the Sugar Enquiry Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr. Carl Goldenberg.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, to continue with the debate on this Resolution, before I proceed any further with the intention behind the tabling of this Resolution I want to reply to a few of the remarks made so far by the Government Ministers on this debate. Speaking earlier in the debate, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture referred to the question of cane prices and he said that he noted the prices being paid for canes in some of the other West Indian Islands were not as good as that in Barbados. What he said was as much as to say that the prices being paid in Barbados was so good that they could admit of no further review.

2.45 p.m.
As a matter of fact, he went so far as to say that the prices paid in Barbados bear no comparison with the prices paid in some of the other West Indian islands, and therefore there can be no dissatisfaction, so to speak, on the part of the peasants in Barbados as to the price they get for canes. The hon. member proceeded to quote the prices paid in Trinidad, British Guiana, Antigua and one of the other colonies. The price paid in British Guiana is \$9.01 per ton; Grenada, \$9.91; St. Kitts, \$8.86; St. Lucia, \$12.20; Antigua, \$13.52 and then he said that in Barbados the price paid was \$16.10. In these days when there is such a high degree of organisation on the part of agriculturists and small farmers throughout the area, only a village idiot would expect that any farmer in any of the West Indian Islands would sit down and allow sugar factories to rob him of a fair and equitable share of the price of sugar. If the Minister had gone a little further he would have discovered that there are a number of fringe benefits which the farmers in some of the other islands get which we do not get in Barbados. In Trinidad, the factories have a light railway which runs through the lands in which the canes are grown to the place where they are processed. You put the canes at the siding and they are shunted to the railway and on to the factories. In Barbados, the peasants pay as much as \$3.00 per ton for carrying their canes to the factory. In addition to that, as is well known, the sucrose content of canes in Barbados is very much higher than that of canes in most of the other West Indian islands, and the factory recovery is very much greater. While a factory may take as much as 7 1/2 tons of canes to make a ton of sugar in Barbados, it is not unusual for factories in some of these islands to take as many as 9 or more tons of canes to make a ton of sugar.

There are also other contributing factors, like the price of manure. I made it my business to find out how much the Barbadian and the Trinidadian farmer paid for manure. In Trinidad, the price of sulphate ammonia is \$8.95 per bag, whereas, in Barbados, it is \$14 per bag. As I say, there are basic differences in the growing, reaping and harvesting of canes; there are basic differences in the cost of ammonia and sucrose content.....

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is not present to

hear the statements made by the hon. member. While I am not taking or attempting to take the Minister's place, I would say that it is rather unfortunate that he is absent because some of these facts which the hon. member is adducing to challenge the Minister's remark, in respect of these facts, I think that the Minister should be given a chance of hearing, and if possible, refuting them. I am made to understand that the prices which the hon. member has quoted are not correct; I have been made to understand that there are reductions since Trinidad started to manufacture.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: Which prices?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I understand that the prices have been reduced. I would like the Minister to hear these facts for himself and check on them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I hope that the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing is not suggesting that I have waylaid or kidnapped the Minister of Agriculture. I am surprised that he is not here. If it had been suggested to me that, because of the Minister's absence I should not have carried on the debate, I should not have done it. I will promise the Minister to give him the page in Hansard in which the quotations from the Minister's speech appears so that he can check their authenticity. The Hansard would be there with what I said and it would be an easy thing for the Minister to check his quotations and my reply to those quotations. The page of Hansard is page 442 and the debate is that either of the 30th March or the 4th April, 1961.

I was saying, Sir, that nobody could reasonably expect that any cane-producer in any of the small islands who is reasonably informed or even more highly organized than his Barbadian counterpart - I may say here that I see from a newspaper report that the Minister of Agriculture is quoted as saying that the Barbadian peasant does not need to organize because of the comparatively reasonable price which he gets for his canes. I am quoting these prices, the fringe benefits and the basic differences in order to show that even if, on the face of it, the prices appear to be higher here than in other places, it does not necessarily mean that more money actually goes into the hands of the small producer.

The Sugar Industry in Barbados is about the only industry in which the industrialists are assured of a guaranteed profit before they start to work.
2.55 p.m.

In every other industry you acquire raw material, you have your current expenses, and then if anything is left to you, you call it a profit. In the sugar industry in Barbados an entirely different process operates. The industrialists are allowed to take the total value of a ton of sugar, including the price of fancy molasses and what not, then they are allowed to deduct a certain amount for depreciation of machinery, even in these days when they are entitled to funds from the Rehabilitation Fund for the purpose of acquiring new equipment; they are allowed fixed manufacturing costs, they are allowed so much profit per ton of sugar, and then whatever is the difference from these figures is divided between as many tons of cane as it takes to make a ton of sugar; so that if the price of sugar is say, \$216 a ton and you take out depreciation, the manufacturing costs and the profit margin allowed for manufacturing a ton of sugar, then whatever is left is divided on the basis of the recovery of the particular factory.

As a matter of fact, in the Domestic Sugar Agreement, which I will deal with later on, which the member for St. Michael regarded as a Magna Charta for the industry, the basis of fixing the price for a ton of canes is totally unfair, since every factory is allowed to use its own individual recovery. In other words, no premium is put on the efficiency or otherwise of a factory. Some of the factories owned by the wealthiest people, because of their inefficiency are allowed to use the lower recovery rate, and this of course works to the disadvantage of the supplier of the canes; but the geniuses who signed the Domestic Sugar Agreement on behalf of the peasant farmers did not think it worth their while to insist that since they were allowed

a fixed rate of depreciation, and since they were allowed as of right to use the Rehabilitation Fund for bringing their machinery to a high efficiency point, the best recovery rate should be the one in use for all factories.

The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that whether or not the sugar factories in Barbados pay just as good a rate or a higher rate for canes than elsewhere, even up to now considerable profits are being made in the sugar industry in the West Indies. The fact remains that in Trinidad, Antigua and Jamaica in 1960 there have been Government-sponsored inquiries into the industry for the same reasons I am going to outline later existing in Barbados; and the fact remains that since it has been discovered and disclosed that these profits are made in these islands, it has to be assumed until it can be proved to the contrary that considerable profits are made in Barbados; and nothing that the Government Benches will say will prevent a similar inquiry from being conducted in Barbados.

It is not an easy matter, Mr. Speaker, to get the figures relating to the sugar industry in the West Indies, but the last figures I have for a sugar factory in Trinidad - Caroni - disclosed that on the manufacture of 4,748 tons of sugar they made a profit of \$390,000. I remember, Sir, that a few years ago when the University College of the West Indies was endeavouring to raise funds, the Jamaica Sugar Industry made a gift of \$180,000 a year over a period of seven years. Tate and Lyle, the big West Indies Sugar Producers gave \$600,000 over the same period. I am yet to hear that the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association gave a single cent. I am not saying that they have not given it; but if they have, I have not heard. In spite of the high state of organisation on the part of sugar workers and cane farmers in these islands, yet it was possible for the sugar industrialists in them to give annual gifts of this munificence to the University College of the West Indies.

I remember that in 1958, the year in which the agricultural workers in this colony took it upon themselves to go on strike, which of course I will deal with in more detail later, because considerable profits have been made by West Indian sugar producers out of the sale of surplus sugar, in British Guiana the sugar producers distributed \$1 million to the workers without being asked to do so. They claimed that they had made \$2 million extra from the sale of surplus sugar, and voluntarily offered to give the workers \$1 million. In Barbados the workers had to go on strike supported by the Democratic Labour Party in order for the Government to be compelled to appoint Mr. Lewis, Mr. Dyce and the other arbitrator to decide whether or not they were entitled to an increase, purely because the Sugar Producers' Association in Barbados had signed an agreement the year before with the Workers' Union in which, with an advance in the price of sugar by \$6, the workers were supposed to get a fixed percentage, and the Sugar Producers here were sticking to the letter of the agreement. They were not saying that they could not pay more; all they were saying was that they had signed an agreement and according to the provisions of that agreement were not supposed to pay more than so-and-so, and the workers went on strike in 1958. As I said, I will come to that later.
3.05 p.m.

I only mentioned it in passing at this stage to demonstrate that it is fair to assume that since the profits made in the industry elsewhere are the same that are made in Barbados, therefore, similar basic wages and similar conditions of work should apply. I said just now that one relatively small factory in Trinidad - Caroni - was from the point of view of figures producing less than 10,000 tons of sugar and they in addition were providing facilities for workers which no sugar factory in Barbados provided. In Trinidad, workers are given recreation facilities free, nursery schools free, and along with that, they have community development assistance. They give lands for housing settlements, scholarships for the workers' children. That is given by Caroni Estates, Trinidad, in spite of providing all those other amenities such as recreational facilities, nursery schools and so on. In spite of all that, Caroni Estates have been able to declare in their balance sheet a profit, the figures to which I have earlier alluded.

Sir, I want to deal for about five minutes with the illusions by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture in what he re-

garded as a jibe on me when he said that in Barbados some years ago I talked about the proportionate profit sharing farm in Puerto Rico. He said that he went there and from what he gathered he was so depressed that when a photograph was taken of him talking over the matter if you had seen the expression on his face you would be surprised. That is to be found on page 463 of the Hansard. He then proceeded to give some garbled account of the profit sharing farms in Puerto Rico and he said that the Puerto Rican labourer had been exploited and the Government had to resort to the purchase of a few plantations in Puerto Rico in trying to improve their lot. He had also been told by people there who had been running these profit sharing farms that they would be glad to get rid of what little they had now. The whole tenor of his remarks was to the effect that the profit sharing farms in Puerto Rico had been a loss to the Puerto Rican authorities and they would be glad to get rid of them, and as regards the agriculturists, their condition and position leave a lot to be desired. Nothing could be further from the truth.

What the Minister was referring to was this. In 1946 I went to Puerto Rico and investigated the profit sharing farms and came back here and tabled on the floor of the House a Resolution suggesting a similar type of operation here. The position there was not the same as here. It was not as the Minister said that the Government had to purchase a few plantations. There had been an old land law that no particular person should have ownership of more than 500 acres. No corporation, as it was laid down in a small island like that, was allowed to own more than 500 acres and it was for obvious reasons. In the year 1940, long after the Spanish Conquistadores had left the island, Governor Munoz Marin decided that the people should not be exploited any more and anybody who owned over 500 acres had to give that over to the Government. Of course, he ran foul of the sugar barons but eventually the Puerto Rican Government created an Authority to manage the land that had been acquired from expropriation with compensation. As I have said, that land was formerly owned by the big sugar barons in Puerto Rico. As a matter of fact, I have suggested in an Island like this, similar to Puerto Rico with limited land acreage, we should have similar protection and no individual, family or company should be allowed to own in Barbados more than a fixed acreage of land — 300 acres or so — on the ground that the greater the distribution of land in the country, the greater the distribution of the profits acquired from agriculture.

There is no reason why in Barbados a handful of families should own the sugar estates and should be allowed to continue to hold all the profits made in the industry to the exclusion of the bulk of the population; and if in the old days of the Spanish Conquistadores it was found necessary to have a law that a person should not own more than 500 acres, there is no reason why similar provision should not apply here. As I have said, the information given to this House by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture on this question of profit sharing farms in Puerto Rico was so misleading that I had to check on it in order to reply to him.

Now, this is what he said:-

"What did they tell me? They told me what little they have of that, they want to get rid of now. They went on to say that that was done at the time, just as I have said before, when we did not have certain things in 1944. That was done at the time when the Puerto Rican labourer was exploited and inadequately paid; therefore, the Government had to do something. The Government had to resort to the purchasing of quite a few plantations. As you know, you cannot do a thing like that unless you purchase the land. They had to buy quite a large tract of land in order to implement that scheme and they have told me with no uncertainty that only in one or two instances the people made a profit out of it. Only those who worked very hard got a profit out of it and Government in most cases had to make good the rest of them. That was done as an emergency. Those people also warned me that if things are going all right here not to worry with it. I have the Director of Agriculture and my Permanent Secretary to back me in that statement."

3.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should not quote from that speech; he may refer to it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have some fairly extensive notes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member can take up that debate and quote from it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was doing so in order to be accurate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can memorize.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Anyhow, that is on page 463. In 1960, the Puerto Rican Land Department had 98,000 acres of land. Apart from the sugar plantations, the Government owned and operated 98,000 acres. The entire arable land in Barbados is 100,000 acres. In Puerto Rico, the manager shared in the profits and the workers received basic wages as determined by law, plus shares in the profits distributed, and the hours worked during any given year. The profits earned were around 15% a year given to the workers. The workers were paid basic wages fixed and agreed upon by the Sugar Industrialists and the Union. As a matter of fact, at one time, there were as many as sixteen Unions in Puerto Rico negotiating wages with the sugar producers, both Government and private owners. At the end of the year, apart from the wages, they received a share of the profits made by the particular firms, which profits, according to the reports of the Land Department, were as high as 15% of the wages they received. In one year the profits paid out amounted to \$600,000 American Dollars which is over \$1 million in our money. (ASIDES) Mr. Speaker, you would not think that it was their mission in going to Puerto Rico to get information; what did he go there for if he cannot give us the information which we want?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. Would the hon. member quote a little further and say how many workers was this \$600,000 (U.S.) shared among?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not sure that I have that figure here; but I quoted that in contradistinction to the remark of the Minister that only in one or two instances did the workers make a profit out of the farm. That is what the Minister said on page 463 of this debate.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I wish the hon. member would go a little further with his argument. Let him disprove what the Minister of Agriculture has said. Is it impossible that in one or two instances they made that profit? The hon. member is quoting figures to show that what the Minister has said is not true.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The operation of the proportionate farm would make a profit from the point of view of the workers generally speaking. I said that these profits amount to more than 15% of the actual wages in some cases. In one year the profit amounted to more than \$600,000 American dollars. In addition to operating some of these farms as proportionate profit farms, the Puerto Rican Land Department carved out 500 small farms out of this land which they sold on easy terms to private farmers. In addition to that, they distributed 26,500 acres of land among 100,000 workers, roughly a quarter of an acre per worker, for his own garden. These workers were allowed to cultivate these acres for their own purposes, so that, apart from getting the profits, they were also given, or some of them were given, a piece of land to work as their own gardens. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that the Minister was really talking about Puerto Rico when he said what he said? The Minister tried to give the impression to people who do not know any better that this scheme was such a failure that when the photographer took the picture of him, people would see how depressed he was. If he were here, I would have taken him out of the picture.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: There are over 100,000 sugar workers in Puerto Rico. That is a point of information.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister cannot interrupt the hon. member on a point of information.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not even on a point of order. The Minister cannot interrupt the hon. member because another Minister is not in his place. I will not allow those points of interruption any more.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I will ask to speak later on.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like in passing to satisfy the hon. senior member for St. Thomas that the information which he has vouchsafed to this House is not in any way original. As a matter of fact, he said that there were 25,000 sugar workers here and there were over 100,000 in Puerto Rico.

3.25 p.m.

The hon. member is dreaming. In a population of 2 1/2 million people, does he expect to have only 100,000 sugar workers? I imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the agricultural population of Puerto Rico must be anything like 300,000. Honest to God, Mr. Speaker, I never really had regarded the Minister as being capable of such idiocy. I never said that every agricultural worker in Puerto Rico works on a profit farm. I said that \$600,000 were devoted to the profit farms among the agricultural workers. If I had the information, Mr. Speaker, I would give it to the hon. member, but I have not got it. I say for his information that the number of agricultural workers in Puerto Rico working on the profit farms would represent a very small proportion of the workers in the country. What nonsense is he asking? They only were established after Munoz got the land and the Land Law was put into operation, and they were taken from among the number of agricultural workers in existence then, maybe 10% or maybe less.

I only diverted, Mr. Speaker, to put this phase of the question in its true perspective because of the erroneous statements which the Hon. Minister made. I do not know where in Puerto Rico he could have got that information; it just is not there and the Government is entitled tomorrow to send to the Puerto Rico authorities and get the latest reports on the profit farms and check the proposals against what their envoy brought back. Nothing could be more misleading. Furthermore, to compare agriculture in Puerto Rico with agriculture in Barbados is definitely a very stupid thing to do at this stage, because when I was there this year they told me that agriculture had been very hard hit by hurricanes and drought. Over a period of three years there had been serious damage done by hurricane and drought to the extent that the Government is now giving \$50 for every acre of sugar land brought into cultivation. If you are in the sugar industry in Puerto Rico you can get a free gift of \$50 from the Government to bring your land back into cultivation. Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, there is, as everybody except possibly the Ministers know, this tremendous industrial economic development in Puerto Rico. As a matter of fact, it is expected that in about 15 years' time the per capita income in Puerto Rico will be the same as that of the United States' citizen. Industries are being established there at over 150 a year, so that there has been a drift from agriculture to the industrial centres, and it is difficult nowadays to get labour to engage in agriculture. As a matter of fact, in January or February this year a sugar company from Hawaii came into Puerto Rico to acquire a lot of the estates there to put them back into cultivation using mechanised methods of production, because of the fact that there was this enormous drift of labour from the agricultural industry in Puerto Rico in consequence of the great industrial strides the country is making.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, there are 150 industries a year established in the construction industry and other phases of economic development, there are so many avenues for development that people are not as interested in agriculture as they were before — to say nothing, of course, Mr. Speaker, of their free and completed unhindered emigration to the United States of America.

Now I will go on to the text of the Address itself. This Address was tabled in March, 1960. There were these marathon debates on Single Member Constituencies, Transport and what not last year week after week and month after month, and the debate on this matter had been postponed

a few times this year because people who were engaged in it were not in the island and what not, and we are discussing it now. As I said when I introduced it, the main reason that brought this dissatisfaction to my attention at the time was because of the manner in which the agreement was signed that year between the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Union. The agreement called for an increase of 15% in wages. Apparently some workers thought that this 15% would apply to all wages during the year; but the increase only applied to day's work. In my constituency workers at River Plantation told me at the time that they were getting a few days' work; so therefore they were getting 15%. Elsewhere in the parish the picture was this: they were not getting days' work; they were getting task work digging cane holes, draining, working on hedge rows, and the 15% did not apply to that job work. They complained to me that they were not getting any increase at all; so as far as they were concerned the 15% was a farce.

