THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th January, 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, *(Leader of the Opposition)*; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D.,C.M., *(Premier)*; Hon. M. E. COX, *(Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour)*; His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., *(Deputy Speaker)*; Hon. R. G. MAPP, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing)*; Hon. D. D. GARNER, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries)*; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. StA. THORNE, *(Minister of Education)*; and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 10th January, 1961, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. *(After a pause).* There being no objection, those Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took their seats.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay Message No. 2/1961 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly, regarding appointments to the Executive Committee.

The Message is as follows:-

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that pursuant to the provisions of the Executive Committee Act, 1891, he has appointed the following members of the Honourable the House Assembly to be members of the Executive Committee under and in accordance with the provisions of that Act:-

The Honourable M. E. Cox, M.C.P.,
The Honourable R. G. Mapp, M.C.P.,
The Honourable F. E. Miller, M.C.P.,
The Honourable D. D. Garner, M.C.P.,
The Honourable L. St.A. Thorne, M.C.P.

J. M. Stow
GOVERNOR.

Government House,
Barbados.

10th January, 1961.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Public Officers' Loan and Travelling Allowances (Scheduled Officers) Regulations, 1961.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Barbados Savings Bank for the half year ended 30th June, 1960.

Annual Report of the Barbados Fire Service for the year 1959.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders to 30th November, 1960.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of $19,300 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61, No. 31, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Resolution to place the sum of $4,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61, No. 32, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the Trade Act, 1910.

A Bill to amend and repeal the provisions of certain Acts of the Island relating to the dues and charges that may be levied upon shipping.

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 MEMBER'S NOTICE

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

WHEREAS the establishment of a new industry is of general economic advantage to the country, and

WHEREAS the completion of the Deep Water Harbour renders it imperative to endeavour to find suitable alternative employment for dock workers, and

WHEREAS as has been pointed out in Questions tabled in this House in July, 1949 and in a Resolution tabled in October, 1950 that the manufacture in Barbados of flour from imported wheat would make available different grades of super-quality, including whole wheaten flour and a highly nutritious additional ingredient for preparing feed for dairy cattle and pigs, namely bran, and

WHEREAS it has been established that it is economically feasible to establish a flour mill to produce as little as 20,000 lbs daily - working 250-300 days a year, and

WHEREAS the consumption of flour in Barbados alone now approximates 24 million lbs annually at a cost of nearly $2 million — to say nothing of the adjacent units of the Federation,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government take immediate steps to ensure the establishment in Barbados at the earliest date possible of a mill to manufacture flour from imported wheat — a project which has been rendered highly practicable by the completion of the Deep Water Harbour.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: Questions standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, who, I observe, is not in his place.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, I beg to enquire for oral answer of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

Will the Minister state -

(1) What wage is paid to the janitor or janitors employed at the Richmond Schools?

(2) Will he also state whether such janitor or janitors are paid during vacations and what they are paid?

(3) Will he further state what amounts are paid for scrubbing whenever this is done?

Mr. TUDOR entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I beg to enquire for oral answer of the appropriate Minister:-

Can the Minister state if the Government has awarded the contract for the printing of the Laws of Barbados?

If the answer is "yes", can the Minister state if the contract is awarded to a printer in Barbados?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, the Bill to amend the Trade Act, 1910, was read a first time.

On a similar motion, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, the Bill to amend and repeal the provisions of certain Acts of the island relating to the dues and charges that may be levied upon shipping, was read a first time.

12.25 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the House into Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1960-61, No. 30

LEGAL

Head VIII - Legal - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is to seek supplementary provision for the Legal Department. This was rendered necessary because a typewriter was repaired and the cost of it was rather more than the usual. We had to have this typewriter because of the state of the work being done in the Legal Department which had to have an additional stenographer. In addition, there were other expenses incurred in the Department.

In connection with Item 13, this is rendered necessary because the Crown Counsel who has been appointed now has to travel to the various Courts of the Island on business. This amount for his travelling was not included in the current Estimates.

I beg to move that Head VIII - Legal - stand part.

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

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

JUDICIARY

Head XIV - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Due to an oversight, Mr. Chairman, no provision was made in the current Estimates for the travelling of the Provost Marshal. That was discovered at a very late hour, and this supplementary provision is required to pay for his travelling already done and to carry on to the end of this financial year.

I beg to move that Head XIV - Judiciary - stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, as to this Head, it is not quite clear to me whether this travelling done on official duties by the Provost Marshal, was done within or outside of the Island. Perhaps the Hon. Minister of Finance would make that clear.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This was for his duties inside the Island.

Mr. BRANCKER: I thank the Hon. Minister. I am grateful for the information because I heard recently of a case in which a highly placed public official did some travelling and was involved in certain other expenses totalling a comparatively small figure for which, I understand, he was not reimbursed by Government. He was thereby out of pocket by that amount which I was told was in the vicinity of £30; so I was just wondering whether this travelling may have been done without or within the Island. If it has been done outside of the Island, what is the principle on which public Officers are reimbursed for travelling outside the Island on official duties?

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

MEDICAL

Head XXIII - Medical (2) General Hospital - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this item is for work done on research projects at the General Hospital. According to the information I have, a special effort is being made to produce at least five papers on research projects from Barbados for presentation at the Conference of the Standing Advisory Committee for Medical Research which will be held in April, 1961. The work is not proceeding, as far as I understand, as rapidly as one would expect; and this supplementary provision is required to pay for temporary clerical assistance so that the work can be completed in time.

I beg to move that Head XXIII - Medical (2) General Hospital, stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, in connection with these papers on research projects for presentation to the Conference, I wonder if — it does not seem at all inappropriate — as we are considering the passing of a Resolution, to produce papers for presentation before this distinguished body, the Hon. Minister of Finance perhaps on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Health would give us some information as to producing on the Table of this House, the Report of the Medical Advisory Committee on the General Hospital. I think it is, more or less, all *a propos* the same line of thought; it is something to which we are looking forward. Just as it is seen fit that these five papers on such projects should be produced on Barbados, it seems to me even more necessary and urgent that there should be also produced for presentation to Barbados through its Parliament, the Report of the Committee which examined and reported on conditions at the General Hospital.

I trust that the Hon. Premier would take us into his confidence as to how soon we may expect the laying on the Table of this House for presentation to the public of Barbados, this much sought after and greatly awaited Report.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I think it is very well known that the Minister concerned was very ill. I think that as soon as he is able to resume coming to his office the Report will be presented. I am not in a position to do it for him, therefore, we must await his return.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the Hon. Premier for at least giving the official answer to that query, but I must say that the most regrettable indisposition of the Hon. Minister, as I understood, took place comparatively recently; whereas, this Report was, I believe, according to rumour, presented as long ago as last September. Of course, apart from when the Hon. Minister's illness took place first in relation to the presentation by the Committee of this Report, you know the old saying that the King is dead, long lives the King; as soon as one King is dead, somebody else is there.

12.35 p.m.

We are very glad that the Hon. Minister has recovered and is very well again; we saw him in the House last Tuesday. However, in respect of that, we feel that somebody should have been carrying on as Minister of Health; or, perhaps, another Minister should have been attending to this portfolio whether the cause of absence be a holiday, a vacation in the colony or any condition of illness. It is expected, as far as parliamentary procedure is concerned, that if a Minister is ill someone else would be acting for the ailing Minister, would be performing the duties of Minister of Health just as if the Minister was perfectly well and attending to the duties of his office. I trust having seen him out last Tuesday, and on other occasions, that at the next meeting of Parliament this report would be put before this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think it is more serious than that. This idea of looking upon business of the Government as if it were proprietorship must be completely eradicated from the public's mind. It was pathetic to hear the Hon. Premier answering the query put to one of his Ministers in relation to the laying of a document. He has come out with the astonishing statement that the Minister was ill and, therefore, as soon as the Minister has completely recovered, the question about this Report would be-----

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I did not say if he recovered. I said "when he resumes his office." An hon. member on that side said he saw the Minister of Health out last Tuesday. Yes, that is so, but the Minister has not yet come back to his office.

Mr. WALCOTT: The people of Barbados do not seem to understand that when you have a system of Government, you have nothing to do with who is sick. It is just like telling me that because the Minister of Health is sick, the medical services of the island have come to a standstill. The Government is not dead; the Government is not sick - although the Government is likely to be mentally sick!

When it comes to this question, how can you say, because the Minister of Health is ill, the report was not laid. What has that to do with the Minister being sick? There is nothing in our constitution to say that a Minister should resign through illness; and, as a matter of fact, he can go on drawing all the emoluments of his office when he is sick; and there is nothing to say that he has to retire after 40 days or six months' illness. He is the one person who can draw his pay for the whole session.

This is a question of a report which has been made in so far as the Barbados General Hospital is concerned. The Hon. Premier either has to say that the Government has not studied it sufficiently as yet, or that the Government is not laying it yet on the Table of the House; he cannot say that it has not been laid yet because the Minister is ill. As a matter of fact, when it comes to a question like this, this is the collective responsibility of the whole Government. This matter does not rest with the Minister alone. If the Minister of Health does not wish that the Report should be laid in the House, and other members of the Cabinet desire that it should be laid, then he should resign. Mr. Chairman, I know how anxious you are for me to stop speaking on this matter. I can anticipate your anxiety, but I want to say irrespective of your anxiety, that, to hear statements coming from the Hon. Premier as that which he made just now, is an acknowledgment of what type of Government we are aspiring to for the people of Barbados. We have the Hon. Premier in the position where he has absolutely no knowledge of what internal self-government implies.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there is only one thing for me to say, and that is that it is a very good thing that the Hon. Minister of Health has not died! We would wish to see him well of course as an individual, but judging from the Hon. Premier's remarks, if this Minister had died we would have had to bury the report with him. It may have added to the expenditure of the turnout!

The entire action of the Government in this matter is most reprehensible. This report, so far as we are aware, was made public before the illness of the Minister. The Government has been sitting down on it for what purpose, we are fully aware. If we had not prod them into publishing it, this report would never have seen the light of day. It is sincerely to be hoped, Mr. Chairman, that an action of this sort will not occur again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, now that we have the opportunity of speaking on this matter it is my intention to query about the publication of this report at some future time. Contrary to other members' thinking, I do not agree that any report the magnitude of this report on the General Hospital should be put purely within the scope of the Minister concerned. To me, it is of such great importance that it should be dealt with at Cabinet level; this is not merely a matter for the Minister alone to answer.

I hate to say this, but I believe that the report has been published. I know that it is customary for honourable members to say that I will bring people into trouble by what I

say, but I want to preface my remarks and say now that three people cannot keep a secret unless two are dead according to the Hon. Premier. There are those of us who are so interested in the public health of this country, and who, perhaps, because we are not so strong, have to make enquiries as regards the publication of this report.

I do not want to bring any tales out of school, but I know as a fact that the Government is not very enamoured over the publication of this report; that it is not a very kind report. Let us face facts. None of us expected that this report would be a kind report; even the Hon. Premier himself who is more knowledgeable of the conditions at the General Hospital than any of us, would not expect that this would be a kind report — if any person learned in the medical profession had to report honestly on that institution. I think I have said enough on that.

I say to the Hon. Premier to forget all the stupidity that the Minister of Health is in charge of this matter. This matter is one which should be treated purely at Cabinet level. We are contending that because it concerns the health of the community that this report should have been published for the benefit of the people. We of the Opposition are contending that the shocking conditions at the Hospital are something which we expected would be spoken about in this report. The Government is even in the happy position where they can say, when this report is presented, that what they are doing to remedy it is to build a new hospital, the work on which has started already.
12.45 p.m.
The amount of money which we are spending on the Hospital is such that, if I were in the position of the Government, I would publish that Report and show the justification for publishing it. You have one General Hospital to serve 230,000 people and we are demanding the publication of that Report for the benefit of the people. It is unanswerable for anyone to say something about a Minister's illness in relation to this Report; this is not a Report for the Minister; obviously the Minister will get his copy of the Report, but, as I said, three people can only keep a secret if two of them pass off; under the circumstances, you have three medical men doing something. Like members of the Government, I, too, have my friends who may be friends of doctors, and I am interested in public health and in human beings. Because the conditions are shocking you should face them; if conditions are shocking then you should be removing them. I say nothing more about that.

You cannot bring people here at the expense of the people of this colony to make a Report on a Hospital and then withhold the findings of the Report from the people. I do not think it is right to do that; therefore I am demanding that this Report be published. I am sure that the Opposition joins me in saying that it should be published. Mr. Chairman, if it is not published, I will come in here with extracts from the Report and then the public will know. What is the point of hiding a Report? Public Health standards are improved, people demand more of medical practitioners and you have not got the number of medical men in the island to cope with these matters. When people pretend that they know all and do not want to take instructions from other people, then you are bound to get these things going from bad to worse.

When this Report comes to this House I should like the opportunity for us to have a field day in connection with it, because there is a feeling in this country that if you offer criticism of medical men then you are in danger. The Premier laughs; but he knows well enough that I have passed through the days when people like myself whose qualifications were alongside those of people in the Hospital, when surgeons and people like myself could not have dared to criticise medical men because you would have been debarred from entering the Hospital. The hon. member knows that what I am saying is true. There are those who believe that if you attempt to criticise a doctor at the Hospital you are looking for trouble; but I say that if we, in this House, must stifle our consciences and come in here with our tongues in our cheeks and be prepared to say nothing because it affects some particular doctor, then I say we should not be in here.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly on this matter. I hope that the Premier will forgive me if I tell him not to attempt to say that the particular Minister was ill and that affected the publication of the Report. This is an important matter and members of the Cabinet should have studied it. I feel that the Minister will agree that we are not partners in crime, but partners in peril, because we suffer from the same illness and I do not want to give him any worry. However, this is not a matter merely for the Minister but it is a matter for the Cabinet. This is something which deals with the health of the people of this island. This Report must be laid in this House, and it should be laid by the end of this month.

The question that Head XXIII - Medical (2) General Hospital - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MENTAL HOSPITAL

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (3) MENTAL HOSPITAL

Head XXIII - Medical (3) Mental Hospital - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Under this Head, Mr. Chairman, there is the Item "Incidentals". In the 1959-60 Estimates certain items such as cigarettes, tobacco, snuff and toilet paper were removed from the vote under "Incidentals" to the "Provisions" vote. However, in the 1960-61 Estimates, through a typographical error, the notes to the Estimates continued to indicate that provision is made under "Incidentals" for cigarettes, tobacco and so on. In short, this amount seeks to make provision for these items under this Head, and the supplementary amount required is $3,250. I beg to move that Head XXIII - Medical (3) Mental Hospital - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this: there seems to be the tendency when you are dealing with Government Estimates to have one view of them while when you are dealing with Local Government Estimates, to have another view of them.
12.55 p.m.
I heartily support what is being done, but there is a tendency to say in certain quarters that incidentals — I do not know for the other two areas, but for the Bridgetown City Council — must be itemised. I wonder, Sir, from whose brain that sprung; and why it is not actually so for Government Departments. This amount would carry the Incidentals for the Mental Hospital to quite over $7,000, and it merely sets out in the Estimates that it includes these things; and, quite naturally, things within this scope you cannot very well estimate for and they are usually paid for out of Incidentals. For some reason or other somebody with a hair across his brain seemed to have advised the Government as to what the Bridgetown City Council should have.