Well as I said then, and as I repeat now, the Union made this agreement with the Sugar Producers' Federation and it was not explained as thoroughly as it should have been to the workers concerned that the Union felt they were not entitled or could not get more than 15% purely on a day's work. Even the Union Leaders would agree that in the absence of accurate statistics relating to the industry, it is impossible for them, Mr. Speaker, in the conduct of their negotiations, to say precisely what or what not the industry can afford.

3.35 p.m.

Over and above the dissatisfaction engendered by this particular matter, Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to discover how it happens that the Barbados Labour Party which comprises the Government could be so obtruse, so dumb, as not to realise that even if there has been no claim on the part of the workers for further wages — and a little later I propose to get back to the disputes over the last ten years — even if there had been no expression of dissatisfaction over the matter, they do not realise that changing conditions in the industry make an enquiry into the industry imperative at the moment. Throughout the Island the industry is being more highly mechanised. In addition to that we have just introduced bulk loading of sugar, and when I go on to explain the economics of bulk loading I am sure hon. members will realise how much money will be saved in the hands of the industrialists by that one undertaking alone. But apart from that, there is common knowledge that many people formerly employed in sugar factories are no longer employed and there has been this question of bulk loading. In addition to that, no bags are being used in the industry today. Sugar is loaded in bulk on the special lorries at the factories and then they transport it to the bulk loading sugar store. As a matter of fact, the differential in the freight on sugar from Barbados to London by bulk loading as compared to when it was shipped in bags is an enormous amount of money.

Sir Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I do not think I will allow the hon. member to get away with that. In determining the price of sugar, the hon. member could not have used a better example than the question of bags. That is deducted from the cost because they say no longer do you ship sugar in bags; therefore, the price of bags is deducted from the cost. You simply do not get it. As long as any operation which is included in the price ceases, that is taken away from you.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I ignore the interruption because it is totally irrelevant. The price of sugar is quoted c.i.f.. The Ministry of Food in Great Britain underwrites the cost of freight and the West Indies are only charged \$4.00 for freight; the Ministry underwrites the balance, whatever it is. There is now a considerable reduction in the freight rates of sugar from Barbados to London: which means, therefore, that the British Ministry of Food is paying considerably less for sugar from the West Indies now than they paid before. That is money which is accruing to the British Ministry of Food. The hon. member must realise that if the British Ministry of Food paid a certain rate for freight on sugar from the West Indies to London before and they are paying far less now by bulk shipment of sugar, obviously, the sugar is costing them less. The c.i.f. is less.

This enquiry among other things will ensure that the saving in freight cost on sugar from the West Indies to London accruing to the producers and to the British Ministry of Food is passed on. (A VOICE: Tell that to the Marines.) Let me put it in ABC manner that any little school boy can understand. Let us say that the price of sugar quoted by the British Ministry of Food was \$180 per ton. Let us say shipping sugar by bags, the freight cost was \$40 per ton. It means that the total cost to the British Ministry of Food would be \$220. Now, let us say that by bulk shipment the cost of freight is reduced from \$40 to \$10 per ton. I made it my business to enquire in Puerto Rico as to how the economies of bulk shipment have reduced the cost of flour in Barbados and I have been told that bulk shipment of flour had resulted in the saving of \$27 (U.S.) per ton of flour; therefore, it means that if the difference in freight on every ton of sugar imported from the West Indies to London is now \$30 per ton, then the British Ministry of Food is saving money and that money should and must accrue to the West Indies. What the Hon. Minister said is not important. The Sugar Producers' Association themselves have taken it up because no producer is going to sit down and allow the British Ministry of Food to effect this considerable saving on freight cost and do not demand their share of it. They are not going to do it. Apart from that, over and above that, there is this question that here in Barbados numbers of people who worked in the industry have been put out of work by the bulk loading in the sugar factories and on the waterfront people who were previously employed there in the handling of cargo are no longer employed.

As regards warehousing of sugar, that costs money. If you want to know, just try to rent a warehouse in Bridgetown and you will find out that the rental of a small sugar warehouse in Bridgetown costs over \$120 a month. A sugar factory has to store the sugar in a warehouse in Bridgetown for God knows how long waiting the transport of it from here to London.

Hon. M. E. COX: The sugar factories never did that; the sugar brokers did that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It does not matter who did it. It does not matter whether Stalin or Khrushchev did it. That is not important; what is important is that expenses accrued as a result of it. What happened was that the factory produced the sugar and sold it to the merchant in Bridgetown and the merchant had to provide the warehouse to store it until he sold it; therefore he had to pay a rate for the warehousing of it. The sugar had to be taken by the lorry from the sugar factory to the warehouse where it was stored and when it was ready for shipment it had to be taken from the warehouse by lorry to the Wharf. All that expense does not now take place. What is important is that that expense no longer applies to shipment of sugar and therefore, there is a saving in the cost of it to the consumer and therefore, that saving, Mr. Speaker, we are insisting must be passed on in proportion to the workers in the industry; and nobody, least of all the Barbados Government, is in a position to determine the entire extent of savings effected by bulk shipment of sugar. 3.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, nobody can say that now because this is the first year in which the bulk loading shipment operated. I do not believe that all the sugar is out yet for this year so that you will not be able to make the comparison as to the savings except by taking "X" pounds at this price and "X" pounds at the other price. The last part of the matter can only be done when the exportation of this year's crop is completed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not agree with the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: If it is going to cost \$10,000 to ship by bulk and you have not finished shipping yet, you cannot arrive at what the cost will really be. You know the cost as operated by lighters, but you cannot say what it is for the bulk handling of 161,000 tons as manufactured this year.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about the total production. The hon. member is right. He is talking

about the cost of the entire production which you cannot naturally estimate before you finish shipping it. But that is not the point at all; the point is that if a ship holds 5,000 or 10,000 tons of sugar you cannot estimate the difference in cost of shipping the 5,000 or 10,000 tons in bags and in bulk. Mr. Mc.Kenzie in his Report which the Government was so fond of quoting, foresaw what would happen on the threshold of bulk loading. This is what Mr. Mc.Kenzie said:-

"I cannot conclude my report without reference to the future. The inevitable and major change in the industry is to the instalment of bulk loading facilities for sugar. This will have considerable repercussions throughout all sections of the industry."

Then Mr. Mc.Kenzie goes on to talk about the amount of savings which would be effected in the handling of sugar by bulk loading. Certainly Mr. Speaker, if the Ministry of Social Services or the entire Government were mindful of these enormous savings being effected in the industry, it should be the first to realise that an enquiry into the sugar industry is needed. The Government should be the first to understand that any reduction in the total production cost of sugar to the British consumer should be passed on to the purchaser.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is misleading. Let us take the shipment of molasses in bulk. We used to ship barrels and as soon as we started to ship in bulk, that operation was removed from the cost of the molasses. What the hon. member is saying is untrue and he knows that it is not true, too.

Mr. CRAWFORD: To go on, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that Mr. Mc.Kenzie pointed out that the bulk storage of sugar would mean considerable investment on the part of the factories under the new transport system. This is what Mr. Mc.Kenzie said:-

"To the factories it will mean heavy capital investment in suitable storage and transport system which for some time will impose burdensome financial problems. To the sugar exporters who have played and still do play a vital role in the industry, it will mean the virtual disappearance of the need for warehouse facilities except for domestic sugar and a very little special sugars. They have in the past contributed and indeed still do contribute to a great extent in meeting the initial and day to day financing of the producers and have provided all facilities for storage and shipment of sugar. Their role in the future must be carefully considered. Finally, to the workers in the industry other than those in fields and factories, many will have to face a harsh period of re-adjustment. The industry and the Government must study these problems which will arise so that the period of transition with which the industry is faced will pass on as easily as possible."

As I said, Mr. Mc.Kenzie pointed out that bulk storage would mean a considerable investment on the part of the factories under the new transport system and what not, but it would also mean a considerable displacement of labour.

Mr. Speaker: As the Deputy Speaker is not here, I must suspend the sitting of this House for fifteen minutes for personal reasons.

This Sitting now stands suspended for fifteen minutes. 3.55 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Philip was addressing the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the point I was making on the Suspension was with reference to the economies effected by bulk shipment and to extensive mechanisation of the industry. In addition to mechanisation we have centralisation. When I came into this House there were around 30 odd sugar factories in Barbados. They have been gradually whittling down, and latterly there were 21, then Oldbury

and Sandy Lane went out of production; so now I think there are only 19. I have been reminded, Mr. Speaker, that further scrapping is now pending. In other words, within another year or so there shall be a further decrease in the number of operating sugar factories.

This centralisation, Mr. Speaker, means two things: it means reduction in manual labour and reduction in employment opportunities and savings in manufacturing costs. What information have we got, what basis is there, what data is there available for us to work on in an accurate estimate of the savings that are accruing from these things to the sugar producers, of which savings an appropriate share should be passed on to the small farmers and the workers in the industry? We have had in operation since 1946-1947 the Rehabilitation Fund under which the sugar factories get a fixed amount of money for every ton of sugar they produce for improving their factory equipment. How long is this to go on when the improvement of factories from the Rehabilitation Fund has reached saturation point? Should the Rehabilitation Fund go on indefinitely? Should a factory be allowed money from the Rehabilitation Fund and still be allowed depreciation amounts in terms of fixing the amounts to be paid for the canes they grind? This, Sir, and other important relevant material can only be acquired after a thorough, capable investigation into the industry.

It is most significant, as I said earlier, that elsewhere in the area at this time enquiries of this sort have been found imperative. Last year the Antigua Government made this announcement:-

"It has been announced for general information that the Government of Antigua has invited Professor Simon Rottenberg, Associate Professor, Department of Economics, University of Chicago, to enquire into the Sugar Industry of Antigua with the following terms of reference:

(a) to review the economic position of the territory with special reference to the finances of the Sugar Industry as regards the finances of the Antigua Sugar Factory, the individual estates and the industry as a whole;

(b) to investigate the cost of production at all stages; from the planting of canes to the shipment of sugar;

(c) to investigate the causes of the dissatisfaction among the peasant cane growers regarding the price paid to them for canes; and

(d) to conduct discussions with all Parties engaged in the industry; and

(e) to make recommendations to the Government."

Then in Trinidad, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Goldenberg was appointed by the Government along with Mr. Derek Knight, Barrister of Grenada and other St. Lucia gentlemen, to investigate the dispute between the Sugar Manufacturers Federation, the Trinidad sugar estates and the Trade Union. This was after Jamaica had had Goldenberg to conduct their inquiry. I want to say this: one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why the Jamaica Government saw fit to support a demand for the Goldenberg inquiry was the fact that for a period of four years, from 1955 to 1958, the Jamaica Sugar Manufacturers' Association representing the 20 sugar factories in Jamaica have in the figure they submitted to the Jamaica Union represented that they had made £1,744,798 less profit than they actually made. We all know how difficult it is for the Unions in the West Indies to get anything approximating accurate figures of sugar production costs in the West Indies. Now and then as in the instance when we had Mr. Arthur Lewis here and when we had Mr. McKenzie here to investigate the industry, we were told that the Sugar Producers' Federation were obliging us by submitting all the relevant figures to the investigation - figures supplied by themselves.

Now in 1959, the year before Jamaica brought out Goldenberg, the Jamaica Trade Unions discovered that for

four years the Jamaica Sugar Producers' Federation had hidden a profit of £1,744,798 in the figures submitted to the Union, and this is how they hid it. They did not include in the figures presented to the Unions over this period the profits made on the manufacture of special sugars used for the local trade. In other words, the figures they submitted quoted the value of the sugar shipped, that is, the entire amount of sugar produced. They quoted the figures of the entire production and the British Ministry of Food's price, but the special figures they made for local consumption fetched more money, and they did not include the difference between the special sugars for local consumption and the price of sugar shipped abroad. By a simple method like that they were able to rob the Unions of something like \$8 million dollars in four years or present figures showing profits of \$8 million less in four years. They could not defend it at all, and what they said was this: that since the wage negotiations were always conducted during the crop and the employers were always in a rush to procure these figures, the estimates they gave were the best they could get; and they went on doing that for four years.

4.20 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the light of all the information so far submitted - centralisation, mechanisation, bulk shipment and all of those things - the only reason that anybody can advance for failing at this stage to endeavour to have all the statistical data relating to the industry through an expert and unbiased investigation is if you have something to hide. That can be the only reason for denying an investigation at this stage. The same problem with which we are faced here, Jamaica, Trinidad and Antigua found themselves faced with. We have this decreasing number being employed in the industry as those colonies have. Last week I gave the figures for the reduction in the employment of labour in the sugar industry of Jamaica. In 1954, they were 45,000 employed in crop and by 1958 the figure was reduced to 42,000. In 1956 they were 26,000 employed out of crop and by 1958 the figure was reduced to 23,000 odd. Faced with this factor among other factors, the Jamaican Government proceeded to set up this inquiry.

Well, now, if the Sugar Producers in Barbados were to object to an enquiry, one could understand because one could reasonably understand why they may not want any inquiry and why they do not want any further exposure and any more details to come out. But what is the reason that a Government, said to be a Labour Government, with no interest holding in the manufacture of sugar, should refuse, in the face of all that is happening in the West Indies today, to place the industry on the best possible footing? How are we to get accurate figures with regard to the bulk shipment of sugar? We cannot depend on the figures supplied by the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association. Are we to wait until some spokesman for the Barbados Sugar Producers' Federation comes out with a little bag of figures which the Federation wants us to have, and say these are the figures and expect us to work on them? It is highly important that in order to conduct the most effective negotiations with the most satisfactory results, certain essential information is an essential prerequisite. None of the recent enquiries into the industry - and when I say "enquiry" I refer to the arbitration by Mr. Arthur Lewis and the McKenzie Enquiry - was conducted on the level that would make information of the sort to which we refer available to the public, the Government or to the Union representatives; therefore, unless included in the Cabinet there is some special expert of whom we know nothing whom the Government feels is capable of delving into this matter and coming up with all the information required at this stage, then we say that you should have this sort of enquiry by somebody with expert knowledge and with experience in a matter of this sort and you cannot have someone more suitable for a task of this sort in Barbados than Mr. Goldenberg, owing to the fact that within recent times he has been utilised by West Indian Governments in the Federation for precisely the same purpose. Mr. Goldenberg will be coming to Barbados for the first time, but he will not be coming to the West Indies for the first time to look into the sugar industry. He will be coming possessed with the knowledge gained in the previous

enquiries and, therefore, he is in the best possible position to give this Government and the people of this country engaged in the sugar industry the kind of report that is required.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to cover new ground now for the simple reason that it would merely make it more difficult to pick up when I resume to conclude next week.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member wants to conclude now, you can.

Mr. CRAWFORD: No, Sir.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: This House now reverts to Government Business.

THE OLD AGE PENSION BILL, 1961

Hon. F. E. MILLER: On the suspension, I was telling the House of the Government's decision requesting the assistance of the International Labour Organisation to deal with the creation of this social security scheme. You will remember during my period in 1957 to 1958 we had Mr. Seers released to the Government Statistical Department and it was in 1957, five months after I joined the Ministry, that he started a series of discussions in advising us on this thing. Mr. Seers signed a recommendation on the 30th April, 1959. He said that although my request would probably be covered in the overall field of economics it is by no means shortsighted that we ask a Social Security Officer to advise us in this particular line. We are going towards these other things. Since 1957 we have taken this thing up, the Cabinet has discussed the matter and has come to the conclusion that we should ask the help of the I.L.O. to send an expert here so as to undertake to put up a scheme of social security to us.

4.30 p.m.

In 1960 the request was made and we are told that we will be sent from the I.L.O., Mr. Stockman who will begin his study in October next which is in another two months from now. Looking at his career as an expert, I think we have to go rather far to find someone who is equal to this gentleman with his knowledge, experience and over-all ability. We hope to receive him in October when he will begin his study and will put forward the Report which we are so anxiously awaiting.

The Government decided not so long ago to appoint a Salaries Commissioner. We are satisfied that, due to a change in the cost of living, it was necessary to increase the salaries of the members of our Civil Establishment. It is for that reason that a Salaries Commissioner was appointed. I need not state that it is customary that we go to the pensioners immediately that the figures are made available to the Government; we have decided that since we are committed to a scheme of social security we cannot do otherwise. It is not a question of the Election; we are not really worried or uneasy over the Elections; we know that all Governments are elected on their performances. We have done a magnificent job in the Five Year Plan and this is just a question of a temporary measure standing against time. We were satisfied, and it is not even for humanitarian reasons that we brought down this Bill, that the over-riding prosperity of the colony is obvious even to the casual visitor; that being so, we thought it was only fair.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Did I hear the Minister say that the over-riding prosperity of the island was obvious even to the casual visitor?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: That is what I said. When we took the Old Age Pensioners to \$1.80 per week, the estimated revenue of the colony was \$14 million and now, in 1961, it is almost \$25 million. There is no argument about this; all over the country you can see that buildings are converted from wood to stone, and when you consider your figures in relation to Customs you will ask where is the money coming from. However, we considered that the increase to the Old Age Pensioners should be based on what we could afford.

Up to today the figures from the Statistical Department reveal that since 1956-61 the cost of living increase based on the index was 12%. The Government did not have in mind that we would off-set this cost of living increase by adding 12% to the \$1.80 which the Old Age Pensioners are now receiving. If we went on the increase in the cost of living, that 12% would take the figure to \$1.92. However, the increase as expressed in this 35 cents is 19.4%. This suggested increase is 50% higher than the increase in the cost of living. We know what is the misery, suffering, anxiety and poverty existing among these people and we decided that, rather than wait for the Report from Mr. Stockman, something should be done at once; it is for this reason that we have decided that we would increase the pensioners from \$1.80 per week to \$2.15 per week. I know that this increase can only be regarded as a palliative and even if we could give this increase based on standards, we could be criticised. This increase is not intended as a source of support to any one individual; it is a subsidy and that is what it will always be. It is never to be intended as a pension; it is really Government relief. I dislike the term "poor relief" but this was given in addition to what is decided upon and what is given by the then many Vestries in the island. I know that \$15 instead of \$2.15 would not be enough for these people but we must decide on what we can do.