Mr. Chairman, I shall follow the example of the Government in this case in doing this whether it is good or bad. I do not follow the Government's example in doing everything, but in this case I should follow its example. I hope that when the time comes and the City Council's Estimates go before the Premier he will see that it is what Government has done, and if the Bridgetown City Council does it that way, there should be no quarrel.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the Hon. Premier has not taken up the hon. member on that point. As far as incidentals are concerned, the hon. senior member for Christ Church, as a former Minister, knows that every Head of Department when applying for or submitting estimates has to give a breakdown to the Finance section in respect of these incidentals. No Head of Department can set out incidentals without having anything behind them; they must be itemised. I would like to assure the Committee of that.

I would not like the hon. member to give the impression that, because we may not come to the House setting out the various items, breakdowns are not given. If any mem-

ber asks for a breakdown of incidentals, I am sure that we could give the information.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I quite appreciate what the hon. member has said about a breakdown, but I think he should take out the words "itemised account of incidentals". If you look in the Estimates, you will see that incidentals include tobacco, haircutting etc., and therefore according to the most elementary principles of accounting, if you itemise small things, they could not be incidentals because you would know how much is needed.

Mr. Chairman, if you look under Item 41 - Head XXIII (3), you will see that the note reads "includes for Account Books, Manuscript Books and Registers; Cricket Gear, Gratuities to patients, Carpenters' and Masons' tools, Rent of Rediffusion, Gratuity to attendants operating cinema, Burials, Subscription to daily paper, Postage, etc., Christmas Festivities. Provision for cigarettes, tobacco, etc.," — a word which they made the Bridgetown City Council cut out — "Provision included for medical treatment to staff and travelling expenses of Dispenser."

The Hon. Minister is correct, and we are not at cross purposes on that at all; but if you itemise incidentals, according to elementary methods of accounting, they are not incidentals. What I contend, however, is that you cannot very well say that the method of breaking down your incidentals must be different for the Government and for the Bridgetown City Council. If you put in Account Books, Manuscript Books and Registers, Cricket Gear, Gratuities to patients etc., how can you itemise that? I maintain that if you could itemise them, you would have Items 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 and so on. That is an elementary principle and you can seek your Queen's Solicitor's advice on that point.

If you bought an item which was not included in this List, naturally the Accounting Officer could not pass it because it would not be in keeping with what you set out under incidentals. For instance, if you wanted to buy shovels, it would not be in keeping to include it under Incidentals, and that is the question I am raising. I am raising the question, Mr. Chairman, because I know the stand which the Government has taken with the Bridgetown City Council in this matter. As far as the Minister of Trade is concerned, he said that people should not be allowed to think that the Government's Heads of Departments would sit down and put up a note for incidentals that way. Does the hon. member think that any Head of Department could come before the City Council and put up an incidental vote that way? The request to itemise incidentals is just so much nonsense in my opinion.

Hon. M. E. COX: Surely the hon. member has been much better than that on many occasions. I do not think he is thinking very clearly today. The fact that the member has mentioned the various items set out in the Estimate is sufficient to convince him that they are itemised. The moment that you set down books, registers etc., means that the incidentals are itemised. As soon as you decide to set out the various items in the list, that is itemising.

I believe the hon. member is slightly mixing up contingencies with incidentals. However, Sir, I wanted to make our position quite clear. Our position is that as far as incidentals are concerned, they are to be itemised. A breakdown must be given showing so much for books, and so on and so on, and the total amount is so much. That is what I know obtains as far as the Government is concerned. As far as incidentals are concerned, every Head of Department must submit to the Finance section a breakdown of the various items and the cost of them in a request for an incidental vote.

1.05 p.m.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for the City has emphasised in his own right that the City Council should do it like that. To put the records straight, it would be worth while for me to point out that this was not an insistence made to the Bridgetown City Council alone, but also to the Northern District Council; and I think that the Southern District Council had to do the same thing. I can also say that at one time I knew that our Clerk, that is to say the Clerk of the Northern District Council, thought that it was pretty irritating. However, I think that it was an instance made by the Government on all the District Councils.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I wish to say that there seems to be some discrepancies as to the proper significance of the item, whether it should be designated "Provisions" or "Incidentals". The Hon. Minister of Trade, explained to some extent and I agree that these incidentals are outside the normal conditions and form of items which come under incidentals, and that they form the basis of a separate and distinct head which means more or less small items.

That is one point, but then it is the question of voting for cigarettes, tobacco, snuff, and toilet paper which items really are not incidentals at all, and because of which the Accounting Department would not recognise or give the O.K. for money to be spent. These items fall under the Head of "Provisions" of some sort. It is in my mind that it is for the department in question to raise a specific head for items such as these - cigarettes, tobacco, snuff. The confusion arises, as stated in the Note under the item "Incidentals", where items which can very well be termed items come under the item "Provisions."

When all is said and done this has occurred because you have not pinned down yourself to saying what the item is. If it is cigarettes, say it is cigarettes. Whatever it is, say that it is that. Do not try to hide or conceal that expenditure under the Head "Incidentals" when in truth and fact you are spending money under "Provisions". If you are spending money under "Provisions" say so, and do not deceive members on the Opposition benches.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make clear the point which I raised. We have it in the Note that Item 41 "Incidentals" includes cigarettes, tobacco, snuff and toilet paper; you come back here now and say that this money has been spent and therefore you are now asking for more money. My contention is that you broke it down that way. I do not follow what the prospective member for the Northern District Council Chairmanship has said, but there is nothing wrong in your breaking it down that way. I maintain, and it has been my experience, that you break it down that way. There is nothing wrong in your having it this way, but why should the Bridgetown City Council have it this way? I am not saying that this is not the correct way but I do not see why the Bridgetown City Council should have it this way.

Of course, if a Head of Department came before you and said that he wanted $4,700 to be spent under the Head "Incidentals" you are not going to give it to him just so; you would want to know from him what he wants it for; therefore, you must expect if you run a Government and other people run a Council that they would ask the same questions. I hear in a *sotto voce* remark that other Councils do the same thing. You are saying: "tell us now how much you have in mind for cigarettes, for tobacco, for toilet paper and so on". In other words, that cannot be "Incidentals" as you want it.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Is that what you say? If for any particular item the expense is particularly heavy, well it would be more feasible to put it under a separate item. That is the reason for asking to itemise these things.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is what the Minister said and what I said. I should have said that you cannot set out the entire estimates for cigarettes, but you can tell it to the Committee. When I used the word "itemise" I mean that you must actually break down the estimate and say what the items included would be and what you are spending on each.

Under the Note you further state that in addition, provision was included in the 1960-61 Estimates for the purchase of a new ambulance. It was expected that the new unit would arrive in May, 1960, and so an amount of $200 only was included in the "Incidentals" vote to pay for car hire to assist in the transportation of patients to and from

the hospital. The new ambulance did not in fact arrive until August, 1960, and the amount expended on car hire during the period April to August, 1960, amounted to $762. To reimburse the "Incidentals" vote on this account, an additional amount of $562 is now requested.

Sir, I am not opposing the Resolution; I am just defending the statement that it is "Incidentals" because you cannot directly say that these items are "Provisions".

The question that Head XXIII (3) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXVI - PENSIONS

Head XXVI - Pensions - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr.Chairman, under this Head I am asking leave to make these amendments: that the two amounts - $194,000 and $2,300 - which appear under the column "Fixed by Law" be removed from that column and put under the column "To be Voted". In the last column insert the Note and asterisk "Authorised by Law".

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, as set out in the Note to Item 6, in Public Pensions and Gratuities, as well as Item 8, Widows' and Orphans' Pensions, the number of pensions has increased very rapidly during the year. On the face of the amount now expended monthly, it is estimated that in the case of Public Pensions and Gratuities $194,000 more will be needed, and in the case of Widows' and Orphans' Pensions $2,300 will be needed to carry on until the end of the financial year.

I beg to more that Head XXVI stand part.

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

1.15 p.m.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, while we are on this question of pensions, I refer to public pensions and gratuities mainly, I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier that in some cases I believe he would be surprised to know that any amount of hardship and inconvenience is meted out to certain Government employees. These employees have worked for many years and are entitled to pensions, but for some reason or other, they are kept waiting and are being turned around for many months - in some cases the period runs into a year - before they receive these pensions. I am drawing this matter to the attention of the Premier because I feel that he may not be aware of certain things which are happening in Government Departments today.

In the Agricultural Department, I know of cases where men have worked in the lower brackets, but the fact remains that whether they have served in the lower brackets or in the higher brackets, they have served the Government; in certain cases these employees have been waiting on their little pensions for many, many months, they are being turned around, and it is just not possible for them to get their pensions. I would be grateful if the appropriate Minister would have a look into this matter of pensions which are due to these Government employees who are waiting on such pensions.

If you starve a man, he might well be dead by the time that the pension is ready for him; if people are to wait for a year before they are given these pensions, then you can easily get rid of these pensioners or prospective pensioners before the pensions are paid. That is not good enough for a Government; if you are representing the small man then you should represent him properly.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, you can only take action in connection with anything which is going wrong when you know about it. If the hon. member will give me the names of persons whom he knows are waiting for their pensions, I will take up the matter immediately. As far as the second point is concerned, of course that is not the policy of the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to show the Premier a letter - I am not showing him the name on it though - from a labourer pointing out that people employed mostly by the Public Works Department at Seawell complain that, when they are sick, they get better before they get their sick leave benefits. If a man has sick leave, whatever benefits he is entitled to should be forthcoming to him almost immediately. The delay is so intolerable now that people have had to protest against it in writing. The whole thing certainly betrays indifference or laziness or carelessness or all three of these things if such a state is allowed to exist.

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

HEAD XXX - INLAND REVENUE

Head XXX - Inland Revenue - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, there is the Item "Travelling Expenses". This item is in connection with the increased travelling done by officers of the Inland Revenue Department because of the number of inspections of hereditaments for assessment purposes. These officers have to travel when people make complaints, and when they are to be re-assessments because of extensions done to houses. It is now estimated that in order to meet this increased rate of expenditure, an additional $1,000 will be required. I beg to move that Head XXX stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD XXXVIII - OLD AGE PENSIONS

Head XXXVIII - Old Age Pensions - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Item "Old Age Pensions", the number of Old Age pensioners has been increasing. At the 12th November, 1960, the expenditure amounted to $564,309 out of the $870,500 which was voted, and in carrying on at that rate monthly, there is a balance of $306,191 available for payment to the end of the financial year. It is now estimated that the amount of $18,000 will be required to supplement the provisions until the end of the financial year.

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

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this is as good an opportunity as any other to ask the Premier what exactly is the Government's policy towards this matter of Old Age pensions. It is now, I believe, five years almost to a day since an increase was given; and in the intervening time the Government has not made any pronouncements whatever. During last year or in the year before, it had been thought possible that these people would have been offered some increase, but they have not been offered any increase. It would be a bad thing if these people were made to wait until the Treasury is nearly empty towards the end of this year, and when a few of them are dead, before the Government takes them into consideration.

1.25 p.m.

I myself have got a motion down under Private Members' Business on this matter; and you would have thought that since it was there last year it would have incited Government even to anticipate this side of the House by declaring its policy. Since they have not done so, we on this side of the House are left to ask them again to make some declaration of their future policy.

While we are on this point, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that there ought by now to be devised in this Island some more scientific method of approaching this question of old age pensions. There are a lot of old people in this island, Mr. Chairman, who do not know their ages, and because they do not know their ages, they are put to considerable difficulty in making out their claims. There was a time, it must be more than 65 years ago, when in this Island registration of births was not the Law as it is now,

and those people who were born before births were registered or registered by law, have no record now of their ages and do not know where they might have been baptized so that they could deduce their ages from baptism. Consequently when the Government says that the number of old age pensioners has increased in the last few months by 57, that is only the number of those people who could truthfully and easily make out their claims; but I suspect that in this island there must be at least 1,000 people who can offer no proof of their eligibility, and who because of that, are put to the great difficulty in making out their claims. There should be some way found to offset that because it is unfair that people who through no fault of their own, who were born in a system which did not allow for such accuracy of information, should suffer and be penalised for it.

The third point I want to make is that without prejudice to the increase in the rate given to old people, it is time that something was done to consolidate this whole problem into a general social security system. There are too many loopholes and too much injustice being suffered for want of a proper and systematic approach to the problem of old age pensions. While all that is being looked into, a case has been more than made out for an increase in what is actually being given; and I should like to see that done long before other people or other interests get their opportunity to dip into the Treasury. Those who are younger, stronger and more voluble could always make their weight felt by frequent protests, but the old people cannot. Other people have to see about them, and I press Government very strongly to declare its policy on this matter before the Treasury becomes so dry in the course of this year that nothing is left for them but a mere pittance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think that rather than allow the hon. member to sing a solo, I am bound to join because this is very near and dear to my heart. While I do not agree with him in certain aspects, I entirely agree with him that the time has come when the whole Act needs amending. Now that we are federating, with my experience, and I believe the Premier has had similar experience, this question of being domiciled here for ten years before you can get a pension wants amending. I am sure the Premier will look into that because Barbadians who went away, and who have become unfortunates in Cuba and Panama, must be resident here ten years if they come back destitute before they receive old age pension. I think that members of the Government would agree that these people in one way or another during the time when they were abroad contributed to the economy of this country through their families.

Mr. Chairman, for those Barbadians who have lived in Trinidad, St. Lucia and Haiti and have now returned to Barbados, I think the Act should be amended generally so that they can draw a pension. As a matter of fact, I think we have reached the stage where one of the first things this Government should get down to would be to have a Conference on a matter of this sort. If you are having Federation and a person lived in Trinidad, St. Lucia or St. Vincent, for forty years, and returns to Barbados at the age of 70 and has to live ten years here before drawing a pension, it is as good as denying him because he is not going to live another ten years.

On the other hand, when I state that this is near and dear to my heart, I myself feel that looking around this Chamber, everyone of us must be interested in the plight of the people in this country. No one could know better than the Hon. Premier - in his nearly forty years of medical practice - that we still have the age fixed at 68; and that is why I do not agree entirely with the hon. member for St. Lucy. It is going to be my contention, as long as I have breath, and as long as I am in here, that the age should be reduced to 65. I have been hearing what it would cost us; do not mind what it would cost us. I contribute my taxation and I maintain that from the Premier's experience as Head of the Government, the people who have worked in the fields in this country from 12 or 14 years for 50 odd years should receive a pension at 65 years and not wait another three years. Sixty-eight years is too long and too old; and I do not think it is humane to keep them waiting so long.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you would agree with me. I am surprised that this question was not included in the Governor's Speech. It is going to be part of my political platform again that the age should be reduced to sixty-five. I understand that there are 9,300 and you may have 15,000, but if you really think of the people and the plight they passed through during the 1914-18 War and their condition today, you would agree that the age should be reduced to 65. I see people day after day between 60 and 65 years of age, but I would not be radical to suggest that the age should be brought down to 60. Some people would be radical enough to suggest that age, but I am bearing in mind the economy of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that if you deny Civil Servants or anybody else in this country, you owe it to the old age pensioners, the people at 65 years and those who passed through the 1914-18 War who worked in the fields from 12 or 14 years. Everybody knows what it is to work in the sun for 50 years. Do you not think that they should draw a pension at 65? In the United States where the standard of living is higher they have reduced the age.

1.35 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I was once invited to a meeting when the late Rev. Godson suggested to me to let it remain at 68 years as it was in England. As you know, Sir, a man in England at the age of 68 years is so to speak a young man. But to whom are we giving a pension? We are giving it to a woman who may never have put on a pair of shoes or one who may never have slept in a bed in her life. I think of people like my grandmother. Of course, there will be no necessity for contending that in the City of Bridgetown. However, Sir, I never brag about anything. I believe that you must be humble in everything you do and that you must take everything with dignity and humility.

Sir, I maintain that until you have a system of social security that your system of old age pension should be based on the condition that people who pass the Means Test at 50 years should get it. As you have it today, a person who is blind at 25 years and passes the Means Test can draw pension, therefore a person at 50 years who according to a medical report is unable to work should be able to draw a little pittance.

We are spending today $870,000 on Old Age Pensions, but I maintain that if we spent $1 1/2 million to give assistance to the aged people who contributed with their sweat and blood to this country in the sugar industry that that is not asking us to do too much. I heard the Hon. Premier say in this House some time previously that the age for people to retire from the Public Service should not be 55. We have this farce that people retire at 55 years and you hire them back. If policemen, school teachers and Civil Servants can retire at 55, you can see the wisdom for reducing the qualifying age for Old Age Pension to 65. Tell me who you think has worked the hardest between the policeman, the school teacher and the woman who cut pond-grass?

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, this is one aspect of this matter on which I feel very strongly. During the last Session, and on a number of occasions before, I have asked questions and made representations on this matter. In spite of personal attacks in the past on me, I shall again attempt to put the case of the Old Age Pensioners clearly before the Government.

I think, Sir, that there is another angle from which we should look at this matter. I have always said in this Honourable House that it is the propensity to produce and not the propensity to spend which is the foundation of national income and wealth. What is the position with these old people who had to produce under more difficult conditions than today and on whose production we are living today? When they are finished with their years of production not through any fault of their own but through the natural laws, they find themselves placed in the position that they are no longer thought of by the community; therefore, I say that not only the Government but all of us should look out for these old people. A lot more can be done for these old people and when I say old people, I do not mean only the old people by age but I mean also people who have given their youth to the production of the island and who because they have become blind or through any other reason like that can no longer give of their youth.

When we consider their plight, I think we should look at the other side of the picture. Sir, how do you feel as re-

gards that part of the wall of the dining room of this Hon. House on which tiles were put recently? On it were put 40 six-inch tiles which took one man five weeks to do. At a rough cost, that man is drawing $20 a week but the old age pensioner is drawing one dollar a week. One man took five weeks to lay 40 tiles. It is an utter shame to think that one man can spend five weeks of the taxpayers' money for doing no more than laying what can be done in a matter of two days by other persons, and which can be done by another man who is perfect in the art in a matter of hours. Is it fair to allow circumstances such as that to continue in this island? Newspapers of this island can do this island a wonderful amount of good if they took full grasp of instances occurring in this island daily.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. What the hon. member is saying does not apply to this resolution at all. If the hon. member wants an opportunity to attack the Government on such a matter as that, he may do so when the opportunity arrives. We are dealing with Old Age Pension, and not really with the performance of workers in the Government or in private employment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was waiting patiently to see the connection. I myself have not seen it up to now. As I see it, the hon. member was dealing with productivity from which old age pensions should be met; but dwelling on the point of labourers not working is carrying that point too far.

Mr. DOWDING: Sir, it is unfortunate that this matter should touch the corns of the Hon. Minister who got up just now.

2.15 p.m.

As far as my argument goes, Mr. Chairman, it is a very simple one. If $100 is spent on a workman for five weeks' work at $20 a week, when the work could have been done for less, putting the figure at one week at $20, there would be $80 left. That is a matter of a blot on the community. If we do not insist that the members of the community produce, then we will never be able to pay Old Age Pensioners what they ought to be paid. That is a very simple, economic argument.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Having advanced that argument and made the connection, the hon. member should finish with the workman now. The hon. member should continue with the item dealing with Old Age Pensioners.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I would not like to think that you would direct my speech. I have given you an argument based on productive process, the lack of money to pay to the Old Age Pensioners, and I have a perfect right to develop that argument along the lines which I feel are in the interest of this community.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Having made that point and made the connection between the workman and the Old Age Pensioners, the hon. member must not develop that part of the matter in the debate. The hon. member has made his point; he cannot develop the argument of the failure of the workmen to do sufficient work in a particular time. Having made that point I do not think that the hon. member should develop the matter any further.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, in your own words you have agreed that I have not gone outside the matter. I am going to continue my remarks. As I have said on a number of occasions in this House, it is the production of a community which counts and, correspondingly, when you get proper production, you are able to give the amenities which should be afforded to those people in the community who are no longer able to produce. When I was interrupted, I was saying that it would do this island the world of good if the newspaper men in the island would go around and look for non-production in order that that non-production can be made into production. When you think that some of these Old Age Pensioners have produced for all their lives and have been able to buy a piece of land and they are put to the test, that piece of land helps them in respect of the miserable $1.80 per week; but where a man does work for five weeks when that work could be done in two days or less he is receiving wages which are out of comparison with the benefit of the Old Age Pensioner who has produced. On the other hand, the Old Age Pensioner cannot partake in the pension because the bit of land which may be rock, is above the test.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this is a matter which has been raised in this House before, and it strikes on the corns of a number of people. However, as long as I can stand on my feet I am going to criticise anyone, regardless of who it is, in the interest of the community and, correspondingly, in the interest of the Old Age Pensioners of this island. The majority of the people of this island have good consciences, and they should realise that their productuvity would allow others to live better lives; we should get that required amount of productivity.

I hope that those who are responsible will not attempt to villify me in the *Beacon* again because I mentioned that people at the Airport are not working for a day's pay. I will criticise them and I will insist on having a proper day's pay. Let people give a proper day's work and the Old Age Pensioners will get more money. The propensity to produce is the foundation of national wealth and income; not the propensity to work for all the money you can work for and produce nothing. What is the result to the community? A situation which has a blot on it. I will fight this matter if I fight it by myself, and in spite of the opposition or in spite of remarks made in the newspapers of this island. I know that I am right. I know that if we produce more we can pay the Old Age Pensioners more.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I could allow this Resolution to be passed without speaking a few words relative to the Old Age Pensioners. I am surprised that the Government of Barbados has two levels; the Civil Service has a maximum of 65 years and the old people who have carried on under the burden of heat of the sun have to reach 68 years before they get a pension. If I were in the position of the Government, I would put both the Civil Servants and these old people on one level.

1.55 p.m.

In this matter I am speaking conscientiously of what I know is a fact. I have stood behind people who were heading canes, and have heard them cry out for lubrication but they are still struggling on with the canes; and sometimes as late as 8 o'clock they are still in the fields trying to work for a meagre wage.

I think the Government should therefore adopt one level for both sets of people making the age 65 in order to relieve those poor people who worked in the fields. I am not against Civil Servants retiring at 65 years because, in other countries, that is the age at which they retire and can draw a pension; but we should think of the poor man or woman who is working for a small pay and when he retires only receives $1.80 per week. When a Civil Servant getting $600 a month retires, he receives a gratuity along with two-thirds or half of his salary as a pension, and therefore he can go home and survive. I have seen cases where Civil Servants who received $600 or $700 a month have retired and have gone back to work. Surely their plight was not so hard that they had to work again; they should be sitting at ease. The poor man who worked in the field goes from the field to the almshouse and from the almshouse to the grave. Some fall in the field at 68 through starvation, and some die before there is anybody to relieve them; and that is why I feel the Government should make one age limit for all workers.

The question that Head XXXVIII - Old Age Pensions - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

2.00 p.m.

On resumption,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your atten-

tion to the fact that there is no quorum, and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question time was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand there are no answers ready to Oral Questions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition: To move the passing of a Resolution re Single Member Constituencies and the appointment of a Commission with respect thereto.

I observe that the hon. member is not in his place.

Order No. 2 was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition: To move the passing of a Resolution re payment of Christmas Bonus to certain categories of public employees.

Again I observe that the hon. member is not in his place.

Order No. 3 was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Philip: To move the passing of a Resolution relative to an inexhaustive investigation in all phases of the Sugar Industry in Barbados by the Sugar Industry Enquiry Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr. Carl Goldenberg.

ENQUIRY INTO SUGAR INDUSTRY IN BARBADOS

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

"WHEREAS the future of the sugar industry is uncertain and there is therefore urgent need to place every phase of its operation on the most rational basis:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government take steps to invite the Sugar Enquiry Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr. H. Carl Goldenberg, Canadian economist-lawyer, which recently enquired into the sugar industry of Jamaica, with such excellent results for the workers and cane farmers, to undertake a most exhaustive investigation into all phases of the sugar industry in Barbados."

Perhaps, Sir, at this Stage, I had better explain the inclusion of the word "recently" in this Resolution.
2.35 p.m.

Now, as Your Honour is aware, this Resolution was actually given notice of since the 8th March, 1960 which is nearly a year ago. During last year, the time for Private Members' Business was taken with a lot of long-winded resolutions, like the "No Confidence" Resolution and the Resolution on Single-member Constituencies, on which hon. members on both sides of the House expressed themselves at considerable length, so that other matters just as important could not be attended to.

I do not propose this year, Mr. Speaker, to emulate those marathon speakers who spoke last year on resolutions coming under Private Members' Business. I intend merely to present the facts which have induced me to the conclusion that an inquiry of this sort is essential, and let the House in its collective wisdom say whether the Resolution should be supported or not. I want to explain why this Resolution proposes that this enquiry should be conducted under the Chairmanship of Mr. Carl Goldenberg. Mr. Goldenberg is a Canadian economist-lawyer who, within recent years, has had considerable experience in matters of this sort in the West Indies. Since he therefore already has intimate knowledge of conditions in the area, and has already conducted similar enquiries in the area, I personally can think of no one more eminently fitted to take charge of an enquiry of this sort.

Mr. Goldenberg conducted a sugar enquiry late in 1959 and early in 1960 into the sugar industry of Jamaica. Since then he made considerable recommendations for modifications in the wage and profit structure of the industry and has also recommended considerable operational adjustments in the industry itself. Then, in August last year, he was Chairman of the Board of Enquiry appointed by the Trinidad Government to investigate the dispute between the Sugar Manufacturers Confederation and the late Sugar Estate and Factory Workers Trade Union. Then, in September, he was appointed arbitrator in the wage dispute between the United Organisation and Waterfront Workers Union, Trinidad, and the Caroni Estates, Limited. He was also asked to conduct a similar enquiry in the Leeward Islands - I think it was in Antigua. You can see that, with this background of investigation into all phases of the operations in Jamaica, then in Trinidad and in the Leeward Islands, Mr. Goldenberg will come to the task of investigating the industry in this colony with an unassailable background of practical and detailed information which would not be readily available to any similarly qualified persons who were brought in from outside of the area.

In all phases of these investigations, so far as I have been able to understand, the recommendations of Mr. Goldenberg have been beyond dispute on both sides. In the case where he was arbitrator, his decisions had to be accepted. In those cases where he was only conducting the enquiry or the investigation, even although the recommendations were more than what the employers hoped for, his recommendations appeared to be so well-founded that they could not be disputed.

I want to submit that no less justifiable reasons exist in this colony for an enquiry into all phases of the sugar industry today than say in Jamaica, Trinidad or Antigua. To begin with, there has been considerable dissatisfaction on the part of the sugar workers last year in respect of the manner in which the agreement entered into by the Union and the Sugar Industry representatives had operated. Earlier in the year, the Union concluded an agreement with the Sugar Industry representatives for an increase in wages of 15 percent. The workers in the industry expected that this 15% would have applied to all aspects of operation in the industry. Whether they were wrong in expecting this or not I am not informed; whether the Union itself felt that this 15% would have applied to all aspects of the operation of the industry, I do not know. I know in actual fact that what has happened was the 15% only applied in cases of a day's work on the plantations, so that the sugar industrialists were in the position in which they did not have to pay this percentage for job work on the estates. Since most of the work is done by job work, such as can cutting, digging cane holes, draining and nearly all the other aspects of it, it meant in actual fact that the workers in the industry got no increase at all.
2.45 p.m.

Throughout last year I was beseiged with complaints by workers from my constituency to the effect that they were entitled to this increase in respect of days' work, but they were not getting any days' work at all. There are two or three plantations in St. Philip which gave some days' work - River Plantation and one or two others - but so far as I have been able to gather from the reports or complaints which have reached me, nearly all of the plantations only gave out job work and the entire years' operation went through with an increase supplied to very few workers. I do not know whether the Union Representatives were aware of the manner in which this Agreement would have applied, or whether they themselves were being taken for a ride, so to speak, by the sugar industrialists in computing this argument for a 15% increase only applying to days' work. Whether the Union knew or did not know, the fact remains that as things are, the Union is not in a position to insist to some extent on what the sugar industry could afford because of the fact that the Union Representatives themselves are

not in possession of that detailed knowledge which would lead them to a conclusion of this sort.

The last enquiry into the sugar industry of this country was done in a rather irresponsible fashion, to say the least. It was criticised on the floor of this House at considerable length; not one word was spoken in actual defence of the Report. The Goldenberg Enquiries in Jamaica and Antigua were probes of a different order entirely. As a trained lawyer-economist, Mr. Goldenberg took full advantage of his power to obtain all the revelant, detailed background information from both sides of the industry, so that when he came out with a Report, it was a Report on which both sides could operate. Apart from this question of the dissatisfaction existing island-wide last year on account of the failure of the payment of this 15% increase to people equally on days' work as on job work, there is an additional factor which would make an enquiry into the industry at this stage imperative. There is the question of the Deep Water Harbour involving extensive mechanization of a certain part of the industry, and the question of further mechanisation on the plantations and factories themselves. Both the Deep Water Harbour and this mechanization of plantations and factories will result in a considerable displacement of workers. I have already pointed out at length the considerable number of workers who will be displaced by bulk loading at the Deep Water Harbour; and it is impossible either for the Union or the workers themselves to arrive at any accurate knowledge as to what they are entitled as severance pay in consequence of their displacement by mechanization unless they have the sort of detailed information which an enquiry of this sort will provide. Both in the interest of the sugar workers themselves and in the interest of the representatives in the Union, an enquiry of this sort is essential.

Else where in the West Indies, notably in Jamaica, there has been a remarkably sudden increase in the tempo of mechanization in the sugar estates with the resultant displacement of thousands of workers; and I should not at all be surprised, from my limited knowledge of the situation, if at least there are 4,000 or more displaced workers on the plantations and factories by bulk sugar loading alone. I think that in Jamaica they have been loading canes mechanically, and I have an idea that I read somewhere that in Jamaica, Messrs Tate and Lyle were considering cutting canes by machinery some time this year. The powerful Union and the Government were apparently powerless to resist this increase in mechanization on the grounds of the demands of economy in production, world sugar competition and what not. However, if these developments cannot be prohibited, then it devolves upon people like ourselves to ensure that the people whom this mechanization displaces and those who remain in the sugar industry, derive the maximum benefit from the introduction of this mechanization. In other words, you cannot afford to allow the introduction of these developments to redound to the benefit of the sugar industrialists only.
2.55 p.m.

Sugar is a public industry in the sense that its operation is subsidised; and, as the biggest employing industry in the community, holds a responsibility to the community. I have said in this House for the last fifteen years that there is precedent for declaring the sugar industry a public utility; and that the Public Utility Board in Barbados should be given certain powers over the operation of the Sugar Industry in the same way that it has been given certain powers over the Telephone Company or the Electric Company. Both the Barbadian taxpayer and the taxpayer in the main consuming countries for our sugar are called upon to subsidise sugar, and realisation of this fact of the matter would probably nullify the necessity for bringing in outisde investigators from time to time.