For the benefit of hon. members who have joined this Chamber a few minutes ago, I want to repeat that Professor Richardson was unfortunate, not only by his terms of reference, that his Report was considered to be outmoded, if not obsolete. He was thinking in terms of old age pensions. He set it at a ceiling of \$2.40 a week and the Government decided that, due to the prosperity of this country, we will have someone to advise us. We have been granted the release through the I.L.O. of Mr. Stockman who will prepare for us a scheme of social security. The question of social security and other things will probably be discussed in detail. We prefer to have the Old Age Pensioner sharing immediately and not in the next five years. This amount will be regarded as an increase of 19.4% and not 12% to offset the increase in the cost of living.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister had said that this Bill, which is being introduced at this time when the Elections are no more than three months off, is being introduced without any thought of the Election. I might say that perhaps it is being introduced in his case without any knowledge of the Election.

4.40 p.m.

Perhaps he has as little knowledge of the Elections as he has of the wants and needs of the poor people of this country. Now the Objects and Reasons inform us that this Bill seeks to amend the Old Age Pension Act to increase the maximum rate of old age pension from \$1.80 to \$2.15 a week, that is, to make an increase of 5 cents a day. There is no mention of reducing the age which still remains at 68 years, and there is no mention of when they propose to pay a pension of what we regard as the absolute minimum rate for the weekly old age pension in this country, that is, as I had said time and time again \$3 a week minimum, and the maximum age 65 years. As it is now, they have to wait until 68 years when so many of them are dead because of the lack of means to carry on and the lack of a basis of sound health because of malnutrition to enable them to survive to the late age when they would become entitled to draw this money.

The hon. member says it was never intended as a pension, yet it was called a pension and is still called a pension, and in this Bill to amend the Old Age Pension Act, it still remains as a pension, and this is referred to as the "Old Age Pension (Amendment) Act, 1961." If it could not be regarded as a pension by the Government, one is surprised that they did not take advantage of this Bill in order to give it a different nomenclature, because, as you will observe in the Objects and Reasons, we are told that at the same time the opportunity has been taken to delete the word

"parochial", and to substitute the words "Mental Hospital" for the words "Lunatic Asylum." Why not at the same time give a name which the Minister and his colleagues on the Cabinet feel it should have: "Old Age Palliative Act" or "Old Age Subsidy Act" or any of those words which he has used in the course of his remarks?

It was as long ago as 1954 that Professor Richardson recommended that the maximum be \$2.40 a week. In 1961 the Government comes out belatedly on the eve of election, trying to get obviously a few votes from Old Age Pensioners with this proposed increase to \$2.15 a week, an increase of five cents a day. Let me assure the Hon. Minister that this is too little and too late. It could not possibly save a tottering Government. I doubt whether if they increase it to the minimum which we recommend that it could save them; nothing can save them now. One recalls as recently as on the 9th March this year the Hon. Minister of Finance of this Government, the Premier, who may now be looking down upon us from the position which himself and the Federal Prime Minister, we understand, may well be as they orbit around the earth from their starting off point in the United States, said that we either reduce these services and put up old age pensions, or we continue to give these services which we are giving and let old age pensions stay. Of course, the rains had not started yet; and the Hon. Premier went on to say, and emphasised and re-emphasised and reiterated that "members ought to realise if they have any consciences that Government at this stage cannot increase the old age pensions. We have either to increase the old age pension and reduce some of these services, or have the services and forego granting an increase to Old Age Pensioners."

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister would explain what has happened between 9th March this year and 28th August that the Cabinet has come to the conclusion and has realised despite their lack of consciences that it is possible to increase the old age pension even though it is by this infinitesimal, negligible and purely token amount, because that is all it is. Or will the hon. member tell us this? Has there been any decision to reduce some of the social services, and if so will the Minister tell us what? Only in March the Hon. Premier said that they could not increase the old age pension unless they reduced some of the services. Now that there is a proposed addition to the old age pension, will the Minister state what reduction is proposed in the social services, and if none is proposed now in the social services, what the Hon. Premier meant? Had he at that moment in March of this year inadvertently forgotten that this was election year, and before the 16th December of this year unless an attempt would be made to increase the length of Parliament - I will not be surprised if Government came here and announced or introduced some Bill in this House with a view to extending the life of the present Parliament. Is it because of any such reason that the Government has decided that they will make an increase, however slight, in the old age pension? What factors have operated in the mind of the Minister of Finance and the Cabinet to cause the Minister and the Cabinet to decide on this increase at this time, which factors were not present in his mind in March when he made his Budget Speech? What has happened since then, other than the rains? We knew that March was not the rainy season and that it would be in August. Is it not the fact that the tremendous outcry against that passage in the Budget Speech and the fact that in a few weeks the voters will be going to the polls has caused this last minute decision on the part of the Government to introduce into this Chamber on the 15th August of this year this Bill which is intitled "An Act to amend the Old Age Pension Act, 1937"?

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this Bill will pass, but I am only warning the Hon. Minister that it is too little and too late. We will of course be proposing when the time comes in Committee the obvious and essential amendments in line with what we have advocated and see what the attitude of the Government will be, because if the Government does not accept our amendment or defeats our amendment, they will just understand that they will meet us some other place, not in here, between now and when we come back here after the next General Election, all over the Island and explain why this five cents a day increase is what they have decided at the last moment after the Premier had said that it would

be impossible because the Premier said we could not have both; we could not have an increase in pensions without the corresponding decrease in social services. That is the position. We will give this a second reading and will offer our essential amendments; it is up to the Government if they see the wisdom of accepting them.
4.50 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: (*Unpacking a basket of items of food*) Mr. Speaker, I am merely marshalling my arguments before I begin to address you, Mr. Speaker, when people ask what is the difference in politics between the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party, as the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom asked a delegation of our Party some months ago, it is not a surprising thing that members of the Democratic Labour Party should be so quick to say that one of the differences is, at any rate, that the Government Party and the main Opposition Party are diametrically opposed in their concepts of humanity and all human welfare. Therefore, if this debate is likely to be a controversial, if not an acrimonious one, it should come as no surprise to hon. members on either side of the House because the subject matter highlights the irreconcilable cleavage which exists on either side of the House on these matters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, four years ago almost to the very month if not the day, I introduced and sponsored in this Chamber a Resolution then calling on the Government for the increase of old age pensions. You will remember that 1957 was just the year following the general elections, I introduced the Resolution at a time when my own Party had been badly beaten at the polls. A year had passed and consequently, it could not be said then that I was vote-catching or that I was indulging in political stunts. We were in an off period, speaking politically, and there was no immediate political advantage to be gained.

What I tried to emphasise then was that you cannot talk about increasing old age pensions unless you approach the matter realistically, and I was not then concerned, as I am not now concerned, with the wider question of social security. I merely wanted to point out then, as I want to point out now, that if you are to do any good to the old people of this Island you must see in practical terms what it is that you are proposing to them. I said then that the only way in which I can bring home to hon. members on the other side what \$1.80 per week would mean in terms and comfort and well being would be to show the House what the money can purchase because, Mr. Speaker, when all is said and done, old age pensions like any other kind of money granted basically involves the consideration of present monetary values.

Mr. Speaker, you were not then in the Chair, but I pointed out that you could not expect an old person or a needy person to exist under all circumstances on a meagre pension with a Means Test. I said then, as I say now, that even if you abolish the Means Test, the rate of pension then was still inadequate. A moment or two ago when I listened to the Hon. Minister of Social Services, I heard him saying that old age pension is a subsidy; it is not a pension any more. I want to ask him if Government is now admitting that by increasing the pension to \$2.15 it is only merely subsidising poverty.

On the last occasion I brought into this House a basket of groceries. I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, to see the change in money values because the basket today though the items represent money value to the tune of \$2.15 is much lighter in weight and the items are fewer than on the occasion when I brought in the basket with money value to the tune of \$1.80. That means first of all that the value of money has fallen. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the abuse and criticisms which were hurled at me from the other side on the last occasion. It was said that I had degraded the House of Assembly, I had turned it into a peddling shop, I had brought to the notice of members such things as they did not hear about or were made aware of and that I was making a political nuisance of myself. The criticisms were to that effect. I am quite prepared to meet their criticisms. I am quite prepared to be abused and attacked by them because these are the arguments before the House at the moment. It is

not so much what I am saying in marshalling the arguments; it is these few miserable, paltry items of food representing \$2.15 of value. These are the arguments which must be answered by hon. members opposite because in the last resort, however fine the intentions or desires of hon. members of this House are, however great their wish to see the old people comfortably off in this Island, one has got to consider what money can buy at a given period.

Mr. Speaker, the argument should never be that statistically we are only giving this increase because the finances of the country can now stand it. If you leave that argument hanging by itself, it is inadequate because it raises questions which call for very thorough scrutiny, and in order to scrutinise some of these questions, you have to go back a little. 5.00 p.m.

In 1954, or thereabouts, a previous Government of Barbados invited Professor J. H. Richardson to advise them on social security. He did so. He submitted a very extensive and comprehensive Report covering all aspects of the problem, old age pensions included. Now at the time of the issue of Professor Richardson's Report, the pension rate for old people was \$1.20 per week; in 1956, again in consequence of some of the pressure, but earlier than now, the rate was increased from \$1.20 by sixty cents to \$1.80. At this point I should like to remind the House of what Professor Richardson said on the matter of old age pensions. He said that the amount for old age pensions should be considered periodically, especially in a place like Barbados where the cost of living has risen considerably during the past five to six years. "The present amount of five shillings a week is much below what is necessary for subsistence, and it means that destitute people who receive this amount must depend on other resources including the help of their relatives and friends."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the situation has not radically changed and, in fact, it has not changed at all since Professor Richardson made his Report. The old and the destitute still have to rely on the help and assistance not only of certain public authorities but also of private charity and, of course, on the help of their relatives and friends. It is interesting to note that as far back as 1954 Professor Richardson's recommendation in so far as the old people are concerned was that the pension rate should be increased then and it should be increased from \$1.20 a week to \$2.40 a week. That is roughly seven years ago. In 1956, when there was not then any plan as there has been in this year, with the finances of the colony under careful study, the Government of Barbados did not find it possible, although it was pressed to do so, to meet the full complement of the rate asked for by Professor Richardson. In other words, in 1954 he recommended that the rate should be \$2.40 a week when it was \$1.20. In 1956 the Government increased it to \$1.80 and now that five years have passed, the cost of living has gone up and that is everybody's experience.

At the beginning of this financial year we were assured by the Premier, as Minister of Finance, that it simply was not possible to re-consider the question of old age pensions in so far as an increase in these pensions was concerned; he said that if such an increase had to be considered, then essential services would have to be cut down, and, taking everything into consideration, nothing more could be done in respect of these pensions until the island's finances showed a better countenance. You would have expected therefore that the very first thing the House and the public would have heard, even before there was any hint given as to a possible increase in the old age pensions, would have been that the financial situation of the colony had improved, under what circumstances it had improved and to what extent. That should be so because if you used the argument that the financial circumstances of the country did not permit an increase in old age pensions, before you increase such pensions you should be in a position to say where there has been improvement in the colony's financial circumstances and, if so, we should probably still feel as we do now, that is, that this rate is far too low, at any rate; but we would have understood more clearly and accepted more readily the contention of the Government that this is the best they can do in the circumstances. Failing therefore

any detailed assurance from the Government that the position which was outlined by the Premier in March this year has considerably improved, we cannot help, and we cannot be blamed for feeling that the Government has not really seriously considered what the approach to this problem should be. The position now is that we find ourselves, seven years after Professor Richardson has reported, not being able to implement the main portions of the Report; in fact, we have not yet debated the provisions of the Report in this House, I say that in passing, and we find ourselves coming so far as the pension rate is concerned, below the level which Professor Richardson suggested seven years ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is reasonable to ask if in 1954 Professor Richardson thought, and many agreed with him, that \$2.40 was the most reasonable rate of pension for old people, is it not more reasonable now, after the space of seven years, that at least if the Government were proposing to increase the old age pension, the proposal should meet the figure which Professor Richardson suggested seven years before? I personally feel, and there are many who agree with me, that in the circumstances of life today, three dollars a week should be the very least we should think of offering these old people. I would be quite prepared to reconsider that figure if the Government could have kept the figure which it proposes now, to the level suggested by Professor Richardson seven years ago, although the figure of \$2.40 per week does not, in my opinion, meet the case.

Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of the matter. The Premier in his Budget Speech hinted that while it was desirable, perhaps, that some increase should be made in the old age pension rate yet, the old people, at least that was the inference, were not entirely too badly off because there was public assistance at their command. I should like to say that public assistance is a very wide term. While we know that the Local Government authorities exist, among other things, to provide what help they can give to the poor and the destitute, yet, when you consider certain things, you reach the inescapable conclusion that, as things are nowadays, an old person would be infinitely better off in any of the infirmaries of this island than if he or she would be living along outside, and relying perhaps only on the old age pension, the occasional help of friends and relatives and whatever public assistance authorities in the various Local Government authorities can do.

5.10 p.m.

Just look at it, Mr. Speaker. I am here quoting from the Annual Report of the Public Assistance Board for the period April, 1960 to March, 1961, and in one of the Appendices, Appendix "E" I believe on page 11, there is a breakdown of the Expenditure, Staffing and Distribution of Inmates in the several institutions as at 31st March, 1961, and the three areas are separately taken — the Northern Area comprising the six parishes, the Southern Area four parishes and the City covering St. Michael's parish.

Now the average cost per inmate per annum in the Northern Area is \$547.45. Now of course the cost of keeping an inmate does not only involve food and clothing; it involves the running cost of the institution, nursing staff, domestics and all that. That works out at something like \$10.52 cents per person per week. In the Southern Area the yearly cost is \$447 and the weekly cost would be \$8.60. In the City Area the average cost per inmate per annum is \$692 and that brings a weekly average per inmate of \$13.31.

Now I emphasised, Mr. Speaker, that it is not only food and medicine; it is the cost of running the institution broken down per inmate to show what is spent on each inmate. Even if you admit that these are institutions and that because of the numbers in them the average cost of keeping an inmate can be brought with due care and administrative efficiency down to reasonable proportions, yet it seems strange that an old person could have spent on him or her, say, in St. John or St. Philip \$8.60, and outside a pensioner can only rely, other things being equal, on \$2.15 per week plus whatever the Public Assistance rate is in the various parishes — sometimes 30 cents a week, sometimes 25 cents, sometimes 70 cents, sometimes 75 cents and so on. Even if you give them free living space, assuming that they can live at a

relative and do not have to pay house rent, add the \$2.15, change the free living space into monetary value and all that, give them any reasonable amount — \$1 or 70 cents a week from any Public Assistance Board, give them any amount of charity, a daily meal from any friend or relative, and no old person outside an institution can get the equivalent in care and comfort which he can get in a public institution.

Mr. Speaker, if any old person could get outside a public institution — I mean in comforts, food and clothing — \$8 a week, he would consider himself or herself well off. Any old person who could get outside an institution, whether in cash, in care or in kind, the equivalent of \$1.52 a week, would think himself or herself in comfortable circumstances. Any old person who could get the equivalent in cash, care or kind, of \$13.31 a week would feel he was living in princely circumstances indeed.

I mention that, Mr. Speaker, so as to bring home to the House the atmosphere and the context in which we ought to be debating this matter — not so much the percentage increase that the Government thinks it ought to give, not so much that with things being what they are today and the cost of living being what it is, the basic person should be the person who has none of these things, who can command none of these extraneous bits of assistance. You cannot assume that you give \$2.15 because somebody can get a meal at a relative or can carry a bowl and get some food in the Park or wherever it is. You have to see an old person without any help, without any means of subsistence whatever, and it is from that person, using that person as the basic person, that you build whatever scheme of old age pensions you want to build.

I am willing to admit, Mr. Speaker, that with a proper social security scheme, if and when we do get it, the question of old age pensions will fall into its proper perspective and that it would certainly be possible to offer a higher rate of pension within the social security scheme than can be offered now, because, as it is, old age pension under the present circumstances is just a money grant out of the Treasury; there is nothing coming back in, no fund being built up and it would therefore not be possible to increase pensions to the level which they would meet in a full social security scheme. When you have a social security scheme on a contributory basis, the people who would draw old age pension 20 or 30 years from now or whenever it is would be the people who have previously contributed, and therefore would be entitled to whatever benefits they can get. Of course, in addition to that, within a social security scheme — if we had a social security scheme now — people drawing old age pensions would of course be getting benefits out of those who are now working. All those are facts which are well known. That is why I say that, failing a social security scheme, old age pensions cannot be at the level at which they would properly and adequately keep an old person; but that is not to say that until a full social security scheme comes into being we should not strain every effort in this island, at whatever sacrifice to the rest of the community, to make the old people comfortable in the meanwhile.

Honourable members opposite, Mr. Speaker, will remember the visit paid by the Right Honourable James Griffiths, who was at one time Secretary of State for the Colonies in one of the former Labour Governments, to this Island and that in the course of that visit he addressed a meeting sponsored by the Government Party on the grounds of Empire Cricket Club, Bank Hall. Mr. Griffiths made a most inspiring speech, and in the course of that speech he said that you can test the value or the benefit of the work the Government is doing by the manner in which it looks after the young people and the old folk. Now in that audience there were members of supporters of all Parties, and when Mr. Griffiths said that and explained what he meant by saying it, he commanded universal assent.

1.20 p.m.

The young and old must be looked after. Therefore, if that is the watchword, and I suppose it should be to the Government Party and of every other right — thinking humanitarian person in this Assembly or outside, we cannot sit with an untroubled conscience and give an extra 35 cents to old

people with the excuse that we are awaiting a social security Report or that it is only, as the Minister says, a palliative. To say that it is a palliative is to mislead and to misunderstand the entire situation.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am anxious to hear every word which the hon. member has to say but surely it is not by any means necessary for him to misquote me. I repeat that I did not say that it is a palliative.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am certain that I am not misquoting the hon. member. It was in the part of the speech in which he said that he regarded old age pension as a subsidy and the word palliative was used in that connection.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I said that some of us may regard it as a palliative, but we are all concerned about what and how it would cost; and then I went on to say that we can only regard it as a subsidy. I also said that if we were in a position to give \$15 a week, it would not be enough to keep body and soul together.