Sir, what one has to realise in deciding on what the industry can bear, or what it cannot bear, is of course the fact that the future itself of the industry is uncertain. None of us can peer too far into the future to be able to state with any degree of accuracy how the industrialists themselves would fare five or six years from now, or at least when the present agreement with the Ministry of Food is concluded. We do not know whether or not it would be extended, and an impartial investigator would bear all these things in mind; it would be his duty and the duty of those associated with him to take into consideration all the revelant factors, the position of the industry, the position of the workers, the advantage accruing to the industry from mechanization on the plantations, in the factories and in shipping, the position of displaced workers and all that. All this would have to be considered impartially and the representatives of the people as we are could not bring an unbiassed point of view to bear on it; neither could the industrialists themselves be expected to bring an unprejudiced outlook to bear on the matter.

Once we have therefore accepted the principle that an enquiry is essential, Mr. Speaker, the only question to be asked is who is to conduct the inquiry. I am perfectly willing to accept any better suggestions than those offered in this Resolution provided I can be convinced that the result would be no less advantageous to the people who expect representation from us.

At the beginning of my remarks, I said I did not intend to dilate at any length on this matter. I am just giving the few salient points which I think should be enough to satisfy people who are not particularly obstinate in outlook that a Sugar Industry Inquiry is essential. In the interest of getting the most speedy action on a matter which, as I said earlier, I introduced since March last year, I propose to cease my remarks at this stage and to listen to the expression of opinion from other members of the House.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the passing of this Resolution, I would say that many years have now elapsed since a thorough and comprehensive investigation has been conducted into the Sugar Industry. It was in 1945, Sir, as far as my memory serves me, when Professor C. Y. Shepard was brought here. Professor Shephard as we all know was an Agricultural Economist, and he made a thorough investigation into the conditions and terms of appointment in the Sugar Industry in so far as the workers of this island were concerned. Since that thorough and comprehensive inquiry was conducted in 1945 with which the workers of this country were thoroughly satisfied, we have had no comprehensive and satisfactory inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, the Government should be aware that conditions in the industry are none too happy at present. Government should not wait until a general furore, upheaval or strike as has happened on several occasions within recent years, take place but should be forearmed and forewarned. When the Opposition, as has been done through my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, has moved a Resolution pointing out that a Commission of Enquiry should be set up, and has indicated reasons for setting it up, I think that the Government should take heed and not await any general confusion, strike or upset before action is taken. The hon. member has pointed out that the services of Mr. H. Carl Goldenberg, a Canadian economist-lawyer who has served with distinction in the neighbouring islands of Jamaica, Antigua and other places in the West Indies should be obtained for conducting this Enquiry.

As to the qualifications of the gentleman, I can merely just endorse what my colleague has said. The fact that this gentleman has been called upon to conduct an enquiry of a similar nature in Jamaica and other territories in the Federation is ample proof that he is quite capable of conducting an enquiry in this island.
3.05 p.m.

The enquiry which was conducted in 1958 by one Mr. Mc.Kenzie is regarded in all sections as impossible, and has caused the workers of this country to have little or no confidence in it. Therefore the enquiry of 1958 can be ignored. The recommendations were debated on the floor of the House for many weeks and then the Report died a natural death. It was attacked on all sides because it did not bring the matter any further.

Sir, I think that in 1961 before conditions become too unsettled, before the workers become too restless, that, if an enquiry under a competent person was set up, it would bestow confidence among the workers and give them a little ray of hope. To promise them a 15% increase on day's work and then employ workers by job work whereby they were deprived of the percentage increase was not good enough, and that in itself would cause workers to become dissatisfied.

With the completion of the Deep Water Harbour in view, and with various systems of bulk loading being inaugurated, and with the general structure and operation in the sugar industry undergoing a change, I think that it would be a good thing to engage the services of a competent economic adviser who would undertake an investigation into the sugar industry as a whole. When I say that I do not refer to the sugar workers in the industry only, but to all sugar workers whether they be in the warehouses, the field or in the factory. It would be a means of relieving the minds of thousands of workers who have worked for the past forty years in the industry and who with the coming into operation of the Deep Water Harbour will find themselves displaced if proper provision is not made for them. It is not good enough to treat these workers as the displaced coppers were treated; therefore; if the Government secured the services of a competent expert who can advise them on matters of this nature it would be a means of assisting the Government. It is an awkward situation arising and I feel that the Government should make a move at this time and do not wait until there is wide dissatisfaction.

Sir, I have great pride in seconding the passing of this Resolution. I feel that the Government would be well advised, now Mr. Goldenberg is in the area, or whether he is in the area or not, to secure his services, not only for the Government but for the workers of this island so that they may not continue to live in fear as to their future and in the unsettled state which they are at present. As I understand it, nothing has been worked out for them yet; there are a lot of negotiations going on, but, as to how far they have got nobody knows. I myself am no wiser than the average worker in this respect.

The time is fast approaching when the Deep Water Harbour will be finished. What provisions has been made for the security of workers from old age? Would they be given gratuity, pension, re-employment or what? Those are the burning questions. It is not good enough just to sit around and allow month after month to pass while we have the workers apprehensive as to what their future would be.

Sir, I feel that lenghty speeches are not necessary on this Resolution. This is a Resolution which speaks for itself. Too often we talk too much. We should pass it so as to get some benefits for the workers, and so as not to keep them in a state of suspense any longer and cause them and their families to live in fear.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a difficult position in that I have to make myself extremely clear. Sometimes I feel that I am not a Barbadian because I am not taken up with all the Barbadian methods of doing things. I find that politicians in Barbados want things to go on in the same way as they have been going on for the last 300 years, and that they believe that there should not be any changes but only the changes which affect themselves and make it better and easier for them.

I am not going in for any parish pump politics. I do not regard a Resolution as this as one to get any political credit from. I will say that I have no particular favour for the Government in power because I believe the Government in power did everything possible to destroy me. I agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church that, on an issue like this, you should not talk too much; that you should either pass it or oppose it; but it is an issue which you have to examine.

The hon. Introducer of the motion introduced this Resolution which, substantially, is that the Government takes steps to set up a Sugar Enquiry Commission to undertake an investigation into all phases of the sugar industry. I cannot agree with all that the Introducer has said, because, as a leader of the Trade Union, I completely and categorically deny that these broad statements can settle the question of wages and the specific conditions of employment of workers in the industry. These questions cannot be settled by a Parliament, or even by a Commissioner of Enquiry, or even by an impartial commission.

3.15 p.m.

If you want to represent the workers in a direct and specific way, there is no point in believing that in here where you have nothing with which to get to the core of the matter, a broad, general statement means anything. For many years you have said that the workers have been badly treated and exploited, but how are you going to stop this exploitation? Are you going to stop it by talking about it? The workers have to be organised and they have to remain organised. All over the world where workers claims have been met, they have been met by the workers taking their own problems in their hands and doing something about them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but he will realise that nowhere in this Resolution is the suggestion that anything should be done to interfere with the rights of the workers. I specifically said that the hon. member is a representative of the Union and he would bring the Union into the Report which could be obtained by an investigation of this sort. By all means, let the workers, organise, but when they organise they still want facts on which to work.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am still at the beginning of my speech; I have not got the end of it yet. I said that I substantially agree with this Resolution; I want to make the position clear for the benefit of the workers. This is an age in which people have to be practical. Mr. Harold Laski in the last book he wrote entitled "Trade Unions in the New Society" said that the days of industrial isolation are over since the rise of the factory system. As to this bogus idea of the right to work, if there is the right to work, you cannot just walk into anybody's place and start to work. The workers have to realise that there are conditions of employment and they need protection. They have to have protectors, not people from outside, but people in their own organisation. We live in a community in which people have been encouraged not to protect themselves. People have been encouraged by politicians to think that they do not need any protection. They need protection on the ground floor, but higher up they need protection not to be exploited by Government and by politicians whenever the time for election comes around.

Every sugar worker in this island is regarded as controlling the salt of the earth by every politican when the Election comes around; the babies are kissed, and they are the favourite element in the sugar industry in so far as the political parties are concerned, because the sugar worker is the deciding factor as to who rules this country. You take away the sugar vote and where will you get the Government?

In my Organisation, we negotiate with the employers in the sugar industry, not on the political level, because we consider that the fundamental principles, on which we are negotiating are industrial. Even if the Government believes that it is something political, we have to let them know that we are not prepared to stand that sort of thing from any Government at all. I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. senior member for Christ Church that we need an investigation, but we need an investigation on a very broad plan.

I am going further than both of these speakers. There is no point at this stage in confining this motion to an investigation of the sugar industry; that is what the hon. member is doing in this motion. I would not blame the pursuer of the motion on that line, but we need an investigation into the social and economic conditions of the West Indies

arising out of the new economy. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that the callous way in which Barbados allows serious problems to go by the board has given rise to a situation in this island in which extremely serious issues are left to somebody else, and nobody knows who that somebody else happens to be.

I agree that the Government not only wasted money on Mr. Mc.Kenzie, but they defended him. His Report on the sugar industry was a most atrocious one. Only a fool could have attempted to write a Report on the whole sugar industry of this island in four weeks' time. A good exercise on any single issue of the industry would have taken four weeks to prepare.

The Union refused to have anything to do with that Report. We believe that we know something about how industrial Committees and enquiries should be conducted, but we are not going to lose our fundamental right in saying that we are going to participate in them. As to the Mc.Kenzie method of dealing with the issue, notwithstanding what the Government said, that that was the best way to get information, we do not regard national information as being secret information. If any Minister is going to defend the idea that national information is secret information, and the only way that the information can be given is through sources which cannot be public sources, then we are in for a very unhappy time.

In the sugar industry, we do not ask any individual man or factory owner how much profit he made last year; we do not negotiate on any individual basis. What I have to correct the hon. senior member for St. Philip on is this: a passing acquaintance with this matter is not good enough. As to this 15% increase, there was no question of the sugar industry giving this or that.
3.25 p.m.

When we negotiate in the Sugar Industry, we tell the sugar manufacturers what we want; we do not accept what they say they will give. On this question of 15%, we never asked for a 15%. We asked that specific rates should be paid and said that the minimum rates in the out-of-crop season for fixed wages shall be these. We asked for $3 or $4 a day for an A-class man as against what he was getting, that is $2.72, and therefore we concluded the agreement on $3 a day unrelated to any percentages, because we could not care less what percentage it was.

Mr. Chairman, we went to a factory and found that there was no minimum rate in the factory, and we said that the minimum rate shall be $3 a day whether a man was getting $1, $1.20 or $2. Just as we do not like inquiries we do not like arbitration, because an arbitration does not have the time to negotiate. We spend nine months negotiating but, at the most, an Arbitration is going to spend four weeks and come back with an award for everybody of 10%. When it gives everybody 10%, it means that those who are low down will get a little more, and those who are high up will get a reasonable increase, because if you give 10% to a man who is getting $2, that means only 20 cents, and if you give 10% to a man who is getting $10 he will receive $1. That is not a scientific basis for determining wage rates; they must be determined within their own context and circumstances that concern the rates that must be paid in relation to the overall question that affects the whole industry. So again I say it is not a question of the 15% not applying. The reason why we did not ask for it to apply to the other rates was because the other rates were not as such tied to the situation with which we were dealing.

When we did that, Mr. Speaker, it was in the year when there was a serious drought and a reduction in the prices. There is no point in asking any employer at the worse period of his existence for a totality in a wage claim, when the successful conclusion of that would be extremely difficult, and the very workers themselves would feel it. A man may get $20 for one minute' work, but there is a certain basic commonsense you have to acquire. You can have a man getting $20 a minute but he never gets a minute's work, therefore the net result is that 20 x 0 x 0 x 0 does not mean 20; the answer is going to be nothing; so I should like to make it clear that this should not be associated with any wage claim, nor would I agree unless there is an industrial dispute for any inquiry to be set up with a view to determining wages. Nobody fixed wages for us.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation. I must explain to the hon. member that if he is generalising, it is all well and good; but if he is applying these observations to the matter before the House, he is completely wrong. Nowhere in the context of the Resolution or in my remarks was it said that we wanted an investigation to fix any wages. If he reads the context of the Resolution carefully, he will see that there is nothing like that anywhere, and indeed and in fact, all he has said is what I have said before. The hon. member himself pointed out that 20 times something which you are not getting is non-existent, so to speak; and the increase in percentage on the whole wage structure when only about five percent of the work is being done by the day, will naturally mean that 95% of the work you are doing you get no increase at all.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think that if the hon. member knows the Sugar Industry, he must give me some credit for knowing a little better than that. The point I want to make is to what he himself said, that is, that you want these investigations, and I am answering some of the points with which he wants his Resolution to deal. I will tell the hon. member that my organisation is a member of the International Plantations Organisation which has an Economist in London carrying out a survey on sugar not only here but elsewhere, and I have to be in close contact with that gentleman. I spent some time with him in London before coming back here, and I have to spend more time with him in the Spring; so whenever an inquiry comes about, no other Organisation in this island would be able to put up any person as competent as we can. You do not have any person competent to advise us on these matters, and we have to be in a position like that because we feel the days are.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I must object to that. On a point of order. The hon. member must not assume that he is the only person in this community who knows everything about the Sugar Industry. The hon. senior member for Christ Church referred to the fact that an exhaustive inquiry was made in this island in 1945 by the late Professor C. Y. Shepard, and the people who gave the Professor information for the memorandum are also alive and in this House; and the information they gave him was of an inestimable value to him in reaching the conclusions which he reached. I concede that the Union must have a certain amount of expert knowledge at its disposal and can produce that information.

Mr. WALCOTT: I can go back to 1945, but as I said, I am not living in the past. You should not think that in 1961 the sort of memorandum that was written in 1945 of which I have copies to show, could be written today; because, unfortunately, in 1945 the people who wrote the memorandum did not have a single economist to advise them. They wrote in general terms because 1945 was near to 1939 and wages had never been negotiated. There was a bogus thing called "conciliations" because the workers were not organised; nobody was speaking on behalf of the workers on the basis of meeting with them and putting forward something for them. A bunch of political people as members of the House in 1944 met in a conclave because there was going to be an election, and therefore what better thing could you have?

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is clearly out of the question. The hon. member must have in his possession a little more information on the matter of which he speaks. The Conciliation Board to which he referred comprised of Mr. Adams and Mr. Springer, the Leader of the Opposition and myself, and we responded to a request by the Labour Commissioner to represent the workers on this Board. It was not a question of an election year, so that is a most unkind remark. Mr. Guy Perrin, the Labour Commissioner, announced

the setting up of this Board with representatives of the Sugar Industry, and the seats for representatives of the workers on the Board went to Mr. Adams, Mr. Springer, Mr. Brancker and myself, so there was no question of an election year at all.
3.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member must understand that I am not speaking as a politician; I am speaking from an analytical mind of conditions which existed in the past. History is a very brutal thing. Do not get mixed up with the Conciliation Boards set up in 1944. There was then a bunch of political people who were in the House. There were two political factions in the House then, therefore it meant that both of them had to put in a memorandum.

In the memorandum was no specific rate. The only specific rate put forward in any memorandum was that it would deem that the minimum rate should be on a basis of one cent per hole for cutting canes as against the sliding scale. Do you believe that you can go ahead with a wage scheme asking somebody at this stage what they must pay for us? We must be in a position that we can made demands on all the points for what we require; therefore that is a vast difference from what it was in 1944. The hon. member said in a *so tto vo ce* remark that we had no facts nor figures then. That is not what we are talking about. We represented to the Commission of Enquiry then that, on the basis of what the profits were, the workers should have got an increase. The profits were nearly three times as much as they were before, and the Commissioner could not deny that. As a matter of fact, the Commissioner had to depend on figures produced to him by a local man, and the Commissioner could not even make a hand of them.