Mr. TUDOR: That is exactly my contention. The Government itself, if the Minister is to be taken as a spokesman, does not feel itself on sure ground in this matter and all I am saying is that you should not justify what you are now doing on the ground that you are awaiting the implementation of a social security system. If you say that you are concerned with what it costs an old person to live on now in moderate comfort, that is the approach which you should take and we are submitting that an extra 35 cents a week is meaningless. That is five cents a day and it is only the cost of two extra boxes of matches. You have to break it down like that, or you can say that it would provide a few more biscuits. It is things like that which you have to take into account.

I emphasise again that we have to put out of our minds the fact that people in Barbados are charitable to the old. That is a fact and we are glad for it, but the Government cannot legislate on the basis of what individuals will or will not do. The Government has got to legislate on facts and the facts are that \$2.15 a week just would not do.

Mr. Speaker, you will not be surprised to know, but some people will be, that if you put an old person on, say, a budget of \$2.15 a week, there are accidents which can happen within that budget which would spell disaster for that person. When you say, for instance, that a man or woman wants enough to live in modest comfort, all we mean by modest comfort is that when your moderate daily needs are met, you should still be able in an emergency to put by even a dollar to meet the needs of that emergency. You do realise, Mr. Speaker, that there are some old people in this Island — a lot of them, perhaps thousands, — if the very wick in the lamp which they use at night becomes burnt out, they cannot replace the lamp wick by the next night of the same week in which the wick was burnt out. I put it at a lamp wick. You can imagine the budgetary disaster which will follow if the entire lamp was broken; and yet you would think that a lamp is a kind of thing that if you broke one this morning you can go into town and buy another one to use tonight. But there are some old people who would not be able to replace a lamp unless they begged somebody to replace it for them or unless somebody gave it to them or unless they do without it altogether; and, therefore, their budget is so tough that if the wick got burnt out they cannot replace it perhaps without going without a piece of soap or something like that. They have to exist on a tight budget and lack of the slightest thing spells disaster and discomfort. That is what it means.

Now, obviously, Mr. Speaker, an old person will like the sort of increase which will enable him or her not to buy luxuries but to buy a little more of the things which we all regard as necessities. If, for instance, all the old people in this Island were living in their own houses or if all were living with relatives or they all were living in grace-and-favour houses — I mean houses given to them by the Government — the money which would normally be spent on house rent would go to supplement the food budget. But that is not the case in this Island. You have got hundreds, near

thousands, of old people who out of their old age pension have got to meet a weekly rent bill of 40 cents if they are so lucky, but mostly of 60 cents or 80 cents a week. That is a matter of general knowledge so that unless they have other means of support, unless other help whether of a public or a private nature is forthcoming, they literally starve in this Island because they cannot buy a whole week's supply of food, and to nourish themselves properly, they cannot always buy a full two days' supply.

I will tell you something else. There is another aspect of the matter which we must consider. The smaller the amount of money a person, particularly an old person, has at his or her disposal, the more difficult it is to get it spent not only because of its smallness, but because the very quantities which you are forced to buy do not permit the economies which you would enjoy if you had more money at your disposal.

5.30 p.m.

Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that an old person could buy a gallon of kerosene oil and save four or five cents? He just could not do that. For them to buy a gallon of kerosene oil would be to cut a big slice out of the money at their disposal. You will probably find an old person having to buy perhaps a half pint or a pint of oil at a time, and therefore he loses more on the retail purchase than he would on the wholesale purchase. These are things which have to be taken into account. The fact that small quantities have to be purchased makes the purchases dearer in the end and expose people to the swings in the fall of the value of money. If the Government has not taken that into account, then it has not reached the root of the problem; and it is those aspects of the problem which have to be considered.

Mr. Speaker, let us consider the case of any old person, but particularly one who does not have any visible means of support and who cannot, as in the case of some others, be fortunate enough to receive frequent private charity. Out of \$2.15 per week, an old person cannot have a cooked meal every day; that is certain — at least, not on his own or on her own. The only alternative therefore is to have a cooked meal one or two, or possibly three, days a week and make out for four days on tea or any other liquid beverage as the case may be. In some cases it is within my knowledge, and it should be within the knowledge of other hon. members in this Chamber, that an old person, because of house rent and other financial commitments and stringencies, cannot afford to have milk in his tea every morning or on every occasion he would like to have it; therefore he or she has to resort to the boiling of bush tea and putting sugar in it. An old person will decide this:—

"I cannot have a cooked meal and therefore I will have tea twice a day." Well, that old person will need at least two bags of coffee, which will cost 20 cents, an ounce of tea, which will cost 14 cents, and he cannot eat more than four biscuits a day with the money at his disposal. If these old people have 28 biscuits a week, that is fourteen cents, if they have to boil tea twice or even three times a day, they will need half gallon of oil at least, and that is twenty cents, and the least amount of sugar, and they will have to be very moderate in their tastes, would be two pounds a week. When you add all of that together, that will make 92 cents out of that \$2.15. Suppose an old person decided that he must still eat something although he is drinking tea twice a day, if it is for no more than three days a week! If he buys two pints of rice, that is twenty-two cents; if he buys a pound of meal, that is 11 cents; and if he buys half pint of split peas that would be 9 cents. Half a pound of fish will cost him 10 cents, two ounces of the cheapest butter will cost 8 cents and the smallest quantity of edible oil would cost perhaps about 6 cents. If having bought rice, he wants a piece of meat bone to add in, it would pay him to buy a pound of something which at least he can cut in three or four pieces and use it three or four times. These are things which are happening in this island. A pound of meat added to all of these things would bring the amount to over \$2.15.

Mr. Speaker, that is as tight a budget as you could possibly have. It would not include milk, and if the Old Age Pensioner is an aged person, it will not include any snuff. It is no use saying that you want people to live in modest comfort if you do not take into account their ideas of what

modest comfort is. You cannot call an old man an extravagant person if he wants a half pound of snuff because he cannot afford to buy a pack of "Du Maurier" cigarettes. There will be no money for milk or for snuff and no money for a grog obviously. And, Mr. Speaker, we have not taken into account soap and starch — things which you must need. We have not taken into account the very necessary things; eating three days a week, drinking twice a day for seven days. That budget will also leave out very necessary things. There would be no money for house rent coming out of this budget, and if the lamp wick burns down, it would put people in considerable difficulty to replace it in the same day; and if the whole lamp gets overturned as a result of a high wind or it gets knocked down accidentally, nobody who has to rely on this pension of \$2.15 a week would be able to replace the lamp.

Mr. Speaker, when you see this matter in all its stark reality, could anybody forbear from thinking that this is a matter which needs the most careful consideration? 5.40 p.m.

What I think happens with all politicians, whether they are in Government or in the Opposition, is that we get taken up far too often in the intricacies of debate, and especially if you are in the Government, in the tidiness and niceties of administration, which is a nice thing to be taken up with; but at the same time one has got to relate the problem to its basic human proportions. If \$2.15 a week cannot do what even Government must have a desire to see it do, then it is time to pause and to think.

We of this Party have made our views known on this matter, Mr. Speaker. We have said that in our view Professor Richardson's recommendations specifically about old age pensions should have been implemented long since, and we have not been put off by the contention that the finances of the territory cannot bear the strain. When my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. John, gets up to make his contribution, he will deal specifically among other things with whether or not the finances of the colony can stand the strain, and we are not going to be put off by that because we feel that if any sacrifice were to be put upon the rest of this community in order that those members of the community who are old should have a more comfortable life, it would be a sacrifice which the rest of the community would gladly bear, and that is why we have to contest very bitterly the contention of the Minister that this is the best that Government can do at the time.

We hope, Mr. Speaker, that by the time this debate is concluded, the criticisms we have made will show the Minister that he is wrong all along the line — both he and the Government — wrong in their conception of human welfare, wrong in their politics, wrong in their arithmetic, wrong in their attitude to questions of public finance and of social security, wrong in their reading of the temper of the old people and of the public generally, but right they are only in this: that at long last they have had the courage to come out boldly and say that they cannot do more for the old people at this or any time.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy made a very dramatic speech on this matter, and conversely the Hon. Minister of Social Services made an extremely tepid speech in introducing this important matter. The Hon. Minister said it was an interim measure — between where and what? Is it between here and the elections? It is the most shameless, scandalous and incompetent bit of legislation that men even without consciences could ever have dared to come before us with at this time; it is a complete denial of the people we represent; it is a total misunderstanding of the needs of the community and it is a lack of ability to accept a challenge which is ours to face and live up to. To offer old people 5 cents a day is shameless in the extreme. (*Cheers from Opposition.*) You have absolutely no knowledge of the requirements of the community if after this long period your travels can only bring you to the stage of offering the helpless, the weak and the poor 5 cents a day. Which of us in our circumstances would think that if we are going to offer charity this is the type of increase of which we should think?

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy gave an analysis of the spending budget; but the Minister of Social Services should understand that he is the Minister of Social Services, and an examination of the meaning of the word "social" in the context of 1961 should offer him some dynamics for doing things that a man without a social conscience should be able to say that this is meeting a requirement that is understandable. You should not have brought this nonsense. What in the name of patience can you budget for on 35 cents as an increase on \$1.80? You get the preposterous remarks by the Minister that he is reducing this to a mathematical formula to produce a percentage. Is he aware that any two figures can produce a percentage? If you are given a penny and you give one cent more, that is 50%; but are you suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that you are going to tell someone you are giving a 50% increase when the net amount is one cent? And if it cannot buy bread, you have given him an increase which is negligible and cannot meet any of the requirements of present day life.

I do not do any shopping now because I am too busy. I only do the eating and that is provided for me. I was amazed when I was shown an ordinary coconut sweet-bread and was told that the price of it today is 25 cents. That is my old time four-cents sweet-bread; so the four-cents sweet-bread now costs 25 cents.

Are you suggesting then that when one bread is for 25 cents, the equivalent in increase which you are giving is less than a bread a day? Even the Biblical injunction speaks in terms of bread. The Hon. Minister's portfolio is a very challenging one because in the age in which we are living it is the social and economic changes that are going to matter most. His portfolio - social science, sociology, social security and all aspects of social life - today covers a wide area. I say that all public assistance is a subsidy. Everything you get in life because it cannot be basic has to be a subsidy; but what are you subsidising? Millionaire companies get subsidies from Government in income tax and other concessions, though in a different context. We subsidise rice, flour and things like those, and if you are going to subsidise the aged and the poor now, what is going to be your outlook?

5.50 p.m.

I do not know who worked the figures out for the Government. I do not know if the hon. member understands how the increase of 2% on the spending of what an ordinary person spends, increases in ten years time. Ten years time is more than what the original position was. May I remind the hon. member that he should never take any terms of cost of living index and deal with them unless he knows what the basic standard of living was. The Government today is budgeting for an expenditure of \$24,000,000. When the present talk about pensions was first mooted, pensioners were given two shillings a week. A complete change has taken place within the same economy that the aged has to exist in and you are asking today \$2.15 which is an increase of 35 cents per week to be granted to these old persons.

The Government must be willing to face the challenge. This is an insult not only to the poor but an insult to commonsense and conscience. The Government says that they cannot give anything more than five cents a day. I say that if the Government cannot give anything more, they were not ready to give any increase. If you say that this is just a palliative, it just depends on what they mean by a palliative. Castor oil can be a palliative in the sense that it relieves you from some other discomfort. Arsenic can be a palliative if life is so miserable on this planet and you want to be removed from it more quickly than you should. If he talks in terms of a palliative, I do not think the Minister can be serious in telling us that after this delay and after this examination you are coming with a palliative to us in the context of giving an increase to the Old Age Pensioners.

What you are really coming to us with is this and this is where I say the Hon. Minister is subsidising low thinking, low standards of health and wallowing within the same thinking of the people whom we should be removing from our midst. He is subscribing to the idea that half loaf is better than no loaf. That is no challenge to us. If you are going to live within the context that half loaf is better than no loaf at all, you better pack up shop and get out. If the present Gov-

ernment was in existence when Father Godson appealed to the community to look into this question of granting an old age pension to the aged, from the point of view of their mental attitude today, this Government would have done nothing about it. This is the lowest increase that could have been given. When it started, it started at two shillings a week. Examine two shillings a week and see what is the equivalent of two shillings a week, when old age pension was started, with its equivalent in money today. Ask yourself what you paid for soap and the house you rented then and compare that with today's prices. Within the economy that existed at the time, the people had the courage and the social conviction to bring about old age pension because their social consciences had been pricked. But I say if the same attitude had been adopted then as has been adopted now by this Government, there would be no old age pension. Sir Arthur Beveridge named five roads to destruction; they were poverty, disease, ignorance, squalor and idleness. Those are the things which mean much to the Hon. Minister of Social Services and those are the things which we have been preaching against. We have been preaching against disease, ignorance, squalor and idleness. We have been preaching against squalor and asking that you put the people in good places of life. We have been preaching against idleness and saying that you should find work for the jobless.

How are you going to approach social security unless you yourself are imbued with some of those fundamentals so that when you start off you can start off on a certain basis? How can the Minister in his heart of hearts suggest an old age pension of only \$2.15 a week within an economy of \$24 million and you had a surplus last year which exceeded the total amount that you paid out for old age pensions? You budgeted for a deficit and it turned out to be a surplus - and I am willing to show that the average surplus over the last ten years has exceeded \$2 million. I am going to show before I sit down that you can pay \$3.60 a week which is double this amount of \$1.80. You are now spending \$900,000 odd on old age pension and you can spend \$1,800,000 on it. What is wrong with any Government spending 5% or 6% of its national revenue on its aged?

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy showed the cost of keeping the aged in the almshouses. This Government has increased the administrative cost on the aged without giving the aged anything more. You have increased the cost of administration of public assistance, and today you are looking all about for money because of your Local Government administrative cost. You have removed income tax from coming into this country and you are giving relief to people who are not within the context of the aged. Now, we are called upon to grant a subsidy to Local Government. All that is more than what the Hon. Minister is asking today to give to the aged. You should give a positive increase, not an increase which would not be reflected in the purchasing power of the aged because the aged cannot save anything. We have to give a subsidy to Local Government administration which costs us more than what it was before and which is creating a burden in that Central Government has to look for other subsidies. What class of Government would come for only 35 cents a day to give to the aged? How can you justify the situation within the context of poor relief when you create an expenditure on the administrative side greater than the amount you direct to these people? What kind of economic conundrum is that? What justification there is for saying that you are going to give an increase of five cents a day and at the same time you ask the same Legislature to provide a subsidy for Local Government administration which is a greater amount than what you give to the aged?

6.00 p.m.
What justification is there? How are you going to reconcile that with commonsense? On what basis are you going to do that? These are matters which I feel very keenly. Sometimes I wonder about these things and now in an Election year, are you seriously asking the people of this country to be deprived of the representation of people like myself and others when you ask us to come here and underwrite this proposal? If we were to agree to this public exposure of commonsense, what help would it be to this community? We have a social conscience and we can discharge our responsibility whatever be the consequences. I have challenged the Minister that he had a challenge to face and he has failed. The Minister has a portfolio by which, from the

point of view of dynamics, he could make a social transformation in this island in his little way, and it would have at least an impact on the community because he could prepare his own mind for it and he will see the type of thing which I am suggesting to him.

This matter of age is a part of our community. The number of people over the age of 65 years was 12,2 thousand in 1957. I do not know what the figures are now, but that was the total population of that age then. I do not know if the Minister has made any examination of the old age administration so as to know if this administration is being carried out in an honest-to-goodness manner in any way, or whether he is getting two people under one name. If you have a population of 12,2 thousand people of 65 years and over and only people who are sixty eight are permitted to draw the old age pension, we would like to know how many people are available for these pensions and how the amount is made up so that we can see that, looking at the matter broadly, if we take away 25% from that number of 12,2 thousand, it should leave us with about 9,000 or 10,000 people.

I do not know the number of these Old Age Pensioners. If we made a simple study from the social and economic statistics which I have been reading fairly considerably, we will see on page 125 that it gives a break down of the population at the age of 65 and over. In 1957 that number was 12,2 thousand but you may have different figures today. You do not start to give these pensions until people are at the age of 68 years so that those people who are 66 and 67 years of age would be excluded from the numbers who are eligible. To what extent you would put the age group, I am not in a position to say. I am interested about this increase of 35 cents per week which is an increase of 5 cents per day and that is \$1.55 per month or \$18.60 per annum. You must find a means of doing better than this.

Some time ago when we were dealing with salaries, the Government brought down a peculiar formula in which they arrived at certain things. I want to say that easy lessons should go for dunces and you should not have them in politics. The business of the Ministers and of the Government is to tackle difficult problems; it is not for them just to accept things. I cannot see myself giving anybody an increase of 35 cents per week, which is five cents per day. What would this mean to the economy of Barbados? The hon. member says that the cost of living has risen by 12 1/2%. Has the hon. member broken down the cost of living? That is where I say that the Minister must understand these things. If the average cost of living is 12% for a man, then for a pensioner it must be more than that. For the people who reach a certain income bracket it does not cost them anything more for food. The cost of living may rise by 12.6% but if you are living in a high bracket, whereas the items which the pensioner consumes are items like rice and flour you will find that when the rate is 12.6%, it will not hit you as hard as it would hit a man who buys the things in respect of which the rise has taken place. An increase of one cent per pound will have a different effect on the man who is eating bread than on another who is in a different category. The other items might not mean so much to him, but if he is a big bread eater, the increase of a cent per pound means a lot to him.

The Old Age Pensioner has ceased to utilize many of the things of life because \$2.15 per week cannot permit one to live on the barest necessities of life. Anything which would reflect in the cost of living has to be related to the items which the people use; therefore you cannot say that the cost of living has risen by 12% and the cost of living for the pensioner is the same. I would not negotiate for a man who is living in one sector of the economy as I would negotiate for a man who is living in another sector of the economy. The Hon. Minister cannot say that this increase is equivalent to an increase of 19.4%. If the increase in the cost of living is greater, you cannot make it less than it was when the amount of the old age pension was \$1.20 per week. If you talk about percentages, when the old age pension was \$1.20 you gave the Old Age Pensioner a 50% increase and now the amount is \$1.80 per week you are giving him an increase of 35 cents per week which is 5 cents per day? Do not let us talk about percentages; let us talk in terms of

quantum. We are working on the hypothesis that no Old Age Pensioner has any saving on \$1.80 per week.

6.10 p.m.

Let us start off on that hypothesis. If you start off on the hypothesis that he has no savings, what can 5 cents a day bring to him? Five cents is the equivalent of one stage of a bus fare, and I understand that two boxes of matches cost five cents. What items can he add to his food budget with 5 cents? Five cents a day is shameful and shocking. I often say that in the modern context if you cannot do what is right, do not do anything at all.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I could not be a member of a Party. I heard the Leader of the Opposition say that he would vote for this. I am the sort of man who would vote against this. You must show people that you are willing to stand up and tell them that you voted against 35 cents just as you tell people you vote against other things. They said that now they have built the Deep Water Harbour, I would not ask the employers for money. We are not mincing any matters with you. When you give a man 35 cents, that is less than what you would feed the police dog Rip with; he would eat more than 5 cents in Wibix. The increase that it is going to cost the Government to pay a policeman to watch Rip will be more than 5 cents a day. The Salaries Commissioner is going to give more than what you work out at five cents a day to watch Rip. Washing and feeding a horse at District "A" would cost more than five cents. What is going to happen? Are you not going to have some relative value between a human and the animals? Whilst we are all animals, put us in our respective kingdoms.

When the Hon. Minister started on this measure, he said it was an interim measure. Now I want to be very frank. Each time this Government has a challenge to face, they put us off on some United Nations agency, UNESCO, UNO, ILO; the last persons they are putting us on are themselves. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy said it was too little and too late. There used to be a local Barbadian song "Too late, Cocky, too late; too late to contemplate." I wonder what is going to happen? Are you part of that colloquialism? Mr. Speaker, I take an extremely serious view of what I regard as the Government's procrastination. Whenever a situation arises that is the business of the Government, it looks as if they are sheltering. Every time a major issue arises, they say that just as they were going to do it, something or the other. They are so afraid of somebody else saying what should have been done, that whenever one comes with something they say it cannot work now, but that they have it in mind.

Now this old age pension has been mooted for a long time. They did not bring this thing; so let us come clean now. I often hear the Minister of Trade say that they pull people out of the mire. It depends on the context in which you use "mire" or "muck"; that may be a mental approach. When it comes to old age pensions, I do not think that any of us in here can claim that this was our original idea; it was Father Godson's work. It was one of the few things that he had in mind, but I was reading a book some time ago which said not to have too many things in mind, because if you have one thing and you get it done, then it does not matter. I usually say that I am a good friend of the hon. junior member for St. James. His one ambition was to see his friends from St. James removed from in here, but since they have been removed his politics have been removed from in here. He has accomplished that; so he can die now. Whenever you ask the Government to look to these things, there is always the question that they were going to do it.

Now Father Godson put up this old age pension; but after he got to the Council, he did not do much after that. This is no structure you have built; it is something you have found. Let me ask this question: have you made the impact on the aged in this community and in our present society as Godson made on the society in 1937? I say "no", because he was breaking new ground and going into a field unknown, like a man going into outer space. He got the die-hard Conservatives to break through their walls and we had old age pension on the Statute Book.

I often hear the Hon. Premier and the Minister of Trade talk about the world, but I would like to know which world.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the members over there know where this legislation started. This stemmed from Europe. In Germany the old German Republic was one of the first places to talk about social legislation. In Europe where low wages were rampant, something had to be done to cushion the low wages; so old age pension is a European concept, and there are various systems and different retiring ages all over the world. For the hon. member's guidance, I will read from a booklet entitled "Retirement Age for Normal Benefits in General Old Age Programme in Europe by Country, 1957."

"In Albania men sixty years, women 55; Austria, men 65, women 60; Belgium, men 65, women 60; Bulgaria, men 60, women 55; Yugoslavia, men 65, women 55; Denmark, men 65 - 67, women 60 - 62; Finland, men 65, women 63; France, men 60, women 60; Germany - East, men 65, women 60; Germany - West, men 65, women 60; Great Britain, men 65, women 60; Greece, men 65, women 60; Hungary, men 60, women 65; Iceland, men 67, women 67; Ireland, men 70, women 70; Italy, men 60, women 55; Luxembourg, men 65, women 65; The Netherlands, men 65, women 65; Norway, men 70, women 70; Poland, men 65, women 60; Portugal, men 65, women 65; Rumania, men 60, women 55; Spain, men 65, women 65."

Those are the European countries, and I can tell you that when the Premier said that he knew nowhere in the world where you got old age pensions, and where they did not contribute, it shows his lack of reading.

6.20 p.m.

But what does he know? There is an Old Age and Survivors Security Act in the U.S.A. It is contributory and it is contributed to the limit of $3\frac{3}{4}$ of your income. In the context of the economy of Barbados, the Premier of Barbados is saying that this is the only country in which you pay old age pension. You cannot speak anything more than what you know. I want the hon. member to be clear in his mind that old age pension is paid by certain states as a state contribution because certain states have to make a contribution to it. You can ask the workers and the employers to make a contribution towards it but your fiscal policy must make up for it. If a man is getting an extremely low wage, you cannot ask him to make any contribution. Would you ask a domestic servant to contribute towards old age pension if she works for \$5.00 a week? If your present wage rate is \$5.00 a week, what would you regard as sufficient for a pension? You have to think of the type of life which an Old Age Pensioner must live and what type of life you say that they must live. At present, you do not give us any income tax allowances for charity to say that you are encouraging more charity among the people. You have income tax allowances given for charity in the U.S.A. so that when you grant old age pension there you know that in addition to what you are giving to the aged you have got people also giving charity to them. Of course, you give income tax allowance to a business for charity but you do not give it to individuals. Mr. Speaker, you know how some of these old people live. You give a poor old fellow an old pants every now and then, and an old shirt. That is the sort of ritual which you get here. That is what the aged depend on; but you have to think of your aged living in decency and to a standard of living which relates to your community. There is no point your saying that you have a \$24 million budget and you are spending money so as to attract people to come to the Island when your aged look shabby, dirty and are living in squalor. That is one of your mental headaches which you have to face. The aged must always show what is symbolic to the era of your development; therefore, they must live in dignity with the era in which they live.

I will give the Hon. Minister of Social Services a book on this matter. Of course, he borrowed a book from me when he was ill and he has not yet returned it. I will add to his reading a paper by Professor Wilbert Cohen. I have had the privilege and honour of spending a weekend at his home and talking with him about some of the things which he thinks about. There are two papers. One is "The Economic and Social Policy for a Dynamic and Expanding America" and the other is on "Employment Insurance and Employment Assistance in the U.S.A." When the Minister finishes reading these papers, he will understand a lot about this matter.

We have to understand, if we are living in a world of challenge, that we have to keep abreast of all these things. I do not know what the Ministers do in their spare time. I do not know if they read, but it is time that they do more reading so as to keep abreast of the times. It is not good enough for the Ministers to come in this day with these programmes of 35 cents a week increase. I wonder if he is like his colleague. Has he gone to Cape Canaveral and gone on the launching pad? It would be a good thing because you will be up there circling the earth forever more. I say that because the Hon. Minister of Agriculture said that he is going to stun us with legislation. Is this how he intends to stun us by giving pensioners five cents a day increase?

The Hon. Minister of Social Services has a way of speaking on his own. I know he is going to make a better speech in his reply. He is going back to the days of slavery; but I want to tell him that though he has collective responsibility within the Cabinet, he is the Minister of Social Services which is a Ministry different from all the other Ministries. Bear this in mind, Mr. Aneurin Bevan is dead and gone, and one of the things for which he broke with the Government was when they wanted to upset his programme of social security. His health programme is a beacon to the world. He broke with the Government because they touched his national health programme and today, the Tories have become socialist in their health outlook. The Labour Party of England has Socialist doctors, but not all the doctors we have in the West Indies are Socialists in their nature. I am warning the Hon. Minister of Social Services that while your having collective responsibility is one thing, your conscience must always stand firm when it comes to health matters. Bear in mind that social services is the one portfolio which is unlike the other portfolios, because the other portfolios deal purely with material things. Your portfolio deals with something that is near to people. You cannot legislate for sickness. You cannot tell a man if he goes in the Hospital that he is not able to pay and therefore you cannot give him the best service. Matters of a social nature deal with the human mind; therefore, the Hon. Minister while he has collective responsibility has to let his own personality be reflected in the things which he brings forward and he should not fall into any excuses for the Government. This increase which you have brought down for these Old Age Pensioners cannot be indicative of any man who is forceful. The Government must always think of satisfying to the maximum the requirements of the recipients of anything which you are going to give. If you are not going to do that, do nothing at all. This is not an age in which you can come in with something to give a man a half loaf. Bear in mind that when you bring in this, you are not dealing with the old people; you are dealing with us. Their representation is with us. We represent them. There is no point your bringing in an increase of five cents a day and nothing more now when you have a surplus of more than \$1 million per annum for the last ten years.

6.30 p.m.

I have proved that you have \$1 million per annum as a surplus and you cannot spend any of it. Other Governments are dividing up all their national income and they are setting up an organization known as "S.U.N.F.E.D.", the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development. Do not let us come down here with any increase for five cents per day; it is not a question of buying an extra gill of rum or an extra pinch of snuff. I want the hon. member to look at this matter in its proper setting; look at the man who is given \$2.15 a week and see what it is. That is thirty cents a day and these are people who, you must assume, may have some relative. If a person is drawing an old age pension, you can imagine what is the income of the relative. If you treat this as a little grog, everybody will feel that it is only a little grog. Some people are not destitute in the true sense of the word, but they will qualify and go and get this pension. It would sound very niggardly for a mother to go and draw an old age pension but she will send her grand daughter for it. If you were to carry out an investigation into this matter you would be able to see that there are professional people whose mothers are drawing this old age pension.

I am satisfied in my own mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Social Services must bear in mind that an increase of five cents a day cannot begin to meet this case. You can look through the Estimates and you will see that the

revenue increase does not reflect a true representation. As soon as your income has risen to a certain level or to the level at which your savings has risen, up goes the provision for the aged. An aged man cannot bring in any income and there is no point in giving these people a five cents a day increase. I do not talk in percentages when I talk about the low standard of living; I talk in terms of buying food. I tell an employer: "If you are paying less than \$3 a day, then I cannot talk to you." It is just like my going to the Minister of Trade and talking about a week; I just regard that as when you are in a ring and sparring. You cannot be serious when you are suggesting that. I say the same thing to the Minister of Social Services; he cannot be serious when he is talking about a five cents a day increase. If you have dogs dying in your yard they would require more than five cents a day. I want to say that anybody who can come down here with any five cents a day increase in this pension has his eyes on the Election, and this is an interim measure for the Election. I say: let us have a test case; keep a meeting; if you win I do not come back here, but if I win, then you do not come back here. However, apart from the Election, what are you asking people to do with five cents a day? Whenever you add it up, on the basis of five cents, it will take you a whole year to get \$18.00. Do you mean to say that all the pensioners must go barefooted and naked? You cannot buy a pair of soft shoes, and all the old clothes shops of this class like Bashart Ali and others have gone. What are you going to tell the people? This Party business is preventing hon. members from representing the people properly because they are representing the Party and not the people.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cadbury came here and everything he did the Government dropped; I do not know if it was a question of a chocolate. (Laughter). Now you have a Five Year Plan; now you have Mr. Stockman who is going to tell you about the old age pension. On the last occasion it was Professor Richardson, the expert who came out here and told you all about the old age pension. He was an expert from Leeds University and he worked at the U.N.O; but the Minister of Social Services says that the recommendations of Professor Richardson are obsolete and outmoded. I would say that when the Minister comes down with this Bill, it is certainly not outmoded, but the least in reality. What is the logic in the Minister's argument? He says that seven years ago Professor Richardson made a recommendation to effect an increase in the amount of the old age pension from \$1.20 to \$2.40; it is true that he recommended that we should go by stages until we reached that figure. The Minister now says that the recommendations of Professor Richardson is now outmoded but still the Minister is down at the amount of \$2.15. (Laughter). He is like a cricket team which has declared; one team makes 240 and the other is declaring at 215. Mr. Speaker, I really cannot see the logic in this matter.
6.40 p.m.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we are all in favour of helping the aged, but I would like to say that this measure is another example of the legislation which the Government has brought down to stun us. I have been stunned; but I will say this to the Minister: I do not believe that the Minister is really serious if he is asking this House to underwrite 5 cents a day and in his own words say that the Richardson recommendation is outmoded. He recommended 8 years ago that the old age pension should be \$2.40.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this House about nine or ten years ago, I never thought that ten years from that date anyone would have to argue with the Party to which I unfortunately aligned myself at that stage, misguided through the blandishments of the now absent Premier of Barbados and the now Federal Prime Minister — anyhow I am being wise in my old age if I was not wise in my youth — that the Old Age Pensioners in Barbados should receive more than \$2.15 a week to keep body and soul together. I never thought I would have lived to hear the day when any Conservative in this island, any dyed-in-the-wool Conservative, any reactionary politician or businessman in this island more concerned with his own creature comforts within the general welfare of the community would describe old age pensioners not being a pension, but a palliative or subsidy. I never thought I would hear that from anyone apart from the set of persons I have just described,

far less from the Minister of Social Services in a so-called Socialist Government as they are so fond of calling themselves.

I have always said that you as an ex-schoolmaster will appreciate this, Mr. Speaker, because you yourself would probably qualify for the description of persons whom I now want to give. I say that the greatness of a man must be known by what he has produced. If you are a schoolmaster, we can know if you are a great schoolmaster by the people who have passed under you and grown up and in many cases have surpassed you. If you are a politician and a leader of people, your greatness must be calculated in terms of the young persons that you have taken and uplifted and who have even gone beyond you. I can say that if that is going to be the criterion which is going to apply to the Federal Prime Minister or the present Premier of Barbados, neither one of them has produced a single person of any social consciousness, and neither one has produced a single person from under them who is capable or has the ability to think in terms of the economic and social benefits of the people of this island. Any potential they have had has been taken away. In this year of grace, 1961, the Minister of Social Services is one of the greatest sycophants which has ever been imposed on the people of St. George or the people of this island when he gets up and calls old age pension a palliative in the smooth, oily, greasy and indescribably ingratiating manner that he has of putting over things which he knows that if he spoke in his normal tone of voice no one in his right senses would want to accept.

In 1937 the great Father Godson, who at a later stage of his life became a member of the Other Place, after years of agitation managed to have introduced on the Statute Book of this Island the first Old Age Pension Act of 1937, Chapter 30. That Act has been amended five times, in 1945, 1949, 1951, 1953, 1956, and despite the five amendments the old age pension is still at a level which is below subsistence level of the lowest paid worker in any sector of this community, or below the subsistence level of the Police Dog which they have at District "A" which enjoys an income of \$14 per week; \$700 a year is what the Labour Government spends on the Police Dog whose usefulness to this community can be calculated only on the effect which the statistics will have on the electorate of this Island some time later this year when it is disclosed that they have spent \$700. Not one single criminal has been brought to justice because of the police dog. All it does is sit down and eat a lot of meat, and whenever they find the author of a crime they run and bring the dog quickly and sit down and pose by the person who committed the crime. That is what we had to vote during the Estimates of 1960/61; \$500 first and then a further sum of \$200 because the food was not sufficient.

Now on my left the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has a bundle, a parcel or whatever you feel like calling it, of goods which can fit into my brief case, and Heaven only knows that is not too large. If one stored these commodities very carefully, one would be able to conceal them about one's person and walk out of this Chamber, and no individual in this community would have been aware that you had concealed about your person a week's supply of food for an Old Age Pensioner. If you put these things before the police dog Rex, he would keep you awake all night if this constituted a single meal, because he would be yelping for hunger.

In 1954 the Government brought down here a Professor of Industrial Relations at the University of Leeds, Professor J. Henry Richardson. Professor Richardson's Report has up to now, as you are aware, never been debated in this Chamber. From 1954 references have been made to it from time to time by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, by myself and by my other colleagues on this. We have asked questions of the Ministers as to when we are going to have a debate on the Social Security of Barbados Report written by Professor Richardson, and they were so unconcerned that from 1954 to 1961 they never said a mumbling word. No time was allocated for discussion on this Report at all.

In 1954 Professor Richardson said that the essential purpose of social security is to ensure "freedom from

want, by collective or community provision for people, who, temporarily or permanently, because of sickness, accidents, invalidity, old age, death of the bread-winner, and other adversities are without sufficient resources." Those were his preliminary remarks and he went on to say this: "In the last resort the Government must assist those who are destitute and who cannot obtain help from other sources, and non-contributory social assistance schemes are a necessary and permanent part of any system of social security even where contributory insurance schemes are in operation." After setting the pre-conditions of a comprehensive system of social security, Professor Richardson went on to demonstrate that matters like old age pension relief are entirely independent of contributory schemes; that a Government must cater for these non-contributory schemes in dealing with the question of old age pension and other aspects of social security on which he elaborated.

Now in 1961 I doubt whether the Minister of Social Services has read that Report because he gets up here and says that it is not a pension at all; this is something which they are doing as a matter of magnanimity on their part. 6.50 p.m.

On the 9th March, 1961, the Hon. Premier said that the Government could not afford any increase in old age pension, and he said from his place over there to members on this side of the House that if we had any conscience we would realise that the Government cannot increase old age pensions unless we reduce some of the other services. That is what he said and you can find it on page 303 of the Official Debates for this year.