The hon. member must not anticipate my speech. The hon. member forgot that I said at the beginning that I agreed with the Resolution in substance, but that there were many things which he said to which I did not agree. The hon. member is in the habit of saying that he has risen to put the records straight. I have to put straight the matters concerning my Union.

With all due respect to the lawyers who are appointed as commissioners of enquiry, usually lawyers sometimes are the most ignorant people on matters industrial; and because of that, after hearing evidence at an investigation, they generally say to give an increase of ten percent but they leave all the basic things blank. I do not take any of the lawyers seriously when it comes to industrial matters. Many of them do not have the industrial experience from which they can draw day to day, therefore, they generally look for the easiest way out. Some of them too are lawyers who practise for the big people, so you can very well see that they cannot do anything do displease those people too easily.

When the Commissioner made the claim that the Union had set up a wage rate, the hon. member must bear in mind that that was not against a background of uncertainty or anything dealing with the overall question of the industry; that was a specific wage proposal which dealt with certain people in the industry. It did not represent a wage proposal for all the people. We knew that it did not represent all of them and that is the reason why we demanded as high amount as we demanded.

The reason why we said that we wanted those rates is because in Barbados for so many years you find that the agricultural workers day's rate was always placed at the minimum rate. The hon. member must bear in mind that we of the Union have said that the minimum day's rate should be $3 a day for men; and the hon. member would know that that is a higher rate than the minimum rate which you get paid out by the Government. When you think of $3 a day as compared with 35¢ an hour which is paid out by the Government, then you can see where the disparity comes in. The hon. member should know this too: more women are employed in the sugar industry out of crop than men. The ratio is something like 60 to 40. We therefore had to put the wages for the women workers at a rate which would connote to something in the industry.

I do not know if the hon. senior member for St. Philip is aware that Mr. Goldenberg went to Trinidad subsequent to his making investigations in Jamaica, and that he made an award in Trinidad of less than what we have here. Of course, I do not want the sugar people here to believe that our rates are higher than those of Trinidad. I do not want either to make a comparison with the rates in the sugar industry in St. Kitts. However, you can see what the people who went from here to St. Kitts got as against what we pay out. Sometimes to make comparisons is not so good. I am afraid that in making comparisons in this instance you may have some people saying things against those people whom you should serve best.

The point made by the hon. senior member of Christ Church about the enquiry is a sound one. In so far as such things which are now under negotiation, such as Provident Fund Schemes, the hon. member must understand, and he should know, that the Union operates as an industrial organisation and the members are informed of what is going on. I may say this to hon. members of this Chamber: If we of this Chamber had held as many meetings as the Union held all through the year, I believe members of the Government would have no doubt as to who would comprise the next Government of Barbados. We of the Union are not lazy and, as a matter of fact, we had three meetings since the year began and two this week. It is only listening in to cricket which has come between us and having more meetings at night. We feel that our workers, as anybody else, want to listen to the cricket and therefore we should not disturb them.
3.45 p.m.

As to the question of a Provident Fund, again the hon. senior member for Christ Church must understand that he was a Minister when the Union put forward the proposition for a Provident Fund. At that time we were asking the industry itself to make the contribution. I was out of the island; when I came back I found that the Union had agreed to something which I would not have agreed to. Anyhow, the worker does not care where you get the money from, whether it comes from the Price Stabilisation Fund or out of the employers' pockets. This was in 1956; we had had many delays, but we have reached the stage where the sugar industry and the Union have agreed in principle on the question of severance pay and the establishment of a Provident Fund. The question of *quantum* is being worked out. The hon. senior member for Christ Church knows that you cannot agree to an amount put forward, therefore you cannot bring the matter to a conclusion. In so far as the details are concerned, we feel that we have to be consulted as to them. We have made ourselves very clear on these issues. We do not want negotiable matters to be put on the level of political dispute.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I must apologise for not paying as much attention as I should have paid to what the hon. member was saying. He made a statement on which I would like him to help me, a statement on something which took place in 1956. The hon. member said that he would never have agreed to it if he were in the island, something about which he differed from the Government in *quantum*.

Mr. WALCOTT: We are talking about the Provident Fund in relation to the people who work in the industry. We agreed on the matter in principle but not in quantum. In 1956 the figure of 40 cents was agreed upon; and as against an indirect method of dealing with this matter, I said that an agreement was reached when I came back to the island and there was no point in making any row about it because there would be a technicality. Sometimes in cases of technicalities, you may be right but people may not feel that you are right.

As to the idea of the workers not knowing what is taking place, I would like to say that the workers do know what is taking place. Our building overflows with people, and we cannot find any one building which can accommodate all the workers when we are holding our meetings. On Saturday night we had a meeting and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition passed through. You will

realise therefore that we do not speak against anybody; I believe we spend more sleepless nights than many people. I would like to tell the hon. senior member for Christ Church that from the point of view of public service, we perform a public service which can stand up to any public service in the industrial field. We are not dependent upon any haphazard action. There has not been a period in which there has not been an opportunity made for advancing the cause of the workers in the sugar industry; we have done so to the extent that we stand second to none in the West Indies.

I have a copy of the Goldenberg Report and, if you look at that Report, you will see what are the rates paid in Jamaica; you will find that the only thing which can compare with any other level in the West Indies is what the sugar workers in Barbados negotiate. I may tell the hon. member that I was asked to be a member of the Commission which sat in Jamaica but it did not suit me to go there; I had to go to a Conference in Europe and I had to be away for six weeks.

There are many changes which are going to take place in the sugar industry. I was in Jamaica where they had a Technical Conference, where they were considering the question of utilising cane-cutting machines. We are living in an age in which changes are going to take place, and there is no point in saying that we will wait until a change is imminent and then say that we cannot worry about such a change. I do not like to speak after the event. I was in favour of the Deep Water Harbour being constructed, and we knew that that project would bring unemployment to some people. We said from the beginning that if a Deep Water Harbour is going to be built, then there should be scope for *ex gratia* payments. You cannot pay any man at the age of thirty-five or forty years any amount of money so that he cannot work for the balance of his life.

My view of an enquiry of this nature is this: I feel I am giving the Government ideas to be used in an election year. The Government will bring down things in an election year which they cannot do. Anyhow, I will give the Government another election tip. One Government in France and one in Europe decided to give a rebate on income tax; that is to say, they decided to give a 10% increase. You cannot accuse the Government of bribery, but you can give back 10% of the taxes already paid, because people had had to pay too much.
3.55 p.m.

I gave you that as a tip. (Hon. M. E. COX: That is what the British Government did some time ago.) When you can send everybody back to the Treasury and they can draw $100 note, it is an indirect way of giving back $100. There is a theory in that because you must win an election. The Government's policy is to win an election; they do not go forward on the purely academic and purist side of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not now speaking on the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. The point I was making is that we have reached a stage in which employment is important. I would have liked to see the Government in Barbados, on a broad basis, make an inquiry to study the entire social and economic situation in Barbados in view of these swift changes that have taken place, with a view to making recommendations so that with the coming into operation of the Deep Water Harbour, it would dovetail into this thing rather than let people feel hopeless from being out of work and not knowing what next is going to be the situation. I feel that these are national facts which should be taken into consideration; that is should be the ambition of any citizen to have a community in which he is living enjoying prosperity to the fullest, and not a matter of who is the Government as such.

While I have no objection to a Commission of Enquiry in the Sugar Industry, I feel that at the serious stage we are today, we need an inquiry that is even wider in scope and embraces more than the Sugar Industry, because the Sugar Industry is only part of the serious problem which has arisen. I would have agreed to having it only in the Sugar Industry had not the Deep Water Harbour been built and you were not likely to have any problems arising from that. I would not like to see an inquiry into the Sugar Industry now, and then three months later to have one for Hotels.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. member's Resolution could be amended to include the social and economic condition arising from the changing problems that arise from these things, it would be much better.

Mr. Speaker, I am in no way fooling myself that the situation in the Sugar Industry is not going to be extremely serious; the number of children being born in the rural areas cannot find room to get on the plantations and space on the land. As far back as 1954 our Union went to British Guiana and passed Resolutions, and we acknowledged the fact that the Sugar Industry could not take on more people not only in Barbados but throughout the West Indies, because we realised that to maximise the Sugar Industry as a competent and competitive force, you would therefore have to mechanise it; it would not compete on the old concept, you could not put more people in the Sugar Industry and get higher wages. The Sugar Industry in itself cannot stand up against beet sugar. At one stage you laughed at beet sugar, but today it is a serious competitive force. As the hon. member knows, you can get sugar from other substances beside cane, because it is not like coffee.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure the hon. member was referring to me when he said that I knew the uncertainty of the sugar position; but in case he was referring to me, I would like to refer him to the opening sentence of the Resolution before the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member may be dealing with the uncertainty of sugar, but I spoke of the specific case of beet sugar as against cane sugar, because we may have a problem with the Cuban situation. The hon. member should be aware that in India itself sugar factories are being put up, which means that if India had to be one of the groups consuming sugar, they would now be producing it for themselves. I would not encourage anybody to believe that you can put more people to work in the factories and produce higher wages when the production has already reached the limit. It just would not add up. That is why I will pause at this point to say that those persons in this community who are misguided enough to make field workers as against factory workers believe that the disparity or differential in wage level that exists should not exist, are not aware of the true economics of the industry; it is a question of whether the productivity of man has risen as against whether it has not risen. Fewer factories in Barbados will mean higher rates for those people who are lucky enough to be employed in the factories, because the ones who have gone would not be paid weekly stipends from them. People must understand that these are the things that follow.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the unfortunate position where we live in a heavily populated country, and it means that the more machinery is introduced into the island, the more unemployment there is going to be, but it means that higher wages would be obtained. The introduction of machinery has brought a lot of misery to mankind as well as a lot of benefits. Mankind is not going back to the old methods, and where you find the old methods existing, the standard of living is very low. If you go to the Middle East or to Africa where they still have the old nomadic fashion, you will find that the standard of living is extremely low. I was in complete agreement with those members who felt that we did not have a full and comprehensive report from Mr. Mac Kenzie; I am opposed unalterably to the McKenzie method. I said it to people and produced notes to show what the man had said.
4.05 p.m.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip says that Mr. Goldenberg is the right person to have for carrying out this enquiry. I feel the time has come when we should have a

national committee to deal with such matters, that is to say, you should have somebody residing in Barbados to make a study and get these facts, a committee of Barbadian citizens sitting down and making a complete study of them rather than having people who know nothing of conditions here coming in to make these investigations. The commissioners whom we get do not live here, we have to live here. It is better for everybody in Barbados to understand that the time has come when everybody in Barbados must be prepared to shoulder his weight. We should have a Committee to deal with such matters and its membership should be broad enough to comprise of all sections of the community. Get the people who have inheritances to come out and be members of these committees. Bring some of those people out. Let us get down to that. I regard this as a national issue. I cannot care less that this is election year. I believe that, if I must tell people the things which they want to hear best in a year of election, even if I feel what you want me to tell them is not good enough for the community, then I should be out of it. I am going to say what I believe is true.

Any crisis that comes upon this country in this year is going to be a different crisis from any which has taken place before because the whole substance of the community has changed in so far as authority is concerned. Therefore, I say that those of us who are leaders - and I think every member of this House of Assembly is a leader - have the opportunity to give the leadership which is required, and we should accept the challenge and do something for the community which we serve.

Mr. DOWDING: Sir, as the hon. member who has just sat down has said, this is a national issue and it is one which should be dealt with on the highest level, lest it become a national trouble spot. Now, Sir, we are accustomed to these yearly resolutions or questions on this matter by the hon. senior member of St. Philip; and it is notable without doubt that, from time to time, they have been allowed to lapse. It is also notable that this is election year. I sincerely hope that history will not record what it has recorded on two instances, in the recent past, of politics interfering with the national industry of this island.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is the second time that an hon. member has risen in his place and talked about election year. This is a Resolution about getting Mr. Goldenberg to come here to enquire into the sugar industry. This Resolution was tabled in March 1960. When I began my speech today, I said that during the time this Resolution was given notice of it should have been debated, but we had a "No-confidence Motion" lasting for months; and, following that, we debated a Resolution for single-member constituencies which took up the entire session; therefore, unless we had been allowed to debate it during the Government's time, I could not have seen how we could have debated it.

I want to ask the honourable member if in 1958 -

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

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I have not in any way said anything which reflects on the hon. member. I was about to say when I said that this is election year, that this is a matter which the hon. member had regularly put on the Order Paper, and that it had been allowed to lapse sometimes.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That is not true. This could not have been on the Order Paper before last year because Mr. Goldenberg only began to come down to the West Indies in 1959.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said that it was a matter which the hon. member had regularly on the Order Paper and it was allowed to lapse sometimes.

Mr. DOWDING: I did not say that the hon. member allowed it to lapse. I feel that this is a matter which should be a way above any political inuendo. I fully agree with the suggestion that there is need for a study of the economic future of this island. When one looks at the modern technological advancements, at the modern equipments coming in along with the nearing of completion of the Deep Water Harbour, and along with the whole forward movement of the world in general along the lines of mechanisation, one must wholeheartedly agree that there is need for a study into the social and economic conditions for the future of this colony.

Sir, I cannot at any junction suggest anything more than that this matter should not be dealt with as a matter of wage issue. There is no industrial dispute of which I know in the island at the present moment. Right now there are negotiations going on by the Trade Union and the Employers Confederation, and I think that any wage discussion would endanger the Union's activities in this island. A number of people may have jumped to that conclusion. Indeed, when it was said that the Union did not realise that they were taken for a ride so to speak, and that the Union also must bear responsibilities for families being in fear and in a state of suspense, I think that that is a reflection on the Trade Union in this Island which bears a very high standing both among the employers locally and the island as a whole.
4.15 p.m.

Any effort whatsoever to revert to the past where the politicians were the ones who got the kudos from the sugar workers, is a most dangerous thing. The efficiency of the Barbados Workers' Union is the main reason for the fact that there have been very few negotiations or investigations, either in one way or in the other, since 1945. That enhanced position should not be trampled upon by any effort to kiss the blue-eyed baby, which is the sugar industry, for votes. That is a dangerous procedure, and one which we should call upon ourselves in the national interest not to allow to occur. It is regrettable that such a statement should be made by persons claiming to have the knowledge, that the workers did not know what was the outcome of the Agreement; that these workers were supposed to get a 15% increase. That statement is absolutely and utterly wrong. The Union made an Agreement...

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible not to correct these errors when they are made. Can the hon. member say that what he said just now was really said by anybody in here today? That was not said at all. The hon. member has just stated that it was remarked that the workers were to get a 15% increase and it was wrong. What was said, and it was said by myself was this: There has been considerable dissatisfaction throughout the entire year last year on behalf of the agricultural worker because the increase in wages, as agreed to by the Union, only applied to days' work and it did not apply to piece work or job work. I said that nearly all of the work done at the Plantations was done by the job and by piece work, so that the workers got no increase. That was what I said and I will repeat it anywhere.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the time when we will advance technically so that this hon. House will have on the screen what any speaker has said. I did not say that the hon. member said anything. I said that it was remarked in the course of the debate, and it was actually said by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, that there was a promise to give a 15% increase to the workers and then that promise was withdrawn. That was said by the hon. member.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. If the hon. member wants to quote me then he should quote me correctly. I made notes and I have my notes before me still. I made it clear that any reference to any increase was in connection with days' work, and most of the work was not done on that basis, with the result that the increase was not paid.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member denying having made any reference to a 15% increase?