I would not have thought when the Hon. Minister of Social Services got up to introduce this amendment to the Pension Act of 1937 that he would not have outlined for the benefit of members of this House the change in the economic situation of the colony which has constrained him to grant this modicum relief to the Old Age Pensioners. I thought that he would have been able to tell us what services had been reduced or drastically curtailed according to what the Hon. Premier had outlined, because members of the public would like to know at what cost to the community are we going to have this. Instead of producing a lot of percentages - 19.4%, 12.6% - percentages which he himself does not understand, I thought he would have told us what this increase means to the poor old persons. Mr. Speaker, you pass them lined up outside of the Post Office in Black Rock waiting for the Post Office to open and they are there before the day opens.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not travel so early.

Mr. BARROW: I thought that the Hon. Minister of Social Services would have been able to tell us what impact this would have on the purchasing power of the persons who line up on that side of the road waiting for the Post Office to open to receive this little pittance. Those people have to travel when the sun has not risen because they cannot afford to pay bus fare. Some live in Alkins Land, some live up Cave Hill and some at Jackson and they have to get down there by six o'clock in the morning so as to avoid the heat of the day.

Sir, instead of some of our social workers having all these glorified fairs and feeling that they are dispensing charity - of course some are working for the M.B.E. - some of them if they were really serious about doing something of a social nature would ask you to allow them to distribute these pensions. What I am pointing out is that these people cannot afford to pay bus fares.

Now, in 1954, the economy of the Island had not reached the stage which it has now reached. I doubt very much that the Government's revenue in 1954 was anywhere more than \$15 million or \$16 million. I do not think it was so much. Today, in 1961, we are budgeting for a Government expenditure of \$26 million. In 1957 the national income of Barbados was less than \$300 per person and then Professor Richardson said that the modest amount to bring the old age pension up to the findings of the recommendations of his Report could be found without undue difficulties from the amount of taxation as presently advocated. The added

cost would be 3 1/2% of Government's expenditure and would be in the vicinity of \$450,000.

The Old Age Pension Act was amended in 1938 and again in 1947. The 1956 amendment brought it up to \$1.80. In the same Report, Professor Richardson said that Government could afford an increase to \$2.40 but, as I have said, the last amending Bill was in 1956 and since then the Government has done nothing about it. There was then an election on and the result is that we have always had an increase in anything only in an election year. The Civil Service Association makes no bones about it; they say that they are going to get a raise of pay this year. That is the kind of thing you get. The people can have an increase only in election year. The Government's fiscal and social policy is absolutely not in relationship to the needs of the needy. You can starve for five years and die during the interim but they say: "We will let go a piece of change before the election comes off."

The present amount which Government expends on Old Age Pension is \$913,008. The increase would involve this Government in an expenditure of \$180,000 to bring the amount of pension to \$2.40 and if they doubled it - the \$1.80 - it could not cost the Government more than \$300,000.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7.00 p.m. o'clock, the sitting of this House stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock. 7.00 p.m.

On re-assembling

OLD AGE PENSION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the House was debating the motion for the second reading of a Bill to amend the Old Age Pension Act, 1937. The hon. junior member for St. John was speaking.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the hon. member is resuming his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for the City indicated his intention of speaking.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is somewhat embarrassing and tantalising and it puts a very severe strain on the loyalty of Party supporters. I do not think that on an occasion like this, I could sit glibly by and do not add my quota to this debate, especially having had some knowledge as a result of many years dealing specifically with the poor and more particularly with pensioners and also the Old Age Pensioners. I may say that whatever these pensioners got, the Vestry gave them what was known as a half ticket which meant that if we gave our parochial pensioners \$5, we gave further to the Old Age Pensioners of the Central Government, \$2.50. Having such a wide knowledge of this matter, therefore, I do not think I could sit here and allow this debate to go unnoticed.

As I said, Sir, this Bill is somewhat embarrassing and tantalising. It is tantalising for this reason; I was not then a member of this House, but it was said here this afternoon - I speak under correction now, and if it is true that seven years ago Professor Richardson recommended the amount of \$2.40 per week for the Old Age Pensioners, I can say that the economy or the revenue of this country seven years ago was not what it is now. If Professor Richardson recommended \$2.40 per week then and the Government is now about to give these pensioners \$2.15, well, it is often said that what you give you should give quickly and in doing so you would have given twice. That is an old adage but I do not think it is applicable tonight in respect of this Bill. Nobody could be more loyal to the Government Party than I, but I feel that this Bill should be postponed and amended so as to give this \$2.40 per week to these old people.

I am in sympathy with the Minister: he may say that the financial advisers to the Government have advised him to do this, that and the other; but Mr. Speaker, it is the little things like this which are of very great importance

to the Old Age Pensioners. This proposal might even cost an Election even although you do not base what you give to any Old Age Pensioner or otherwise on winning any election. The Election is nothing whatsoever when it comes to the question of what you will pay your Civil Service or how well you will treat your Old Age Pensioners. That is just a bit of political trickery. Nothing I may say is based on any Election or otherwise; it is merely a question of my knowledge and experience of the Old Age Pensioners.

Mr. Speaker, I can say right now that there is a lady who is about 82 years of age who, last Thursday, went to Queen's Park on the 24th of this month to receive her pension. Apparently, she had not even taken a cup of tea during the morning, and I am told that she did not get back home at a proper time, but that she had waited in Queen's Park until 2 o'clock. As a result of that, she is a very sick woman tonight and the worst is expected of her. This lady, being of the age she is, and having lived her allotted span and some over, it was felt by her relatives that her illness was the result of her going to the Park on the 24th of this month and returning to her home very late. It is things like that which worry me. You cannot even say that thirty-five cents a week is a bagatelle. I know that the Minister who has introduced this Bill has introduced it much against his will. *(Cheers.)* I know how he deals with many of his employees who are by no means in the category of any Old Age Pensioner. That is why I say that this Bill is embarrassing and tantalising. It is no wonder why someone in some other place is so much beloved and is regarded as this, that and the other; he treats his pensioners better than the Central Government treats theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be misunderstood when I make a statement like that; it may be that the Minister has given you his limits and things of that sort, but when he goes beyond the bounds, it is a question of benefits. I want to say that if the Devil brings a loaf of bread to you, you can accept it. I am not making any long speech. I can make a short speech and get to the point. I want to say that the Government need not have any fear if it is said that the Opposition flogged them on this Bill and things of that sort, and that out of shame they might be prevented from postponing the further consideration of this Bill. I would say that the Opposition can flog as long as they like, but the Minister should take back this Bill and have it amended. If Professor Richardson is an expert, the hon. junior member for the City is no expert; I have a little business acumen which cannot be compared with the ability of Professor Richardson. I have never seen anything in relation to Professor Richardson and his recommendation in the debates of this House; I have not looked for it. As I say, I was not a member of the House at that time and if Professor Richardson recommended \$2.40 a week for these Old Age Pensioners, without any bias, prejudice or Party affiliation, if he recommended that amount seven years ago — I know that around seven years ago the revenue of this colony was in the vicinity of \$14 million and now it is around \$24 million — we could reach that figure of \$2.40.

7.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Government can reach the figure of \$2.40, and a little elementary arithmetic will show the difference between \$2.15 and \$2.40. I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of speaking at greater length, but in all sincerity and in the interest particularly of the Old Age Pensioners, I am merely advising the Government to postpone this Bill for a week and have it amended and bring back the amount of \$2.40. Even when you do that the figure of \$2.40 is an over-grown joke. Even when you do that you cannot rent a room in any part of Bridgetown, not even in Cats Castle about which I know so much, at \$2.40 a week. That is a statement of fact, Mr. Speaker. These Old Age Pensioners are at the mercy of the Government, that is, whichever Government is in power; so I appeal to the Government to postpone further consideration of this Bill, amend it and give the Old Age Pensioners \$2.40. *(Cheers from Opposition.)*

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if we were a Congress of ambassadors, it would remain only for me to thank the Government for small mercies; but seeing that we are a Legislative Assembly, we do not really represent just individual interests, but the interests of the island as a

whole. As a representative of the City, it does not mean that I represent the people in the City alone, but the people of the Island.

This is a very important matter, and one which is very near and dear to my heart, and I believe that unlike any other member of this House, I have been singled out, vilified, abused, called all sorts of names and said all things about because I am interested in administering the affairs and dealing with affairs of poor people. However, I am going to confine my remarks this evening purely to old age pensions. I believe it is universally known that I am one of the people who refused to compromise in or decide to keep persons in the tropics until they reach the age of 68 to draw old age pensions. I remember well, Sir, when a dear old gentleman of revered memory, the Reverend Father Godson, spoke to me and told me I should compromise then on the question of 65 years and 68 years.

Only a few days ago I was reading the report of a Public Assistance Officer who went to Trinidad. He gave us a report on the Public Assistance Board in the administration of public assistance and old age pension in Trinidad. In a place like Trinidad which we can say is an industrial community with something other than agriculture, they have seen fit to make the age 65. We in Barbados with one industry still lag behind and keep poor persons until they reach 68 to give them old age pensions. However much I would use this as a criticism on a public platform, I am going to confine myself to dealing with those gentlemen over there who profess themselves to be Socialists. I want you to remember that every one of you who forms the Government of this country came through the same valley, and some of your ancestors had the same misfortune as these poor Old Age Pensioners are having today. I shall go further to another point. It is amusing and sometimes heart-breaking to think that members of the Government should make such errors.

Now first of all I should like to deal with the entire question of the amount which you are giving. Let us forget Professor Richardson; let us only think of the economy of Barbados. I regret very much that I did not hear the Hon. Minister's speech, but as I understand it, Sir, from my own research, there are between 9,000 and 10,000 Old Age Pensioners in Barbados, approximately or nearly half of which are in the municipal area. That is because I suppose they come to the municipal area between the ages of 60 and 68 when they become incapacitated to be able to get better relief; that can be the only reason. Let us review the situation. You do not want Professor Richardson, Mr. Cadbury nor anybody to tell you that of the 9,000 or 10,000 Old Age Pensioners in this country, 90% at one time or another gave of their blood and sweat to the agriculture of this country upon which we prosper today. Whether you are a Conservative, a Socialist or otherwise, as long as you can buy a pair of shoes, or a pair of pants which you could not buy ten or fifteen years ago, you are riding upon what the Old Age Pensioners in this country today did for you many years ago. There is no point in saying who was in power 300 years ago; you are in power now and it rests with you to do what is right.

Mr. Speaker, this Government was fortunate to have a man, Mr. Griffiths, at Bank Hall who told them that their socialist policy would be assessed on how they treated the youth of today and the old people of yesterday who gave of their life blood to the community. I was pleasantly surprised that the hon. junior member for St. James did not let me sing a solo in asking that the age be reduced to 65 when he said at a Local Government Council meeting that he should like to see the age reduced to 65, and he said too that he would like to see something more given. What did the Hon. Premier say in his Budget Speech? Mr. Speaker, I am going to read from what the learned and genial doctor, the Premier, the Minister of Finance, had to say in his Budget Speech, and I quote:

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, is it correct to say that you cannot quote from a speech in the present Session?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is perfectly correct. As a matter of fact, the Budget Speech is printed for quotation. Every-

one knows what happens with the Budget Speech; it is printed and circulated and members are allowed to make reference to it at the very next meeting. I would not oppose the Rule, but I did not think the Hon. Leader of the House would make that objection.
8.05 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I believe that there is one way to do things and that is the right way. If this happens, hon. members can use it as a precedent. Hon. members will be able to do any old thing. Your Honour has already stopped me from doing it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have stopped an hon. member from doing it today.

Hon. M. E. COX: You cannot allow the hon. member to quote what the Hon. Premier said in his Budget Speech this Session.

Mr. SPEAKER: This very day I prevented an hon. member from quoting from a speech made during this Session. The Budget Speech is quoted from the very meeting after it is delivered. That is why the Budget Speech is rushed to the Printer. It is rushed to the Printer so that it can be criticised by members of the Opposition. They are not allowed to read *verbatim* from it but it is handed to them so that they can make their criticisms of it.

I will ask the hon. senior member for the City not to actually quote from the Official Record but he can read, memorise and refer to it. I must point out to the Hon. Leader of the House and remind him that in the case of the Budget Speech such latitude has already been given.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This thing should be clarified. I did not know that the Hon. Leader of the House would have made that *faux pas*. I want to make it crystal clear. The Hon. Premier read a speech which became a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is wrong.

Mr. WALCOTT: Any document that is handed to the House is not Hansard. Hansard is the speech of an hon. member. As soon as you permit an hon. member to read from a document, I can quote from that speech as much as I like. Hansard is a speech which an hon. member makes: it is not the reading of something. As soon as you give me a document like the Five Year Development Plan, that is an ordinary paper of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entirely wrong and I cannot disagree with him more. What is handed to hon. members is an advance copy of the Premier's Speech and that is not a document like the Five Year Plan. It is just that for reasons of convenience that an advance copy of his Budget Speech is served to hon. members. The Reportorial Staff work overtime and work slavishly hard so that hon. members can get an advance copy of it before the next meeting of the House. It is just a speech which is printed in the ordinary fashion; it is not a document of the House; it is not a separate and distinct document.

Mr. WALCOTT: May I ask Your Honour.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled.

Mr. WALCOTT: You will have to stop the Premier making speeches in that form. If you cannot allude to speeches made, then it is absolutely meaningless.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is falling into another error. Hon. members may allude to speeches. There is no restriction as far as that is concerned, but that does not mean reading and quoting from a speech. All the hon. senior member for the City has to do is to read, memorise and make his references but he cannot read and quote *verbatim* from the speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Your Honour has ruled and I am going to abide by your ruling. You said that we were given an advance copy of the Premier's speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not so.

Mr. SPEAKER: When I say an advance copy, I mean a copy of the speech is rushed through by the staff and put before hon. members.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is that an advance copy?

Mr. SPEAKER: When I use the words "advance copy", I mean a copy of the Premier's speech as is forwarded.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Thank you, Sir. I am going to deal with the Hon. Premier's speech but I am not going to read or quote from it; I will refer to my notes. In dealing with the Premier's Budget Speech this year, just a few months ago he said: "I come to the question of Old Age Pensions". The thing which must strike hon. members' heart most forcibly. He said, "You are agitating for an increase in Old Age Pension". I am asking hon. members to look at the speech themselves. I am using my own notes. I am not surprised that the Hon. Leader of the House is trying to scotch this.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not trying to stop the hon. member; I was trying to establish something. This is what the Rule says: "No member is to allude to any debate of the same session." It is my duty to draw that to Your Honour's attention. I do not care if the hon. member reads from now to next year.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I only say that I think the public of Barbados should know this. The Hon. Premier said a few months ago that if they had any conscience — he meant the Opposition — they would not ask for an increase for Old Age Pensioners. You may call it *verbatim* or whatever you like, but the Hon. Premier said so. Mr. Speaker, do you remember his saying so?

Mr. SPEAKER: That question cannot be asked of me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You are not supposed to remember everything.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member made some aside. Was it in respect of me?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said that you are not supposed to remember everything. I am only saying that the Hon. and Learned Premier said that if the Opposition had any conscience they could not ask the Government to increase Old Age Pensions.

8.15 p.m.

I am quoting from the Memorandum of the Estimates 1960-61. The Premier in his Budget Speech said that we have no conscience, we are an unreasonable lot of people; we cannot ask for any increase in the amount of the old age pension. But in this Memorandum you have, under the Heads Prisons, Industrial Schools, Medical, Old Age Pensions, Social Welfare and Public Assistance Board, an approved estimate of \$3,994,403 and a revised estimate of \$3,904,408. You have the Approved Estimate and the Revised Estimate. The Approved Estimate in respect of Social Services was \$3,994,403 and the Revised Estimate was \$3,904,408. Everybody knows that the Government budgeted for a deficit in 1960-61 and at the end of the year they had a surplus. It struck me forcibly and I said to the hon. junior member for Christ Church that this is a very strange thing. The Premier has just said: "You have no conscience if you are asking us to increase the amount of the old age pension." In other words, you have shown here that you did not spend three quarter million dollars approximately and the Minister will say that it is covered under the Head "Prisons". I should like to say that the prisoners did not go without any food; they got what they wanted. You have the head "Industrial Schools" and the same thing happened there. I see that the sum of \$750,000 has been raised, budgeted for and not spent, but nothing could be given to the pensioners because we had no conscience, according to the Hon. Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I can deal with this matter on a public platform when I can do more justice to it. How do you re-

concile the Premier's speech in which he said that if anybody asked for an increase for the pensioners he would have no conscience and then they have raised the sum of \$750,000 which they have not spent? I thought that the Minister would have given some sort of breakdown in this matter. My colleague, the hon. junior member for the City, made reference to the administration of public assistance and the like; but judging from what happens in Barbados, I wonder what percentage of these people own houses and what percentage of them own houses and land. You should not come here and say: "Give me \$180,000 out of the \$750,000 which we budgeted for and did not spend." And the Premier said that we have not got any conscience! They are like centipedes and snakes and they are hard-hearted. I offer this criticism; I say that this qualifying age should be reduced to 65 years. When you come into power and you realise that you are allowing your Civil Servants who work with their brains to retire at 55 years of age, as compared with 95% or more of the people who have given all their best days in the fields in the country, I say that you should administer your affairs properly. Whoever is going to be taxed, I would be happy to know that the tax which I pay would go to the assistance and relief of the people who gave of their best so as to build up the economy of the country. I am asking what percentage is it of the people who own houses, those who own houses and land and those who have to pay land rent. The hon. member will appreciate the fact that what you are giving to these people will not pay the increased rents which they have had to pay since 1954 up to today.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Opposition feel that justice should be done to these people. I would be the first to say that you would have to convince me of quite a lot, when I see that you have budgeted for a deficit and saved \$750,000 and you cannot give a reason as to how you got over that; now you are giving \$160,000 or \$180,000 to the Old Age Pensioners and you are doing that so as to bribe them today. Let the Hon. Minister show me the reasons for dealing with this matter in this way. How can you get out of this? We would not have any conscience if they had budgeted for a deficit and then they had a greater deficit at the end of the financial year; somebody could then ask: How could you ask for an increase in the old age pension when you have such a situation? But that is not the case here; here you have budgeted for a deficit and you have ended up with a surplus of \$750,000. You could have given the Old Age Pensioners \$2.50 a week. Trinidad has made the minimum payment \$5.00 a week and the maximum goes up to \$10.00 a week.