Mr. TALMA: I am denying that I made a general statement like that. What was agreed on was a 15% increase on days' work. Those who were not employed on days' work got nothing.

Mr. DOWDING: I apologise to the hon. member who is more capable of speaking and writing at the same time than I am of listening and writing without having to speak. What I said I have written down here.

An agreement with the terms stated in the Agreement was signed by the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Producers' Federation; the terms are there; they are known to both sides; and I, personally, can corroborate the hon. senior member for St. Peter in what he has said, in that the Union itself knows about all these various facts and informs the people of them. To suggest that there is any possibility of the Union being taken for a ride, or that the Union does not know what it was doing relative to what agreement has been made, is, in my humble opinion, the wrong way in which to start - if you are looking at this matter not merely from the point of view of a wage increase but from the over-all issue of the over-all picture of mechanization in respect of a Deep Water Harbour, of the sugar industry and of all sorts of other things. That, in my opinion just points to the possibility that we may be heading for another upset in our lives, where we are not elevated to understand that the Union is perfectly capable of taking care of theirs.

As to the manner in which this Resolution was introduced, if it is changed so as to deal with the social and economic future of the island in the light of the existing and proposed changes which occur every day, if a study is to be made of them as to the terms of reference being worked out, I would be only too happy to support the Resolution. As it is now, dealing with the Sugar Industry alone, under the conditions as existing today where, in this island, we have the best wages being paid in the West Indies, and we also have the best prices paid for canes - those are facts which can be verified - I think it is extremely unwise to deal with the matter on this basis. I strongly warn that the matter should be dealt with on a completely different level as has been suggested by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution which we have before us today calls for an investigation in relation to the different changes which have been made in the Sugar Industry. We already know that there must be some reason why this investigation is being sought. The Government intends to make a change as regards the Sugar Industry, and I would like to know if the change which the Government will be making in relation to the lifting of sugar as against bulk loading will be of any help either to the community or to the sugar workers.
4.25 p.m.

It seems to me, Sir, that the change-over will cause great hardship to the sugar workers of this Island, because thousands of people who are at present engaged in sugar will be unemployed. For the last 23 years we have been living peacefully without any noise or riot. We in Barbados are looking forward to this great change. I am not against the construction of the Deep Water Harbour at all, but I am against the shipping of sugar in bulk.

Mr. Speaker, the Ministers go from country to country seeking opportunities of work for the unemployed of Barbados; why then does the Government want to shorten up its work in Barbados while on the other hand seeking work for its people? The shipping of sugar in bulk from Barbados will cause great hardship to those people who formerly worked in the Industry. I believe that the hon. member who has introduced this Resolution asking for a Commissioner to go into the Industry has had a glance at the future, and has seen the hardship that is going to be created on the people; so before that time comes he is asking to have an inquiry into the matter. If the Government of Barbados had the poor people at heart and would reason with them.....

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

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

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

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

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Head XLVII - Public Assistance Board - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Head, Mr. Chairman, is to provide a cost of living allowance for the messenger of the Public Assistance Board. That Board, Sir, appointed a messenger sometime in August, 1960, and no allowance for cost of living was taken into consideration. The sum of $72 is now required to pay the messenger a cost of living allowance from the time he was appointed to the end of the current financial year.

I beg to move that Head XLVII - Public Assistance Board - stand part.

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for $219,958 do now pass.

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

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

PORT DEPARTMENT'S ESTIMATES

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to postpone the Resolution to approve the Extraordinary Estimates of the Port Department and to take the next Resolution to place the sum of $60,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making an advance to the Port Department.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not have any objection to the postponement, but from what has been buzzing around me here today, I think it is our first meeting, and I know from the number of things on the Order Paper that both of these could be done. I want to say that it does not seem to me that you are giving me any time to think properly if you have two items on the Order Paper, you postpone one and ask me to come back here on Thursday. I do not think that makes sense.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If I may interrupt the hon. member before he goes too far, I understand that members did not receive these estimates until yesterday. I was not aware of that. I am quite willing under the circumstances to come with both Resolutions later this week.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, what I do not like is to come to the House a day when we do not have much to do, and then to come back another day. After all, I am elected here but I still have to work for a living otherwise. Ministers cannot arrange business only to suit themselves. Other members must be taken into consideration. Today is the first meeting. Why not finish what is on the Order Paper? The House was prorogued, and I would say to the hon. member that it was the business of the Ministers to see that these things got down here before.
4.35 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I understand the Opposition, including the last hon. member who spoke, agreed that we should continue and get some work done this afternoon. Sir, I intend to deal with the Resolution for $60,000 to put at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making an advance to the Port Department. I think on the Order Paper the Resolution to approve the Extraordinary Estimates of the Port Department comes first. I will deal with that.

As hon. members will see from the Addendum, there are certain sections of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, relating to the Harbour Fund and the estimates of the Port Department which have been proclaimed to come into force on the 10th January, 1961. It is proposed that the Deep Water Harbour should be brought into partial operation as from the 1st day of February, 1961, mainly in connection with the bulk loading of sugar. We are not saying that the actual bulk loading of sugar will take place on the 1st February; the ship may not arrive to take away the sugar until later that month. What we are saying is that the bulk loading sugar store will be ready certainly as from a week hence to take sugar; and from the 1st February next, the Deep Water Harbour will be brought into partial operation especially as regards the bulk loading of sugar. This being so, it is necessary for the House to approve these Extraordinary Estimates of revenue and expenditure as shown in the Schedule to this Resolution so that we can operate this department on the basis set out in the Bill which was passed by this House late last year.

I would just like to reiterate that this department would be run on a self-accounting basis, just as the General Post Office. Members would see that we have estimated expenditure for the two months — February and March — as well as other expenditure which is likely to be incurred during that time. I do not think there is any particular item of expenditure to which I should draw attention. If any hon. member wants any information on any item I would be only too willing to answer.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION FOR $60,000 FOR PORT DEPARTMENT

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, again the printed document is quite straight forward and pretty straight. Hon. members having just agreed to the former Resolution can easily make up their minds that this Resolution is quite necessary. We estimated that it would take $60,000 to run the Port as from the 1st February to the end of March which is before the beginning of the next financial year; and in order to make provision for that we have come with this Resolution so that the Port can be operated during that time.

I would just like to say that these funds are recoverable; and I must repeat that the Port Department is a self-accounting department. Hon. members would see the basis on which we have arrived at these estimates of revenue as well as expenditure which we have attached to the former Resolution. Everything is set out clearly for hon. members. I would like to say further that some of these Committees which are set up are going forward very happily with the matters they have to do.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, when the Hon. Minister says that this money is recoverable, does he anticipate that from the very beginning of the operation of the Port that the revenue and expenditure would break even, so to speak? Naturally, we hope at some time or the other the Port will start making some money, but does the Hon. Minister anticipate that from the actual coming into operation of the department we shall be able to equate the cost of its operation with its revenue?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the hon. member will refer to the Schedule of the Estimates, he will see the estimates of expenditure for the months of February and March, 1961, and the revenue set out. Sir, you will see that the revenue from the Sugar Levy is calculated on the basis of a levy of two percent on the estimated value of sugar to be exported during the period. The revenue from harbour dues is calculated: tonnage dues, tug services, bunkering of ships, pilotage, mooring and unmooring services, fresh water for ships, mooring buoys for tankers, yachts and ships, shipping fees, fees for registration of ships, seaman's certificates, admeasurement of tonnage, fees of office, wharfside dues and miscellaneous port services. The total estimate of revenue is more than we are asking for. It is expected to be $136,765. While of course that sum may be exceeded, or may be lower than that, we hope that this will more or less be the figure.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is one further point which I have to make. A number of excess highways to the Deep Water Harbour are now in the process of being finished, and I want to suggest to the Hon. Minister that the occasion presented by the construction of these new highways should be utilised to perpetuate the memory of a number of Barbadians who have rendered outstanding patriotic service more or less within our time.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that people like the late "Chrissie" Brathwaite and the late Doctor O'Neale have rendered far greater service to the community than a lot of the people who are now cackling. The Premier, so long as he has not lost his voice, can substantiate the fact that outstanding services have been rendered by people like Mr. Martineau in his time. Then we have people like Clement Payne and Lovell who were supposed to have started the disturbances in 1937, and, as a result, made their contribution whereby those members who are occupying the places which they are occupying today.....(Hon. D. D. GARNER: Ulric Grant!) Well, Payne, Lovell and Grant. What these three people have done for this country, not forty-five of them on the other side could have done. Lovell was incarcerated and, as a consequence of that, he died fairly early; in fact, these three people went to a premature grave no doubt as a result of Court sentences of penal servitude at Glendairy. I can recall the then Colonial Secretary, Mr. Creech-Jones, saying that the sentences meted out to Lovell, Payne and Grant were savage, outrageous and unjust, but the Crown Law Officers here at the time were carried away by the pervading hysteria, and that is what happened.

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that coming events cast their shadows; I believe that the people who are now occupying the position of Government would be exhibiting what is perhaps to be expected of them if they failed to take some steps during their regime properly to commemorate the memories of these distinguished patriots. In the same manner that we have a number of streets in the City of Bridgetown named to perpetuate the memories of officials and Governors who have done almost nothing for this country, similarly the opportunity should be taken now that we have these access highways to the Harbour, and they have to be named, we should utilise this opportunity to pay respect to these people, who, by their contribution, have done so much for the people of this island. People who are here now would not have been here if it had not been for the contribution of Lovell, Payne and Grant. If we want to honour the dead and some of the living, then we should name these streets leading to the Deep Water Harbour so as to commemorate their memory.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition reminds me that in Trinidad public honour has been paid to people like Cipriani, Gaston Johnson and other leaders. I, myself, recall that only recently in Jamaica when they opened the new House of the Legislature it was called Gordon House after Jamaica's patriarch, William George Gordon, a man who was hanged by the Governor Eyre for leading a rebellion in his country. The people in Jamaica today are capable of rightly honouring their heritage, and correctly assessing what is expected of them at this time of their country's history. I do feel

that by the time this port comes into operation, and by the time the roads will be in use for conducting traffic to the Deep Water Harbour, the names of people like O'Neale, Brathwaite, Lovell, Payne and Grant should be used; and even although Mr. Martineau is still alive, his name should be included, as a living memory to Barbadians and as an inspiration to those who will follow on. In expressing these sentiments, I am expressing what is my own personal conviction; and it is a conviction which is shared by my colleagues. It is one which will presumably be shared by every single member of this House without exception if, of course, a little temporary occupation of office has not blinded the deep and better instincts of members of the opposite side.
4.55 p.m.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, there are those who believe in C.B.E.'s, O.B.E.'s and M.B.E.'s and other imperial titles and what-not; but I am sure that those humble Barbadians would be content not with imperial honours but with an effort to perpetuate their memory such as the one I am suggesting.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Committee to believe that the hon. member is preaching to the unconverted. This is a matter which I have not yet put to the Cabinet, but certainly it is a matter which I have had in mind. I do agree with the hon. member that you can only show maturity when you do more than allow people who have contributed in a great measure to our history and our progress towards independence to leave this world unmarked and unrecorded in the pages of history. We should pay them due public recognition in some way or another along the lines suggested by the hon. member.

I would just like to say this: we are talking here about one major highway; the hon. member referred to the roads leading to the Deep Water Harbour. There is the road which we are at present building, and there will perhaps be another leading through Hincks Street into the Harbour. The hon. member has called a number of names on the roll of honour of this Island and has not left many blank spaces. In the future, we would have to look for a lot of roads to find even one for himself when the time comes! We can only have one or two names in respect of these roads, since there are only one or two roads; but I would like to assure him that the idea has not been lost sight of. It has not been put to the Government, but it certainly will be. Rather than give some old English name or "Little England" name to roads such as these, we should emblazon a famous name in the history of Barbados by naming one of these public Highways after such a figure.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am indeed grateful, Mr. Chairman, to hear that those sentiments have found expression by the Hon. Minister concerned. I hope that in putting it to his colleagues, it would not be an effort wasted. As to his implied tribute to me, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, my memory is already safe in the hearts of people I have worked for; and I need no public tribute of public expression to cement it further, but I would like to say two things: one is that there are a number of streets in the City which could be renamed — Cavans Lane and Hincks Street, Like Prince William Henry Street; who was he anyway? Quite a number of these streets could be renamed after some of these figures.

The hon. member must surely be acquainted with the old Barbadian habit of giving four names to one street, like Baxters Road, which begins as Milk Market, changes to Tudor Street, continues to be Milk Market and ends up as Baxters Road; so he would not be going far wrong if some of these streets — if they were a mile long — had different names. Anyhow, Sir, there are enough streets in the area which could be renamed now along the lines with which he himself has expressed his favour.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and the approval of the Port Estimates.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, 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. R. G. MAPP, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

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

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 Friday, 20th January, at 12 noon.
5.05 p.m.

I had discussed the two Bills brought in today with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and said that I would have liked to proceed with them; but Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as I have been able to gather from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the Opposition is willing to consider these two Bills - the Trade Bill, and the Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 - now. If that is so, we would be willing to consider them now in order to avoid coming back on Friday.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Leader of the House said that it is for the Government to decide, but I take it that the Government has decided already when they brought down the Order Paper; they knew then what they were doing. What the Government introduced on the last occasion shows that it was the Government's intention of doing that today.

I see on the Order Paper the Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, therefore on the last occasion that Bill was introduced. If, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are going to allow those two Bills which were introduced today to be dealt with now, and Government is not prepared to deal with the Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, why ask me to burn the midnight oil? You came in and said that you were going to adjourn at 6 o'clock without completing the business on the Order Paper; I went home and read everything on Workmen's Compensation, and you now say that you do not intend to deal with that Bill. I shows that when you placed that Bill on the Order Paper that you only did so to prevent somebody else from putting it on the Order Paper. It is No. 2 on the Order Paper and you have the effrontery to ask us to come back here on Friday to do something else.

You brought a man here five years ago to help you with this legislation, and now the Minister is not prepared to go on with it although he has had the opportunity of studying it for four years. This is where I ask, how can I have any confidence in the Government when they put something on the Order Paper and instead of doing it, they are going to adjourn at 6 o'clock? There are people who are dying through injuries, people being injured daily on their work and they are only getting pittances; they are getting the pittance of $1,800 for fatal injury. I have a long list in my bag on which I have to speak to the Government when it begins to deal with this matter.

They are asking me to come back here on Friday to deal with two foolish Bills which have come about by the coming into operation of the Deep Water Harbour. You push them in my hands today and say now that that is what you are going to deal with now. I will have nothing to do with any further legislation in here today when this Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act is before me. This is nothing else but a complete fraud.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am sorry that the hon. member has taken that attitude. I know however that he objects to our referring to an agreement reached between the Govern-

ment and the Opposition to do certain things in this House; but I have said to the hon. member on several occasions that the Government acknowledges the Leader of the Opposition — not the individual — as the person forming the Opposition.