I know that the Hon. Minister will compare the number of people there are in Trinidad with those that there are in Barbados. The non-skilled people can find more avenues in Trinidad for getting work than they can find in Barbados. In Barbados you have to go the rungs from the domestic, the hawker, back to the agricultural worker then to the farmer and then you resign.

8. 25 p.m.

If you take \$360,000 out of the \$746,000 which you have, you could have given them \$2.40 a week. I am not going to waste my time by suggesting that you should carry this back. You can do what you like with it, but facts are stubborn and figures are more stubborn. You may be able to rule in here, Mr. Speaker, and I do not question your ruling. The Leader of the House might be able to draw to your attention that the Rules say the hon. senior member for the City cannot quote from the speech of the Hon. Premier, but I challenge him to say that I cannot read it at a public meeting; only God can do that, and when I read it there, it is going down with good taste to show that you ought to have a conscience. When we ask to give them this amount of \$2.40, we are not asking you to build a house for them. When we ask you to give them a little more in old age pension, you say we have no conscience. I will take this to Porey Spring and let the people who have worked at Dunscombe and Vacluse for all their lives know that this is all their representatives say they can get for giving of their life blood. You must remember that they had to pay taxes and you are only giving them \$2.15 per week.

Mr. Speaker, when I deal with old people, I realise that my grandmother came through this channel; she had to mash trash and see hell. If they say that I do not have any

conscience because I ask for more, that is a matter for them. I do not question your ruling, Mr. Speaker. As far as I am concerned, they can do what they like; but that is the state of affairs that exist today.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, one would imagine that the Minister in introducing this would have given us some financial figures to state why it could not be more than \$2.15. It is true that he is not the Minister of Finance — the Premier is — but he is a member of the Cabinet and he has to take charge of this. Surely at Cabinet meetings he would have been told because he must have argued for an increase to \$2.40 which is the figure that Professor Richardson indicated in 1954 when the Report was written. He did not say that that should be the maximum, but that that is what it should be in a few years. From 1954 to 1961 is eight years and we all know that the cost of living has gone up since then, wages have increased accordingly and the old age pensions should have progressed in the same ratio. I go further and say that when he said \$1.80, he as an Englishman was speaking in terms of shillings, and you can see quite clearly 7/6 and 10/-. To us who have a decimal system I think it should be \$2.50, but that is beside the point.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that even the Ministers on that side would not want to see old age pensions increased to \$2.50, and they must give us an argument why it is not done today. If they cannot do that, then the finances of this island are alarming and something of which to be afraid. Other members have said how over the last ten years we have had Budget surpluses to the extent of \$3 million per year. They have budgeted for deficits and they have had surpluses; but in the absence of some figures from them, we can only say that this is a stop-gap, and they are only bringing it this month because the elections are not far away. This is one of the things with which to go to the people, but it would have been better if they could have implemented the Richardson Report in its entirety. Of course this is only a phase, because the Richardson Report goes in for many other things which they have not tackled.

Now I wonder if it is because in the Cabinet of the Labour Government there are so few members who have ever been on a Vestry or Local Government that it seems they are so far removed from public assistance that is meted out daily through Local Government. They are unaware of the poverty and distress that exist throughout this island, and if they want to know what it is, the hon. junior member for the City, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who is the Chairman of the Northern District Council and a few of their backbenchers could enlighten the Cabinet on the need of the Old Age Pensioners for public assistance. There is no argument and no use in driving home any more what has already been said; but I would say that the finances of our Government must be very shaky indeed if when they are coming down to increase old age pensions from \$1.80, they could not see fit to go beyond \$2.15, when a specialist who reported in 1954 told them among other things that \$2.40 should have been reached way back in 1958. Today they are coming here for an increase of 5 cents a day. The introduction of this leaves a lot to be desired and there are so many things which have been left out. Why is it that they cannot find more money to satisfy this great need of which we are all so well aware?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to cross what the Minister has to say when he is replying, and I will be very brief. I would like to take up the member on the point of our bringing this because it is election. In 1956 we increased the amount by 60 cents and it was an election year. No doubt the Opposition used it against us, but it made no difference. As a matter of fact the Party to which he belonged got a seat less than what they had before. This, Mr. Speaker, is no election stunt. The Premier in his speech said at the time when he came down with the budget that he was budgeting for a deficit of 1 1/3 million. Since the financial year ended, the Premier saw that we were not as badly off as we had anticipated and decided that the first thing we would do would be to make a contribution to the Old Age Pensioners.

8.35 p.m.

Whether you believe it is an election stunt or not, it is a matter for you. We do not have to use election stunts. What is the position? I would like to see members like the hon. members who have just sat down give the lead. I would like to see the hon. member who has had people working for him over forty years give the lead.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will just tell the Hon. Leader of the House that the hon. member who has just sat down made no personal references. I will now intimate to you that you should not make use of any personal reference.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was not referring to the hon. member specifically; I was referring to the wealthy people who made a lot of money out of the working class people and then those people had to go in the almshouses. However, I will refer to it at a later stage elsewhere.

What is the position? As I have said, it has been discovered that the position is not as bad as it was and the first thing we did was to consider Old Age Pensioners. What is political about that? If we wanted to be political there were many other things which we could have done to catch votes. We have come down with a genuine, sincere desire to assist the Old Age Pensioners. The Hon. Premier as Minister of Finance has the deciding word and he decided that it would be increased to \$2.15.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is now my turn to reply after a rather lengthy debate by several hon. members of the Opposition. Every hon. member of the Opposition seem interested in getting in a little word on this matter before us today. With all the talk, to my amazement, nobody made a motion to increase it. (A VOICE: But we cannot.) All the recommendations I have heard is that Government should have gone further, Government should have given them something more; it should have been increased to \$2.40.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I said that with the present financial position of this country the Government could carry the amount to twice what it is. They say that it costs \$900,000; therefore, they could carry it to \$1,800,000 which would mean giving an increase of \$1.80 to carry the pensions to \$3.60.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The hon. member is now having second thoughts.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member cannot tell me that. I quoted the money which Government is now expending on Old Age Pensions. I said that you could put on another \$900,000. It was no second thought.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Everybody is trying to ride on this election pony. The hon. member said looking at the difference between \$2.15 and \$2.40, that is 25 cents. We have only increased it by five a cents a day; make it 3 1/2 cents more. He said: give them eight cents a day. Then he went on to say that you called it a palliative.

It is rather unfortunate to hear a group of hon. members calling themselves Socialists and responsible persons in this community getting on in this way. Nobody wants to know how much is involved in this except the hon. member for Christ Church. He got up like an old circus animal. He said: increase the Old Age Pension; give them the Treasury. Nobody wants to know how much money is spent on this. And then the hon. senior member for the City quoted the Hon. Premier's speech in which he said that the Premier said that the Opposition has no conscience!

Let us reflect for a moment. We had two years of drought. They were very dry years; they were the preceding years of 1959 and 1960. The Hon. Premier made his Budget Speech on the 9th March last and he said that he was budgeting for a deficit of \$1 1/2 million. At the same time he said that a Salaries Commissioner would be appointed to go into the question of increased Salaries for Civil Servants. He had no idea of what that would cost. When the Hon. Premier was making his speech the Fire Brigade was going from one place to another. There were cane fires all

around; there was no moisture. Probably one-third of the Island's cane crop went up in flames.

I ask hon. members: what would you have done then? You were budgeting for a deficit of nearly \$1 1/2 million and that was outside of the commitments towards the Civil Servants. However, the rains came later and now we are in a position where we are saving the ratoon. All over the country is beginning to look blue and green. Because of that, we consider that we can venture into a measure like this and the first thing we considered was that we should give these old people a plum. This has no influence on the vote. Because we come down with this, you have every hon. member of the Opposition getting up like a circus animal in the ring and the hon. member for Christ Church fighting his way to get on the tail of this election pony since there is no more room on the back.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter was correct. If you had reduced the age to the 65-year age group, it would have roped in 1,200 people more. At the moment in the 68-year age group, there are 9,800 people, and by the time the rate is changed more people will qualify so you can see that it is going up to 10,000 persons.

As regards what it is going to cost us, it is going to cost us \$211,000 more, which is nearly \$1/4 million; therefore, if it is \$913,000 now, it will go to \$1,110,000. We would be adding by this \$1/4 million to our recurrent expenditure. An hon. member said: "Give them some more money, give them 3 1/2 cents more." It is all well and good to say give them 3 1/2 cents more. It is our business; we know what we can do. This is not getting on a platform and saying this and that.

8.45 p.m.

We are aware of that. To come with a conscience vote - I am surprised at the hon. member for Christ Church. This is an interim measure, as I have already said, before we establish anything. The only hon. member who approached this matter in a proper way was the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. This is a matter of a contributory fund from the Government and employers; but with all of this prancing up and with my friend the hon. junior member for the City, what are they really doing? The majority in St. Michael go to the City Council and the City Council gives them 75 cents a week more. The Hon. Premier has served on the then St. Michael Vestry for about 20 years and he had to be elected to that Body when the electorate was on a restricted basis. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has spent his best years in the Vestry of the parish which he had the honour to represent; all you have to do is to secure your election on every Board for poor relief and sanitation. You can take account of what has happened in Trinidad and in the other Corporations when you talk about 75 cents a week. Our basic economy is in agriculture and we must have a good rainfall. The hon. member represents a rural constituency and he would have to talk about when the canes run into a dry area.

Mr. Speaker, I sat down like a respectable gentleman to listen to the criticism of the hon. member about this increase of five cents a day. I was sick in the Hospital and the hon. member thought that this book was something which I should have; but the hon. member has a short memory because I had pinched two or three books from him before. (Laughter) However, the hon. member can look in his bookshelf and he will see how many books he has with the initials "F. E. M.", written on them. (Laughter) We have spent the whole day on this Bill and it is all because we want to get in Election talk. All of the argument is that we should carry this increase from five cents a day to three cents and a half a day more; no one really wants to know how the Government is committed and to what extent we are committed. The Hon. Premier presented a Budget with a deficit and on top of his head there is this dusty atmosphere.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I should just like to tell the Hon. Minister that when the Premier made that speech he knew that he had a surplus.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. That is not so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Everybody knows that that is so.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: If you are presenting a Budget for 1961-62, funds will have to be used for capital purposes. You do not carry a surplus and tie it up in any bag; these funds will be used, I repeat, for capital expenditure and the surplus goes into one common bag known as the Treasury. How can you come down with a deficit of three quarter million dollars when you know that three quarter million dollars is tied up in a surplus? You would have to come back to this House and ask for a revote. We are concerned with a contributory scheme and we will be in a position to bring relief to the suffering and to the occasional unemployed people of this country. Tonight what we are asking for is an increase in the cost of old age pension of \$1 1/10 million. The estimated expenditure in respect of old age pensions in the Estimates for 1961-62 is \$913,008 and with this increase it will cost us \$211,000 more. We are not altogether satisfied that that figure comes within the accuracy of which we dreamt.

As soon as you change the "means test" from \$3.00 to \$3.60, some persons who were pushed aside will now come into the list. The numbers will, of course, move on and I do not know when we will have to come again to this House for a supplementary vote so as to offset this addition. It is unfortunate that we have had all of this debate on this matter; it is also unfortunate that this is election time, but we can understand the pressure and poverty under which people are suffering. We want to be aware of what is taking place in a changing economy such as ours.

I maintain that that Report submitted by Professor Richardson is outmoded and obsolete. Hon. members can twist what I say if they like, but we are thinking of an overall scheme where you can have all the employers making their contribution and trying to bring greater relief to the community and providing relief to the unemployed. That is the dream of the Government. Professor Richardson made a Report and left the ceiling at \$2.40 a week; he mentioned that in passing, not in his terms of reference. That, however, was not what we were asking of him. We are now obtaining the recommendation of Professor Stockman, whether it is based on 40 cents per ton of sugar or otherwise; we want to be advised and we have nobody in the island who is capable of helping us. I had a talk with the Financial Secretary and the Manager of the Government Savings Bank, and when we examined the matter it was found to be outside the orbit of the officers which we have.

8.55 p.m.

We decided, Sir, that we should have somebody, and when the United Nations recommended this gentleman, Mr. Stockman, we were too anxious to receive him. As I said, it is no criticism of Mr. Richardson; it is only that his terms of reference and his Report is not the type of Report and advice that we require, and that is why we were forced to ask for another expert. On the face of all of this we would have to admit that it is now outmoded and we would like to have the advice of Mr. Stockman on how we can provide a social security scheme of which this country is in dire need. There was much criticism about the amount of money and what the Government can afford, and all of you were anxious to criticise the speech of the Premier. But under the circumstances two or three months later and with the rains, I think that the members of the Opposition would agree with the Premier that rather than hold the old folk over until we had settled with the other Civil Servants, we should bring them this mercy, and it is really what we can hardly afford in the face of a deficit of \$1 1/3 million.

I hope I have satisfied hon. members, and I have no reason to doubt that now that hon. members are aware of all that had to be said or could be said on this matter, we could have saved several hours in the debate. I should just like to say in passing to the hon. senior member for St. Lucy that it slipped me and he took the opportunity to remove the basket with certain items. I do not know whether they could have been regarded as documents of the House, but I wanted you at least to have them left in the House as exhibits. The hon. member was clever enough to remove all this rice, peas, matches, and cold pone that we were discussing; but what I wanted the hon. member to understand is that a joke too often repeated can lose its significance, that is, its joke value. I am wondering, Sir, if I can request that the goods

exhibited today be sent to the Librarian for keeping in order that it would not happen a third time. With your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, is it permissible to ask that? Some members from this side of the Table are asking if he had a can of South African wine.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did signify his intention to take them back home. I would like you to know that there are respectable people in our community who enjoy this subsidy, and if you had to go through with a fine-toothed comb the people who enjoy that money out of that 9,800 people, you would be alarmed at the people who qualify for old age pensions. That is the position, Mr. Speaker, in a community such as ours.

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

On the motion of Hon. F. E. MILLER seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:

2. Section three of the Old Age Pension Act, 1937, hereinafter in this Act referred to as the principal Act, is hereby amended by the substitution of the words "three dollars and sixty cents" for the words "three dollars" in paragraph (c) of subsection (1).

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this is the Clause in which the Minister says they are going to spend more money. I will take this opportunity to say that so far as the Island being able to pay for it is concerned, I think there was an error in the Hon. Minister's presentation. The hon. member said that when the Premier was introducing his argument, he was budgeting for a deficit of \$1 1/3 million. What I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, is that this Island had a surplus last year though the Government budgeted for a deficit; so there is no point in using that to describe that they are in impecunious circumstances. I am making this speech on the 29th August, and I challenge the hon. member that at the end of this financial year the surplus is going to be greater than the amount by which they have raised the old age pension.

There is no point, Mr. Chairman, in using the budget system as a basis for determining your social policy. When the Minister talks about the rains, Barbados has been an agricultural community from the time we knew it and when the Conservatives were here. If you indulge in that kind of talk, that is precisely what the Hon. Leader of the House referred to when the rich people were in power, and that is the kind of argument the Conservatives used - that they never used to get any money from sugar. This is an agricultural community and we would not expect them to spend more money. I never get into that kind of old hackneyed phrase and talking about what the situation was. What has been stated by us is that you asked somebody to make an investigation into the old age pensions, the person made a recommendation to you which is greater than what you have brought down after seven years; so you are duty bound to tell us today why it is that you carried it to \$2.15 and not \$2.40. There is no question at all of telling us that it is outmoded, because if it were outmoded you would have been bringing down social security measures. I hope the hon. member would be able to explain it.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that if it has taken the Government seven years not yet to get from \$1.80 to \$2.40, I am going to say that it will take them seventeen years to get a social security plan. I am one of the representatives of the Union and I have given that to the Government and the public of Barbados a long time ago. When it comes to a

Provident Fund and people making a contribution, who did that? Not you! We have a Provident Fund in the Port of 5%, and there is a Provident Fund at Shell Oil Company. 9.05 p.m.

The hon. member made a speech indicating what the Government intends to do in relation to this. He is gesticulating to you that what I am saying has nothing to do with this Clause. Let me hear what it has nothing to do with. The Hon. Minister said that this is only part of this Bill because they have a plan before them to bring in social security. I am saying that if you cannot carry this pension to \$2.40 after two years, you cannot bring in any plan for social security.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is why I say when you mentioned the amount, that that could have been better dealt with under Clause 4. When you say that it would cost the Government more money, I take it to mean by reason of a Means Test that you would bring more people into the ambit thus increasing the total amount of Old Age Pension; but with reference to the question of increasing the amount to \$2.40, that argument is better in keeping under Section 4.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Means Test is related to what we pay. It says that if you are working for so much money, you should get so much old age pension. This is ordinary commonsense. The Government says that they would not increase it but they would reduce the Means Test, and they say by doing that, it would cost the Government more. Of course it would cost the Government more because reducing the Means Test would mean that more people would qualify.

I am only saying what the Hon. Minister said. He said that there are other things which the Government wants to bring forward in relation to Old Age Pension and Social Security. They cannot come with the same Means Test because when you have people in a scheme of Social Security, you will have to increase the Means Test because you would say that Barbados cannot afford to pay Social Security at all stages and to people of all incomes; therefore, you must say what is the qualification. As is known, all over the world wherever you have social security there are still some people who cannot make any contribution to the scheme, such as the imbeciles, and the halt.

The Hon. Minister made his speech saying that this increase was within the financial context of what the country could afford. I am suggesting that the financial situation of the colony is not as the Hon. Minister indicated. If this country was in such a difficult position when the Hon. Premier introduced his budget and because of that he said that they could not give an increase unless they overlooked doing other things, could they have made this hurried suggestion to increase it now?