When the hon. member refers to the Government bringing down the Workmen's Compensation Bill as just a political move to stop somebody from doing something, I am sure on sober reflection that the hon. member would realise that it could not be so since, on the last two previous occasions, you had motions made by the hon. junior member for St. John to have a Workmen's Compensation Bill put on the Statute Book. What happened was that the hon. member for St. John entered the House and made the motion but no bill was ever introduced into this House. If you come in here and make a motion just saying: "I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend this or that" without producing any sort of Bill whatsoever, that motion can be ignored. It means nothing to us.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is completely untrue and incorrect for the Hon. Minister to say that no amending Bill was ever submitted. As a matter of fact, three Bills were submitted to the Clerk of this House. Moreover, on the first occasion, in 1956, when I moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act at 8.15 p.m., the day when that Bill was debated, the Hon. Premier, now the Federal Prime Minister, got up and made the submission that that would create a charge on the Treasury. Further consideration was postponed because Mr. Speaker, gave as his opinion, as he was then presently advised, that it would create a charge on the Treasury; therefore, the second reading of that Bill did not go through.

What the Hon. Minister got mixed up with is the Adoption Act. I informed the Clerk of the House at that time that I had not finished my corrections to a Bill for that purpose, and when I submitted the Bill to the Clerk two weeks later, I found out that the Government had moved the first reading of a similar Bill, therefore, my Bill was out of order. Not only did the Clerk have one Bill on Workmen's Compensation, but he had three; he had one from me and two from the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. I see the Clerk speaking to members of the Government Party. I do not think that the Clerk should be Clerk of the Government Party, but should recognise that his duty is also Clerk to the Opposition members as well.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am still satisfied that I am right in what I said not long ago. I am definitely sure that the hon. junior member for St. John as usual came in and gave notice of a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act and that was all. If the Speaker ruled that it was a Money Bill, no private member could introduce that Bill. How then could the hon. member introduce a similar Bill on a following occasion?
5.15 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I think that the hon. senior member for St. Michael was in here long enough to know this about parliamentary procedure: Parliament cannot bind the representatives of the people for all time. Every time that the House is prorogued, we have to give fresh notices of motions and Bills. The Speaker was advised and there is nothing to change his mind or his advice.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I say anything to the House, I would like the hon. junior member for St. John to recall the matter of presenting or of the alleged presentation of a Bill dealing with an amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act. I would just like to repeat what I said.

Mr. BARROW: You gave a ruling on that, and you could not have given any ruling unless you had a Bill before you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member means in 1956 when he was armed with a Bill.

Mr. BARROW: You were armed with it as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not doubt that. I have made a ruling in that respect.

Mr. BARROW: And you would have to consider something before making that ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member was contending that a subsequent Bill was put in.

Mr. BARROW: In 1956 the hon. junior member for St. Lucy introduced a similar Bill. I presented him with a copy which he said he had deposited in the Clerk's Office. On being informed that the Clerk did not receive that copy, I presented a copy of that Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was in 1956.

Mr. BARROW: When I came in here in 1958 and you enquired as to whether I would give a fresh notice of the Bill, I said "No" and therefore none was put in. None was put in because that original Bill would still have been there.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am contending and saying quite categorically that on the last occasion when this House was re-inaugurated, the hon. member gave notice of his intention to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act by a Bill, but he never presented any such Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: In 1959-60.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have already given the reason why that was not done; it is that I was not sure that the original Bill was not there. What the hon. member is saying is that I have never presented such a Bill. That is not the gravamen of the submission of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, but since the hon. senior member for St. Michael has made the statement that I have never presented a Bill, I shall present the history of the various introductions. Nothing was presented in 1959-60 because I was assured that the original Bill was there.

As you know, Sir, we do not carry a large army of Private Secretaries which are paid for either by the Government or by ourselves; and since these motions and Bills are already printed and circulated, it is easier for the Government Printer to reprint them. I did not say that I presented a Bill to be debated this year or last year.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I do know is that quite recently notice of such a Bill was given to the Clerk, and I do know that the Clerk made efforts to contact the hon. member in order to get a copy of it.

Mr. BARROW: I was not in the island. I left it to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to intimate to the Clerk that the Bill would be on the same lines as the original Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know what has become of the original Bill.

Mr. BARROW: When the hon. member says that I have never presented any Bill, I should like to say that I not only presented it here, but I drafted it for two other islands as well.

Hon. M. E. COX: I know the hon. member well. You have an opening Session of this House. He thinks that a Bill which was introduced in the last Session is still somewhere around the place and all he says is "I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act".

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. What nonsense is the hon. member talking? The members on this side of the Table, at the re-opening of this Session last Tuesday, gave notice of about twenty-four questions and about ten Resolutions. None of us brought in any new notices, and the Clerk took them from the old files.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am contending that there was no Bill on the Order Paper. No Bill was presented to the House and therefore there could be no Bill introduced on those lines.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John is saying that that was done in 1956.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member was dropped at the 1956 Elections.

Mr. SPEAKER: On Tuesday the 12th June, 1956, I made a ruling against the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: You did that because you felt that it was a Money Bill. Even on Tuesday last when we were here, the hon. member's colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, gave notice of a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, and no Bill was presented to this House. 5.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it would be good to clear this matter up. When I made my ruling on 12th June, 1956, I took it that a Bill must have been in here, but my Clerk has assured me that that Bill must have been or would have been put in before he assumed duties as Clerk in 1956; therefore, it would not be the responsibility of the Clerk unless he saw it among his papers. Probably the present Clerk has not even seen the Bill; it may have been in the possession of his predecessor in office.

Hon. M. E. COX: Suppose we even believe the member that he introduced the Bill; when did he ever attempt to discuss it?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member now addressing the House or not?

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member asked when I discussed it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given my impression and I think that should clear the air.

Mr. BARROW: We were in the middle of the second reading when the Premier came in.

Hon. M. E. COX: That was five years ago.

Mr. BARROW: That shows how far in front of the Government I was if it was five years ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: Who is speaking now?

Hon. M. E. COX: I was replying to a few remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I would like to say this: the hon. member knows as well as I do that embodied in the Labour Code which was done for us by the I.L.O. expert is the question of amending the Workmen's Compensation Act. All those things are in that Code. We have told this House already that we are going to bring in, not a Code embodying all the recommendations made on the various aspects of labour in Barbados all in one, but we are going to introduce from time to time in part various sections of the recommendations. We have already started to do so. You will remember that we passed a Quarry Bill which was part of it. It is not fair to say therefore that we only brought in this part to prevent somebody else from doing something because this is a question.....

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir. The hon. member is wrong. I said that the hon. member had this part to deal with since 1957; the Union was written in 1957 about the Workmen's Compensation in the Labour Code. Mr. Matthews came here to deal with the Labour Code, but this matter of workmens' compensation was before the Union since 1957, and I said that after four years it was introduced last Tuesday.

I cannot see how the hon. member can say, after sitting down four years on a Bill and introducing it last Tuesday, that he wants to come back Friday to deal with a Port and Harbour Bill and not with the same legislation which you have had for over four years. I say it can only be a question of complete fraud because the Bill was introduced last Tuesday to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is mistaken. I would like to assure him when he talks about the Union agreeing with the workmens' compensation.....

Mr. WALCOTT: I never said that the Union agreed with the Workmens' Compensation Act.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Union discussed it with the Government since 1957. If the hon. member remembers correctly, the Government sent the whole Labour Code to the Union and the Union sent back its decision on the whole Code, including holidays with pay and things of that nature. All these things have been gone into and discussed with the Union; and the Union has expressed its opinion one way or another on these items. I have said already, and I repeat, that the Government is prepared to put these things into legislation in a piece-meal way, as we have told this House before.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not going back; I am talking about this matter before us today, not any piece-meal matter. I am saying that we should not be prepared for a postponement. I want the hon. member to understand that I did not come here in a wheelbarrow; and if he thinks I am asking him to deal with me, I will tell him that I have never asked the Government any favours since 1954. It is not a question of doing me any favour. The hon. member introduced this Bill last Tuesday, so it was their decision to put this Bill on the Order Paper. There can be no excuse for asking us to postpone it and come back Friday when you will not be dealing with it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have already told this House that the Government knows how to do its business; and always does its business as Government thinks best in the interest of the community.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill is now before the House for enactment by the House or to be thrown out by the House; but let us now hear something about the Bill. We do not want to go on hearing how long you had it, the background of it, why you did not proceed with it and why you want to postpone it. That is all the House is hearing. Let us go on to deal with the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: With great respect to Your Honour, that Bill is not before the House at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is before the House?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, if you will bear with me, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: I always do. *(Laughter from Opposition)*

Hon. M. E. COX: Thank you very much. A motion was made for the adjournment of the House until Friday; the Opposition was not desirous of coming back on Friday and suggested that the two items which we wanted to do on Friday could be dealt with this afternoon. I am willing to accede to the suggestion made by the Opposition, but the hon. senior member for St. Peter got up and in his usual way opposed and spoke about the Workmen's Compensation Bill. How that got into it I do not know!

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Workmen's Compensation Bill is the second Order on the Order Paper, but the hon. member got up and said they were not doing the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say we are not doing it. I said that closes Government Business for the day.

Mr. WALCOTT: Therefore you will do it at midnight tonight! Mr. Speaker, can you imagine an intelligent Minister in Our Lord's year of grace 1961 saying he was not going to do it — but that he was going to close business for the day?

Mr. SPEAKER: What are we going to do now?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, we are going to do the two Bills which the Opposition agreed should be done this evening. I am therefore asking leave to deal with the Bill to amend the Trade Act, the Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Act, and also a Bill to amend and repeal the provisions of certain Acts.
5.35 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You were not in the Chair, so perhaps I should make the position perfectly plain for the benefit of yourself. The Government proposed that these two Bills which were cyclostyled and handed around earlier today should be dealt with at a Special Meeting, either Thursday or Friday, in view of the urgency of them. We agreed, rather than come back on Thursday or Friday, both of which days are inconvenient to the Opposition, that we would stay on and do them this evening. But may I say that after that discussion started the hon. senior member for St. Peter referred to the Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act which is Order No. 2 on the Order Paper and, so far as we are concerned, I can assure you that we are perfectly willing to stay and do all these matters this evening.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will just formally put the question. The Hon. Minister is asking leave to deal with the Bill to amend the Trade Act, 1910, and the Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Act, 1898. Unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

Mr. BARROW: Objection!

The question that leave be granted was resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. SPEAKER "I think the Ayes have it."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I will deal with the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Trade Act, 1910.

THE TRADE BILL 1961

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, dealing with the Bill to amend certain provisions of the Trade Act, 1910, as hon. members were told a short time ago, we want to start the Port Department as from the 1st February. In order that that Department can take over certain functions at present carried on by the Harbour and Shipping Master's Department, especially that of the collection of dues and tariffs, it is necessary to amend certain Acts one of which is this Act, the Trade Act, 1910.

It is quite simple in its form. The Objects and Reasons are quite clear. The Tariff Book is almost complete, and certainly will be completed by the time this Bill becomes Law and before the 1st February. We are discussing Tariffs with the people concerned and we expect to complete these discussions this week. The new tariffs will be set out in this Tariff Book. At present, there is no Tariff Book so to speak. You have, so to speak, various levies to be imposed with this, that and the other; but with cargo being landed for the first time at the Deep Water Harbour, we are going to have this Tariff Book. In order that these new Tariffs be imposed it is necessary to amend this Act.

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: Sir, what rather disturbs me about this Bill is the fact that we are amending the Merchant Shipping Act, 1898, and repealing the Miscellaneous Taxation Act, 1921, so as to enable the new Tariffs set out in the Tariff Book to be levied as far as practicable in the interval between the opening of the Deep Water Harbour for the reception of sugar ships and the final completion of the Harbour.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is referring to the Bill which comes next.

Mr. BRANCKER: Then we are dealing with the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Trade Act, 1910?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Yes.

Mr. BRANCKER: Thanks.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I want it to be recorded that I regard this as a very unsatisfactory manner of dealing with important business. I have not had the opportunity of studying this Bill; it was only handed to me today. In order to be aware of the amendments, you must have copies of the principal Act before you. I know that almost all hon. members are unaware of what is happening. If hon. members want to come in here and pass legislation without knowing what it is, that is entirely a different matter. I cannot subscribe to that. I defy any hon. member to say that he is aware of what is being done.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I really cannot let the hon. member's remarks go unchallenged. Certainly there was no attempt from this side of the House to ram things down the throats of members of this House. We asked that we come back on Friday to deal with these two measures because of their urgency; and we were willing to come back then in order to give hon. members opportunity of going through these Bills. We consulted with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I supposed that he saw that this Bill was a simple affair and he agreed that we should do it this afternoon. The hon. senior member for Christ Church should have told the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that he did not agree to that. Do not blame us and say that we want to ram things down their throats.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know what hon. members of the Official Opposition have agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House has not five minutes ago gave the Minister permission without a division being called to deal with these two Bills.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I quite appreciate that, but I must state here that the Objects and Reasons of this Bill seeks to repeal certain provisions of the Trade Act and the Hon. Minister in charge of the Bill intimated that this Bill must be got through in time so as to be ready for the 1st February; and, as such, it must be passed by this Chamber to go to the Other Place.
5.45 p.m.

Because hon. members do not bla-bla-bla on every Bill which comes before the House, that does not mean that we do not actually, in our spare moments, go over the Bill. However, if the only reason for the Opposition agreeing to deal with this Bill today is because they do not want to come back here on Friday, I do not agree with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not the Opposition, the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not care what the House agreed upon. I am an individual member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to differ, but he has a duty to respect the decision of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I recognise it, but I do not respect it. I am not offering any opposition, but Your Honour will agree with me that in my position, I am a representative of the City. The Government has brought down a Bill to deal with the Deep Water Harbour. I was not here when the Hon. Minister was dealing with the other matter, but if, as I understand it, the House agreed as a proposition not to have to come back here on Friday in order to deal with this Bill, and they say that they would rather deal with this Bill now and rush it through, then the Opposition is condoning something which they should not attempt to do. *(ASIDES)* Hon. members must recognise that it is my right to speak. It would be better, in my considered opinion, to give any hon. member the opportunity to take home this Bill, go through it and ask about anything which he does not understand.

I have every reason to respect the views of the Opposition, and that they will do their business properly. I recognise the decision of the House and that of the Opposition

who say that they will go on with this Bill today. The Government wants this Bill done on Friday and the Opposition say that we should do it now, even although we do not understand anything about it.

Mr. BRACNKER: On a point of order. The Opposition never agreed to do anything like that. The reason for our agreement to proceed with this Bill this afternoon and not to come back here on Friday is that we are anticipating that the same spirit which we show will be shown by the Government; and that the Hon. Minister in charge of this Measure will give a full explanation, one after the other, of all the sections and provisions of the Trade Act which are to be repealed and those which are to be retained.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear what the Hon. Minister in charge of the Bill said in the first instance. However, I heard him say that they wanted to come back here on Friday, but they would accommodate the Opposition by dealing with this Bill this afternoon rather than come back on Friday. If the Minister says that this matter is such an urgent and important one, and that it must be ready by the 1st of February this year, surely the Minister must have known that the Deep Water Harbour, and what not, would be opened in February? Why was this matter not brought forward before? Why was notice not given of this matter before? The Opposition does not understand this, but they want to go on with this Bill because they do not want to come back here on Friday to deal with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not cast reflections of inability to understand things.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is an honest reflection. I do not mean to observe the Rules of the House in the breach rather than in the observance; but an honest observation cannot be taken as a reflection.