I think I have said enough to show the Hon. Minister that it can be done. He can see the amount of money by which you will have to pay more because of this increase. Now, look at what you have to give to the Federal Government. All of these things show that you have to find money to implement them. Do not say that we are suggesting more or asking the Minister to do something more than what Professor Richardson asked the Government to do. This is something which you should have done but you have not done it.

Sir, I have taken this opportunity to mention this at this stage. It has been said that what I have said applies to Section 4, but what I have said is purely a reply to the remarks of the Hon. Minister in relation to what he said about the Government budgeting for a deficit. The Hon. Minister of Trade said that the Hon. Premier considered this and agreed to this and that he is the Minister of Finance. The Hon. Premier could only be a Premier among his Party members. Where else could he be a Premier? Not even in a mock House.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I do not know if the hon. member understood me. The Richardson Report deals with Old Age Pensions up to \$2.40 a week. It is true that the Government can take it to \$1000 were it in position to do so. The overall scheme for social security is not to be found in that document. Professor Richardson was asked to undertake an ex-

ploratory investigation with the object of assessing whether, having regard to the financial and economic situation of Barbados and the other obligations to be faced by the Government in the immediate future, Barbados is in a position to support any measure of social security and if so, to what extent. He came out and said that the increase in old age pension could go from \$1.20 to \$1.80 then and from 1958 and onwards to \$2.40. In the order of things, it is passing on. We have been unable to meet his demand to increase it to \$2.40 because of our anticipating a deficit of \$1 1/2 million, but that does not mean that this suggestion is outmoded. However, I would say that the advice we need in the creation of this scheme of social security is not to be found in the Richardson Report. Whether it is outmoded or not it does not give the advice we need for an overall scheme of social security. I hope I have answered hon. members on everything.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, may I ask what would be the increase in the case that the pension was increased to \$2.40 per week?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I suggest to the hon. member that he put that question when the Committee is dealing with Clause 4.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I have not actually joined in this debate because the points on all sides have been so carefully covered that I thought it unnecessary for me to say anything further, but it is certainly very amusing to sit and listen to the Hon. Minister of Social Services who for some reason or the other is making use of the phrase "that Professor Richardson's recommendations have been outmoded." How can anyone say that that is so? As a matter of fact, we have never actually implemented his Report, his recommendations were never considered in this House but the Minister keeps on saying that Professor Richardson's Report is outmoded.

9.15 p.m.
I should like to ask how could that recommendation be outmoded when even up to today the object of this Bill, which is now before us, is only to increase the old age pension allowance from \$1.80 per week to \$2.15 per week and not \$2.40 as recommended by Professor Richardson in 1954? That recommendation should have gone into effect since 1958. Until the Old Age Pensioners are in receipt of \$2.40 per week, any comment on Professor Richardson's report is still good because we have not got to his recommendation yet; that recommendation applies and it is ahead of us. Professor Richardson's terms of reference were, as the Hon. Minister has said, mainly in connection with the question of old age pensions, to advise on that and not on a general social security scheme and what not; but if the hon. member would refer to the files he would see that in 1948 the hon. senior member for St. Philip moved a Resolution in connection with a social security scheme.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying a bit too far; let him confine his remarks to Clause 4 of this Bill which deals specifically with the amount of the old age pension.

Mr. TALMA: I can refer to a question of which I gave notice in July last year relative to the establishment of a compulsory insurance and security scheme for all types of workers based on the lines of the National Insurance Acts of the United Kingdom. I only got the reply to that question in March this year. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that that would be in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That would be dealing with a social security scheme and it would amount to a second reading

speech. The hon. member can make reference to that but not make a general debate on it.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am repeating the hon. member's arguments which are closely associated with this question of social security. I think it is only proper that I should bring back this matter to the attention of the House and to point out that I have only received the replies to this question in March this year. I am only making a reference to that, unless you want to stifle my remarks in this Chamber.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should be the last person to say that, but I must ask him to keep to the Section with which we are dealing.

Mr. TALMA: However, Mr. Chairman, I think that sufficient has been said by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, my colleague and other hon. members who have spoken on this matter. Enough arguments have been adduced so as to convince hon. members that a change in this amount is necessary. It may be that some objection might be made, but, after all, unless somebody makes a practical motion to have the amount of the old age pension increased from \$1.80 to \$2.50 which the Hon. Minister says is an increase of three cents on the figure they are proposing, nothing will be effective. I am making a motion therefore that wherever the words "two dollars and fifteen cents" occur they should be deleted and the words "two dollars and fifty cents" be substituted therefor. I am asking the Minister to accept that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, we are now dealing with this Clause which is the money Clause. The Minister has said that the reason why they did not accept Professor Richardson's recommendation to increase this amount from \$1.80 to \$2.40 was because the Government is considering a broader thing, not any old age pension. The Minister is stopping us by saying that the term "old age pension" should not be used because they want to do something bigger. It is only this week that I was talking about Workmen's Compensation which is a part of the recommendation and I put to the Ministry that I regard industrial insurance as part of the global scheme and the State should carry out this insurance scheme. What I want the hon. member to understand is this; if he is postponing giving a man \$2.40 a week instead of \$2.15 a week until such time as we reach this stage which we want to reach, that is absolutely nothing to do with putting in this amount. I am submitting that the least the Minister could have done was to accept the recommendation which Professor Richardson said should be implemented in 1958, and deal with the matter retrospectively. In view of the fact that we are carrying out a further investigation, the least the Minister could do would be to accept that recommendation of Professor Richardson which would put him four square with his argument, but he is refusing to accept the recommendation which has been made by the expert and he is putting in a plea for a recommendation of a further scheme of social security.

Mr. Chairman, I have spent some time in the United States of America studying this question of social security. I have made some study of the British system of social security and I have also studied the system in New Zealand. The present wage level in Barbados cannot, at this stage, envisage a social security scheme so as to cover all the aspects you can think of covering. You take the question of unemployment; unfortunately, there are not enough people in the employment sector, and of the number of people eligible for work, you have 84,000 working in an employment labour force. It may be that 40% or 50% of the labour force is casual and working on a low income basis. 9.25 p.m.

It would be extremely difficult to introduce a scheme that would provide unemployment benefits in Barbados when the unemployment rate is so great. Beveridge said in England that you must aim at full employment; so one of our prerequisites for a social insurance scheme is full employment. You cannot introduce it on too broad a system, but that does not mean that you cannot have a contributory system in which you add greater benefits to those you have now, excluding old age pension.

Our point, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister should not tell us that because they are making an investigation into the wider schemes, they are giving these people \$2.15. We are saying that giving these people \$2.15 is a step you would have to take anyhow, and even if you have a contributory Old Age Pension Scheme to which all of us make a contribution of 1% or 1-1/2%, it would only mean that those of us who are not now eligible to come under the scheme would have to do so, because as soon as it is contributory you cannot stop anybody. I want the Minister to be quite clear in his mind that there is no argument against the recommendation of Richardson. Far from that, you are bound now to accept Richardson's recommendation in the light of what you told us, because you asked Richardson to come here and carry out an investigation into all the aspects of social security, and not old age pension. Even the hon. senior member for Christ Church said that you did not ask Richardson to carry out an investigation into old age pension; you asked him to carry out a survey into social security and that is why I say you are asking somebody to do something now which you asked Richardson to do.

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister said that Richardson's ideas are outmoded, but as the hon. senior member for Christ Church rightly said, the Government never paid us the compliment of making the Richardson Report the subject of discussion in this House although it was laid. How can you say that the Richardson Report which dealt with social security within the economy is outmoded? This gentleman who is coming will make a Report to the Minister as in the case with the Hospital Report, and you will tell us that the Report was not for us, but for you. Similarly, the Cadbury Report is not for us. I want to say to the Hon. Minister that there is no validity in his argument that we must agree to \$2.15, based on Richardson's recommendation, because the Hon. Minister is carrying out this recommendation based on the Richardson Report and no other, because he has no other guidance.

The Government of Barbados, Mr. Chairman, has no other Report before them with any aspect whatever of social security than the Richardson Report. He recommended \$2.40 in 1958; so you are three years behind. We say therefore that in view of the fact that you were three years behind, and since you were to pay \$2.40 in 1958, the aggregate that we have received from you should have been greater than what it is now. There can be absolutely no valid reason whatsoever for the Minister to say that because they are going to have a further investigation, they cannot now implement the Report. They are duty bound at this point to accept it. It is the minimum which you should be prepared to do. If the amount that was asked for is so negligible, why not accept it then? If you are laughing at the idea that he only recommended three cents more, let us take that as an arithmetic progression. If you are laughing at the recommendation of 8 cents, it is a retrogression to offer five cents.

My argument, Mr. Chairman, is that the Government should accept the minimum which Richardson recommended, but I would not accept Richardson's figure today to be the figure I regard it should be, because irrespective of what Richardson said then, I am saying that in 1961 I am capable of assessing this for myself, and the economy in 1961 can stand up to \$3.60. What the Minister is saying is that they do not want to go to \$3.60 because they may be asked to make further consideration after this gentleman investigates. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is not quoting me correctly.

Mr. WALCOTT: I did not make that as a quotation, Mr. Chairman, but by implication that is what he was saying. When you talk about the Government making a contribution, I would like to remind the hon. member that the Hon. Premier is wedded to the idea that there must be a contributory scheme for old age pension. That is not a question that he is right up on; I am right up on it and I know the general outlook. I would go 100% with the Government on the idea of trying to merge all the schemes which have

some implication of social security, but that is going to take a lot of discussion. That is your future plan and cannot take place like the old age pensions you are doing today. You say that this is going to be an interim measure, but there is a recommendation which you should have implemented since 1958. The financial position in Barbados which has risen over the years can carry what Richardson recommended, and you do not need an economist to tell you that. It is a simple fact, and your surpluses have shown it. If you have a look at the Customs figures posted month by month, you will see an indication of what the situation is going to be, because the amount has already exceeded what was estimated. I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that you can do what was asked, and I do not see that you can have a review of any other section and you are not going to review old age pensions as a result of the salaries revision. That may take another five years, and I am putting it to the Minister that social security discussions cannot be concluded in any year or two.

We are discussing with the Minister of Trade the question of the sugar industry trying to work on something like that. That has been going on from the beginning of this year. The Hon. Minister had proposals sent to the Government to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act since 1957, and nothing has yet been finalised; so when you come to these matters, they take a lot of time. I may say to the hon. member that there is nobody in the Government Service who could tackle that problem. I am satisfied in my mind that on the question of insurance in so far as the Workmen's Compensation is concerned, the Government was looking for people who would have the impetus to implement such a scheme which could have been implemented long ago; and we would have saved thousands of dollars to help us with some of these schemes.

I will warn the Hon. Minister that when it comes to the question of old age pension that must always remain, because you are dealing with the destitute and people who cannot help themselves. No matter what anybody says, there is no community in the world where you do not find the aged and the destitute. This world is not what you think it is. You have to provide for them and you have to find places for them because there will be people without families, people whose families have died, people who have nobody to care for them and become old and weak and have to be put in an institution. Institutional care is part of our modern civilisation, because there will be broken homes and children out of homes. Those are problems you have to face, and that is why I say that the portfolio of the Minister of Social Services is an extremely important portfolio in the context of modern civilisation; and social and economic matters must be the bulwark of anything we do.

9. 35 p.m.

The suggestion that has been made is excellent and sound and there is no reason why you should not accept what Professor Richardson recommended as a minimum of what can be done. Professor Richardson suggested to you \$2.40 and you could have done it. You have boasted that your economy is buoyant. You have told the people that it is more buoyant today than it ever was, and that you never had it so before. You have told the people that they never lived as they are living now. With all that boast, you cannot yet see your way of putting old age pension to the recommendation which Professor Richardson said that you could do.

Mr. CRAWFORD: May I ask the Hon. Minister what it would cost additionally to carry it to \$2.40?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: To answer the hon. member's question first, you would have to change the Means Test and then you would have to work out the number of additional persons who would come under it; so it would be physically impossible if you look at it from the point of view of mathematics only. It looks as if it would cost \$151,000 more.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I take it that the Government cannot see its way to find this money to give this additional increase. If that is correct, what on earth are they bringing a social security expert here for? It is sheer bluff. If they cannot find an additional \$150,000 to pay the Old Age Pen-

sioners \$2.40 a week, what are they bringing a social security expert here for? Where on earth will they find the money to carry out that scheme? What will they finance it with? The sands on the sea shore? The Hon. Minister said that Professor Richardson came here to advise them on Old Age Pensions. That is not true.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. It is unfortunate for the hon. member to deliberately misquote me. I did not say that. I read the passage from the terms of reference which were handed to Professor Richardson.

Mr. TALMA: The Minister said so and he said other things too. He says one thing now and another thing later on. He did say that and that Professor Richardson made mention of a social security scheme.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I must repeat, I was at pains to state his terms of reference were:-

"To undertake an exploratory investigation with the object of assessing whether, having regard to the financial and economic situation of Barbados and the other obligations to be faced by the Government in the immediate future, Barbados is in a position to support any measure of Social Security, and if so, to what extent."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: How is it that the terms of reference of Professor Richardson or a debate on Professor Richardson's Report comes under Clause 4?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not saying that it is, but the basic argument is that this is an interim measure by the Government. It is a palliative, to quote the Hon. Minister. He said that they are making this increase to Old Age Pensioners pending the introduction of a more comprehensive scheme of social security. I am quoting him again. He said that we are living in an age of overriding prosperity. It seems more than passing strange, Mr. Chairman, that in this era of overriding prosperity the meagre sum of \$150,000 is beyond the capacity of the Government to provide to bring the Old Age Pension to \$2.40. Either the Hon. Minister does not know what is meant by overriding prosperity or the \$150,000 is impossible of attainment in an era of overriding prosperity.

Now, Sir, we are now asked to accept the Government's proposal of \$2.15 a week and I agree with the contention that the minimum we should be asked to support is the amount recommended by Professor Richardson seven years ago. May I tell the Hon. Minister that a social security scheme to provide the most minimum requisites would cost this country \$3 million a year? It is true that the amounts which we are now spending on Old Age Pension, Poor Relief, Insurance allowances and so on we would no longer have to provide; but if he says that the Government cannot find the \$150,000 to provide this increase in Old Age Pension, in a social security scheme in which the Government, the employers and employees would have to contribute their share and in the case of the Government the amount would be infinitely more than \$150,000 which he claims they cannot find now, how would they be able to implement a social security scheme? The Hon. Minister says that they are doing this now because the rains came. It is impossible to conceive that late rains coming less than two months ago have resulted in this tremendous change in the economic prospects of this country as to warrant now their doing what they could not do four months ago. If the rains continue, perhaps we may see them increasing the salaries of the Ministers.

I was interested in the remark used by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the instance of unemployment in Barbados would mitigate against the introduction of a comprehensive social security scheme. While to some extent this would be so, we have to bear in mind that the people of this country still maintain their contribution to friendly societies and nowadays they are paying insurance premiums in addition. There are a number of insurance companies in this Island underwriting premiums for lower income workers involving weekly contributions on the part of the workers to carry those policies.

9. 45 p.m.

If we were to total the amount paid by these workers to friendly societies and in insurance premiums, you would get a figure which would more than pay the workers' contribution towards a social security scheme. For minimum benefits, for basic security allowances, the contribution of the worker would be hardly more than 40 cents per week, and in the scheme in respect of which the over-all costs would be over three million dollars a year.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member deal with the Clause which is before us and not with any question of social security.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, if the records of this House were kept in a proper condition, I would not have to make the remarks which I am making now at all. I have tried to get a copy of the Memorandum I tabled years ago in relation to social security and there is no copy of it at all. It is only now that I have the file in connection with Professor Richardson's scheme that I have found a copy of that Memorandum in the file. The contention of the Government is that they are not going to put this figure at \$2,50 now, either because they cannot afford to do it or because they are bringing down a social security expert from the L.L.O. If they are going to bring down this expert, unless they intend to pigeonhole his report, they must be thinking in terms of finding more money for the more comprehensive system of which they have made mention. If, in the foreseeable future, you intend to find this money, you can also find this \$150,000 more which is needed in order to carry this scheme into operation. It is for that reason that we are refusing to support the proposal in this particular section.

The question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:

AYES: HON'BLE M. E. COX, L. StA. THORNE, F. E. MILLER, MESSRS. SEARLES, T. W. MILLER, STRAUGHN and SMITH - 7

NOES: MESSRS. WALCOTT; TUDOR; TALMA; CRAWFORD and BRANCKER - 5.

On the motion of Hon. F. E. MILLER, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, the CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. F. E. MILLER, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 10 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order in the absence of the Hon. Premier.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as hon. members see from the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill, hitherto the Parochial Treasurers of those parishes in which all public roads were under the control of the Department of Highways and Transport were entitled, by virtue of sub-

section (3) of Section 27 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act 1945, to deduct a commission from all sums collected by them by way of tax. Since the Local Government Act came into being, no funds were paid to the Local Government Councils for the collection of these funds where the roads were taken over from the Government. It is felt that since these Councils have got to pay the Government for auditing their books as well as for the assessment of the various businesses etc., it is reasonable to allow them or to reimburse them with the expense for collecting these funds. This Bill seeks to provide that the Account General should refund to the Treasurers of these Councils 2% of the moneys paid by them into the Public Treasury in accordance with Section 27 of the Act since the beginning of the financial year.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.
9.55 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded in each case by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with Order No. 12 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to deal with Order No. 12 as the next Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

RESOLUTION re ESSO STANDARD OIL S.A.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a simple Resolution. Under Section 7 of the Esso Standard Oil S.A. (Jetty) Act, 1956, the Act provides that Esso Standard Oil may from time to time with the consent of the Governor-in-Executive Committee transfer their rights and liabilities. Esso Standard Oil has asked that their rights be transferred to Esso Standard Oil S.A. Limited, a Company incorporated under the laws of the Bahama Islands and the Governor-in-Executive Committee has agreed. It is necessary to get legislative approval and therefore this Resolution is before the House.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that ends Government Business for the day.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 5th September, 1961, at 12 noon.

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

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

10.04 p.m.