Mr. SPEAKER: It may be.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This cannot be a reflection. If the Minister has said that this matter is so important, if the Deep Water Harbour must be operated and this Bill must be ready by the 1st February, why was it not brought in before? Why put this Bill before us only today?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I have not said that this Bill must be done today. That is not so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Even if the Minister says that he never intended to deal with this Bill today, that he is accommodating the Opposition in not coming back here on Friday, what is the reason for not introducing this Bill before?
5.55 p.m.

There is the idea of throwing things before members of this House who are not members of the Government. I do not even refer to the Backbenchers because if they are not interested, that is their business. That is not good enough. As a matter of fact, the hon. member could have given notice of this last week, because he had ample time to do so, and we would have had an opportunity to deal with it today. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I do not subscribe to that idea, nor do I even appreciate the stand of the Opposition on this matter.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the position of the Government is quite simple. I do not think I need to go over it. It is the decision of the House to carry on. I have already replied to the Leader of the Opposition.

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. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SEARLES being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 6 was called. It reads as follows:-

6. Section one hundred and forty-nine of the principal Act is hereby amended by deleting the words "Harbour and Shipping Master's" appearing therein and by substituting therefor the word - "Port".

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 6 stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would like the Hon. Minister to say whether that should be "Authority" or "Department", because you are deleting the words "Harbour and Shipping Master's" and substituting the word "Port".

The hon. member thinks I am filibustering, but I do not want to hold anything up; and I am not an idiot or a marionette. I am not one of those persons who come in here and go back out and when one of my constituents asks me a question on a Bill passed in here, I do not know the answer. I must understand what I am doing. I therefore ask the Minister whether it should be "Port" or "Department".

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, it is the Port Department because it is not a Statutory Authority. It is a Department in accordance with the policy statement made some time ago. It would be an Authority if you had a Statutory Authority set up by Statute, but on this occasion it is not so. If you refer to the Principal Act you will see.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. member's explanation, but am I not correct in saying that in some cases you refer to the Port as the "Port Authority"? I wonder if the hon. member can satisfy me that in some cases you set up a "Port Authority" as distinct from a "Port Department", and you have here "Port". You must not mind a layman questioning these things. If you are amending the Principal Act by deleting the words "Harbour and Shipping Master's", I am wondering if it should not be "Port Authority".

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, what I suggest would be helpful for proceeding with this Bill, after the brief opportunity we have had of studying it, would be if the Minister who would have certain documents before him equivalent to the Lawyer's brief would explain in moving the passing of this Section the purpose of Section 149 which is the Section dealing with the prosecution of offences. That is the Section which the hon. member might well explain not in reference to this, but in respect of future sections so as to make it easier for other members to follow. There are only three copies of the Trade Act available, if so many, in this Chamber at the moment.
6.05 p.m.

This section deals with the recovery and disposal of penalties. It reads as follows:-

"All offences may be prosecuted and all fees, dues, duties and penalties may be recovered in a summary manner before a Police Magistrate on the complaint of any officer of Customs, of the Harbour and Shipping Master's Department, inland revenue officer, or member of the Police Force, and in default of payment of fees, dues, duty or penalty within the time prescribed by the Magistrate, the offender shall be imprisoned for any term not exceeding twelve months with hard labour, unless such dues, duty, penalty, or costs are sooner paid."

The purpose of Section 6 of this Bill is to amend Section 149 which has laid down how offences and penalties can be prosecuted and can be recovered under the Trade Act. As it is now, by this Bill, it is on the complaint of any officer of the Customs, inland revenue officer, a member of the Police Force or any officer of the Port Department instead of any officer of the Harbour and Shipping Master's Department because it is proposed not to delete the word "department" which stands in the principal Act. If you

delete the words "Harbour and Shipping Master's" and substitute the word "Port" you will only get "Port Department." I say that the Act which we just passed created a Port Authority.

Mr. TUDOR: Before the Hon. Minister replies, I will go further and say this: We have by legislation set up a Port Authority and I therefore cannot see how the Minister can claim, as he seems to suggest, that the word "department" would be in order. Persons employed there would have to be employed by the Port Authority and not the Port Department. The word "Department" would suggest that it is a departmental authority.

A Statutory Authority has been set up to administer the Port - at least that is what one gathers from the legislation which was recently passed here. That legislation stated how the authority should be constituted and it gave certain powers and functions to someone. It meant therefore that people employed there and given authority to prosecute would be doing that under the instructions of the Port Authority. We are now hearing for the first time from the Minister that it is a Department which is a different thing altogether. I think the Hon. Minister should pay attention to this matter and see how it can be clarified.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, hon. members of the Opposition think that there is a lot of strategy in coming and pushing things in a Bill so as to raise a little Opposition.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I object to that statement. The Minister is not at all certain, and he is not giving us a clear and equivocal answer to this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, what is the point of the Hon. Minister adopting that attitude? He is only trying to shut us up. His very expression shows that he is not quite sure. Why should he say that the strategy of some members of the Opposition is to come and push things in so as to raise a little opposition?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Probably, I assumed that there are masters of the situation which they themselves created. The House passed a Bill referring to the Port Department. The authority which the hon. member referred to is not an authoritative body; it is an advisory body. (A VOICE: I hope you are not advised wrongly.) We did not create an authority. The Clerk can verify that because he is a lawyer. The Port is a department of the Government and it is laid down in the Act. We just passed Section 26 in which we substituted the words "Port Department" for "Harbour and Shipping Master's Department."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Will the Hon. Minister just read that for us?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: This is the Section making provision for a co-ordinated Harbours System by means of a Port Department. Section 4 of the Harbours Act reads as follows:-

"(1) The Governor-in-Executive Committee is hereby empowered to provide in accordance with the provisions of this Act and any subsidiary legislation made thereunder a co-ordinated and integrated system of harbour facilities, lighthouses and port services within the Island by means of a Department to be known as the Port Department."

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is good enough. The word here should be "Port Department".

Mr. STRAUGHN: Perhaps the term "authority" is being introduced now because under the Harbours Act you have people authorising employees.

The question that Clause 6 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 7 was called and passed.

Clause 8 was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 8 stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: What I would suggest to facilitate matters is that, when the Section is called, the Hon. Minister just explain the reason for it.

Mr. Chairman, during my life time and before you were a member of this Chamber, the Sections of Bills were read word for word and that gave members a chance to assimulate the section. If the Hon. Minister will explain that this section is dealing with forms for bonding, and so on, it will make it a lot easier for us.

The question that Clause 8 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

6.15 p.m.

Clause 9 was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 9 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, this Section of the Bill proposes to repeal about two dozen Sections of the Principal Act. I would suggest to the Hon. Minister that he tell us what is the purpose of repealing these Sections. He can tell us the general purpose of the repeal of these Sections even if he cannot give us the details.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of these Sections which are being repealed and I do not know if the hon. member wants me to go through them in detail. We are going to have new Regulations.

Mr. TUDOR: Is it that these sections are being repealed because they are covered under the new provisions and that they do no longer apply to these new provisions?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: It is both of those things.

Mr. TUDOR: Well, we had to supply the Hon. Minister with the answer! *(Laughter)*

The question that Clause 9 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 10 was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Clause 10 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: The same thing applies to this Clause.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Premier could tell us how long since it is that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has become a Minister!! *(Laughter)*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Coming events cast their shadow! *(Laughter)*

The question that Clause 10 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 11 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SHIPPING CHARGES (AMENDMENT AND REPEAL) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend and repeal the provisions of certain Acts of the island relating to the dues and charges that may be levied upon shipping.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I would say that most of the remarks which I made on the introduction of the Bill which has just been passed, will apply in so far as this Bill which is now before us is concerned. What I am saying now is for the ear of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The Tariff Book will soon be completed and made available to any member of the public or any organisation or body which requires it. This Book will set out the various Tariffs, and that will certainly be done by the time that this Bill is proclaimed, so that there will be no hiatus whatsoever. The tariffs will be there, and will apply as from the date on which the Harbour comes into operation on the 1st February. 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, I had begin to make a comment on this Bill when I realised that there was then before us the other Bill which we have just passed. The Hon. Minister has anticipated my comment that we would be signing a blank cheque, although we may be signing it with a reasonable amount of assurance. The hon. member has given an assurance in relation to, and because of, Section 4 of this Bill which says this:

"This Act shall come into operation on such day as the Governor may appoint by proclamation published in the *Official Gazette.*

The Hon. Minister, speaking on behalf of the Cabinet, has given this Parliament the assurance that, in repealing the Miscellaneous Taxation Act, 1921, so as to enable the new tariffs set out in the Tariff Book to be levied as far as practicable in the interval between the opening of the Deep Water Harbour for the reception of sugar ships and the final completion of the Harbour, the Tariff Book will be duly printed and published simultaneously with the coming into operation of this Act. I am wondering if, apart from the assurance which the Hon. Minister has already given, he will give the assurance that the Tariff Book will be published simultaneously with the signing of this Act. I wonder also if the Hon. Minister would let us know the most important thing of all, the new tariffs which are supposed to be set out in this Tariff Book.

Mr. TUDOR: There is another point, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to raise. I would like to know, first of all, how much time is likely to elapse between the opening of the Harbour for the reception of sugar ships and the final completion of the Harbour. Of all the Legislation which has to deal with the new Harbour, I think this one is perhaps the most important. This is the Bill which will be effective and will probably have to be changed when certain matters which are now being discussed at Federal level will reach completion. If within the next 18 months or so, the Federal questions of Customs Union, unified tariffs and so on, have been concluded, then our own laws in this respect will have to come under review.
6.25 p.m.

I want to know, Mr. Speaker, whether the Government was bearing that possibility in mind when it mentioned the interval between the opening of the Deep Water Harbour and the reception of sugar ships and the final completion of the Harbour. In other words, what I want to know is if there is anything in this proposed legislation which they will do or have to amend in the light of our Federal commitments when they are known.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, as regards the last question posed by the last hon. member who has just sat down, I would like to say that a separate Bill relating to Customs charges will be coming down pretty soon, so his remarks and questions would be more applicable to that Bill when it arrives. If the hon. member would refer to the Merchant Shipping Act, he will see that there are rates laid out for various ships according to measurement of tonnage, and the maximum fees to be paid.

Regarding Merchants Ships, the hon. member will notice in the Port Estimates, tonnage dues, careenage dues and other dues; and these will be set out in the Tariff Book. I will give the assurance again to the House that this will be done before the Act is proclaimed; it will come into effect with the Proclamation and with the provisions of this Act.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member's point was what time will elapse between the opening of the Department and the completion and official opening of the Harbour.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The Objects and Reasons set out that this is to enable the new tariffs set out in the Tariff Book to be levied as far as practicable in the interval between the opening of the Deep Water Harbour for the reception of sugar ships and final completion of the Harbour, that is between 1st February and the opening of the Harbour.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When is that likely to be?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: We think it might be around May.

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. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SEARLES being in the Chair.

Clause 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called. It reads as follows:-

"4. This Act shall come into operation on such day as the Governor may appoint by proclamation published in the *Official Gazette.*

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the actual coming into operation or the way in which it is going to be done by Proclamation. I just rise at this point to throw out a suggestion to the Government arising out of something which the Minister said a few minutes ago, that is, that the official opening of the Harbour would be in May, or at least it was likely to be.

In view of the fact that there is also likely to be a very important Trade Fair by the Junior Chamber of Commerce also in the month of May, would the Government consider the advisability of telescoping these dates as much as possible - the opening of the Harbour and the holding of the Trade and Industrial Fair? Since this is now January and that is in May, would they give serious consideration to respectfully sending an invitation to Her Royal Highness Princess Margaret for the purpose of opening the Harbour? I do not make that suggestion light-heartedly.

Bearing in mind the Trade and Industrial Fair which I understand is to take place, and bearing in mind the importance of the Harbour, the attractions we want to make for it for our trade and the publicity which it would give, I think it would be a very sensible thing to do indeed; and it has nothing at all to do with any sentimental or other associations, although the Gracious Lady whom I am suggesting would of course be willing to come and likes to come to the West Indies. It is not for that reason, but for hard-headed, practical business reasons and in the interest of the island and the publicity of the new venture that I make the suggestion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I see smiles on the faces of members of the Government. I wonder if they are showing appreciation of the suggestion made by the hon. member. It is not that we feel that in these parts we are in any way inferior, but the Colony has always shown recognition of Royalty from the point of view of its constitutional Monarchy. I wonder why hon. members should attempt to laugh at what the hon. senior member has said. I am serious in what I am saying because I actually agree with the hon. member. The only reason why I would not say to invite the Governor General of Canada or anybody like that, because this is one opportunity of really putting Barbados on the Globe.... (Hon. D. D. GARNER: It is there already!) I am not skylarking. I hope the Hon. Premier would listen to me.

You are now opening a Deep Water Harbour, and what the hon. member has said is not because of any sentimentality of anything of the sort; he is saying what it would mean to Barbados from the point of view of the Trade Fair, tourism, the United States, Canada and the like. As a matter of fact, Sir, we see representatives of Her Majesty going to Africa and declaring Parliaments open. I wonder if members of the Government realised that it would have been a fine gesture had Mr. Deifenbaker or Mr. Massey or one of them opened the St. Lawrence Seaway; but they did not think of it that way; they thought of inviting the Queen to open the St. Lawrence Seaway and the publicity it would give to Canada.

6.35 p.m.

I see hon. members over on the other side laughing. I recall this event very well because I remember that I went around and asked some very talented people whether the Queen on that memorable night had used the correct phraseology while making her speech at the opening of that Seaway. I think the suggestion made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy is one on which you should not throw cold water. There is that sentiment which people have for the Royal family and Mr. Armstrong-Jones although some people say that Mr. Armstrong-Jones should go and look for a job. Let no one fool you, that sentiment still holds good in countries like this. Her Majesty the Queen leaves for India either this week, next week or the week after to go and open an institution.

I should like to see that you have some sort of opening ceremony for your Deep Water Harbour; and I am not just saying so merely to invite Her Royal Highness but you should invite certain distinguished persons from abroad. I know that some members of the Government would take good care not to invite certain distinguished Negro personalities whom you have all over the U.S.A. and Canada, to say the least of the West Indies. I still agree with the hon. senior member that it would be a wonderful thing to have Her Royal Highness, Princess Margaret here to open our Deep Water Harbour. Do you know what it will do for publicity purposes?

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the hon. member who has just sat down for the support which he has given to the suggestion, but I did not make it in any half-hearted way. I said in my speech that I understood that there was going to be a Trade Fair organised by the Jaycees on the Deep Water Harbour during the month of May. The Hon. Minister said that the official opening of the Harbour would take place in May which is the same month of the Trade Fair taking place. I then said in view of that and the publicity which you would bring to the island for the stimulation of our trade, it would be a proper thing to see whether Her Royal Highness, Princess Margaret, would come over and declare the harbour open. It is possible that the Government might have other ideas. What they are, I do not know. (A VOICE: What about Jomo Kenyatta?) There is nothing wrong with that because Mr. Kenyatta whom I know personally is distinguished enough to perform that role; but I doubt whether the hon. member who made that suggestion wants him. I think that he has only made that suggestion because he knows that the British Government would not release Mr. Kenyatta.

For the purpose of the Trade Fair, people from bigger countries other than ourselves would be inclined to send exhibits of their products so as to stimulate trade between themselves and the West Indies; and the tourist promotion centres in Canada, the U.S.A. and other places would quite likely be sending people here to make the month of May a resounding success and to launch us off into something good. As the focal point of all that is that Her Royal Highness, Princess Margaret, should be invited to open it.

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, 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.

On separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 24th January, 1960, at twelve (noon).

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

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

6.45 p.m.