
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st March, 1961.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K N R HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*) and Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1961.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (Materials and Components for the Manufacture of Prefabricated Wooden Houses, Builders' Woodwork, Domestic Woodware and Wooden Furniture) Order, 1961.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders etc. to 31st January, 1961.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1961.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to Question No. 24/1961 asked by

the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding the construction of new school buildings, and Question No. 30/1961 asked by the same hon. member regarding payment of salaries for December, 1960 to Relief Teachers are ready.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement regarding the publication of a Report by an Advisory Committee on Staff structure at the General Hospital. The Report reads as follows:-

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF SOCIAL SERVICES REGARDING THE PUBLICATION OF A REPORT BY AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STAFF STRUCTURE AT THE GENERAL HOSPITAL

During September, 1960, the Minister of Social Services, with the agreement of the Cabinet, invited -

Dr. H. P. S. Gillette, Federal Medical Adviser,

Professor J. Gilmour, Professor of Surgery at the University College of the West Indies; and

Dr. G. W. Moore, Senior Medical Officer, Dominica,

to comprise an Advisory Committee -

- (i) to examine the existing staff structure of the General Hospital in respect of -
 - (a) Medical Services,
 - (b) Nursing Services,
 - (c) Clerical and administrative services;
- (ii) to consider the demands now made on the out-patient clinics; and
- (iii) to make recommendations and to advise the Minister on these matters.

The Committee met in Barbados from 22nd September, and reported to the Minister of Social Services on 30th September, 1960.

During the same year other sections or departments of the Barbados General Hospital had been subjected to expert examination with a view to their reorganisation. In April, 1959, a Records Department was established at the Hospital on a temporary basis under the direction of Mr. W. C. P. Pakeman, Medical Recordologist of the University College Hospital, Jamaica. Mr. Pakeman had been invited by the Government of Barbados to advise on the establishment of such a service and his comprehensive recommendations on the organisation and function of a Records Department for the Hospital were received on 31st October, 1960.

In April, 1960, Mr. S. A. Hammond, Adviser to the Government of Barbados on Establishment, Organisation and Training, submitted to the Ministry of Social Services a report on a survey which he had been requested to undertake on the Business Administration of the Hospital. Mr.

Hammond's recommendations in the main, propose a complete reorganisation of the General Office and Accounts Section, and of the existing arrangements for catering and purchase of supplies.

The Government of Barbados has also found it necessary from time to time to seek the advice of the Division for Architectural Studies at the Nuffield Foundation in the United Kingdom, the Medical Adviser to the Secretary of State and other Colonial Office Advisers on certain aspects of the planning of the New General Hospital.

The Advisory Committee to which reference is made above was therefore not intended to be a public Commission of Enquiry into the Barbados General Hospital. Its report, which deals mainly with the need for strengthening the medical and nursing staff structures and for the introduction of certain administrative procedures to meet the ever-growing demands on existing hospital services and also in preparation for transfer to the New General Hospital in approximately two years' time, is one of a series of reports which the Ministry of Social Services has deemed it necessary to obtain to assist in the reorganisation of existing hospital services and in planning for the administration of the New Hospital. As such, it is not proposed that the Advisory Committee's Report should be published.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Orders Nos. 1, 2 and 3 and to take Order No. 4 as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to postpone Orders Nos. 1, 2 and 3 and to take Order No. 4 as the first Order of the Day and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

12.25 p.m.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill before us is to amend the Local Government Act, 1958. There are several reasons for the Government proposing to amend this Act. One - and it is a very important one - is that as the Act stands at present, each Local Government area can lay rates on trade, as we all know; and it very often happens, as it has happened in the past few years, that the Trade Tax of the Northern and Southern District Councils is high and out of proportion to the similar tax in the Bridgetown City Council area.

We know that there have been complaints by one or two industries located in the southern area; and with our eyes focused on industrialisation, the Government considers that it would be in the best interest of industrialisation to have a uniform rate of Trade Tax applying to the whole island.

Sir, there is another reason which is very well known to all of us; and it is this: After all, Barbados is just a small place and has only one main city. There are one or two others which we call towns. However, we know that the trade done in Barbados passes through the hands of the merchants, commission agents and everybody else in Bridgetown, and from there it goes out into the rural areas. If a man in St. Lucy wants to buy a hat, he comes to town to get the hat. Foodstuffs which are sold in the country areas come from Bridgetown, and the money to pay for those goods comes from the country areas and is paid to the merchants in Bridgetown. Trade Tax is collected on that. That goes for almost everything that is bought from Bridgetown and retailed in the country areas. The money eventually comes back in Bridgetown and the merchants have to pay Trade Tax there on the amount of the trade done. Those are two very important reasons.

The policy of the Government is to do all in its power to attract industries into Barbados, and it is also desirable

that the Trade Tax should be fixed by law because a taxpayer would have a certain guide to his likely commitments. The principle is the same as that to a fixed company tax. A fixed company tax rate is proposed in the Act to settle the rates of Income Tax. We know that for income tax purposes, each trader knows what he has to pay and it is felt that a similar provision should be made in the case of trade tax.

Probably, the hon. junior member for Christ Church who is a member of the Bridgetown City Council knows, or probably has heard, as I have heard, that already certain lorry owners in the island have been paying their tax in St. Michael because the St. Michael rates are lower than the other two Councils. The adoption of such a unified trade tax will also facilitate lorry owners throughout the island because instead of some of them having their trade tax paid in St. Michael, they would be in a position to pay it in their own areas.

12.35 p.m.

I think it would be well to give this House some figures on the taxable income of all of these areas. In 1960-61, the approved estimates of the Councils and the estimated yield from trade tax thereon are as follows: In the City; estimated taxable income, \$7,750,000. As you know, the trade rate was 17.5 per cent in the City, and that was estimated to yield \$1,356,250. At the same time, the estimated taxable income for the Southern Council was \$600,000 and their rate was 21.2 per cent. That rate was estimated to yield \$127,200. In the Northern District, the taxable income was \$370,000 and the tax rate was 26.62%. That was estimated to yield \$98,494. The revised estimate of the taxable income as at the 28th February, 1961, and the revised estimated yield are as follows; the estimated taxable income for the City was \$9,426,462 as against the figure mentioned before. As you know, the tax rate was 17.5% and with these revised figures, there was a yield of \$1,649,630 as against the previous figure of \$1,356,250. In the Southern District, the revised figures are \$592,147, the rate was 21.2% and the yield was \$125,535. These figures show that in the case of the South there was also a drop in the estimated taxable income and, consequently, a drop in the estimated yield. In the North, things were a little better; the estimated taxable income at the 28th February, 1961, was \$377,320. The rate in the North was 26.62% and the yield was \$100,442 up to that point. The total estimated income of the three areas up to the 28th February, 1961, was \$10,359,929. If we had a common rate, the revised estimated yield from tax would be at 17.5%, the same as obtains in the City of Bridgetown, and the estimated yield would be \$1,819,287. That is an excess by \$237,443 of the estimated yield in the Approved Estimates.

It is proposed that the whole trade tax should be paid into a special fund under the control and management of the Local Government Commissioner. With regard to the division of the yield between the Councils, I agree that it is quite natural for the Bridgetown City Council to get the most of it because they have more services and there is a larger area. The services are far in excess of those provided by the other Councils. They have larger public institutions, they have scavenging, lighting and things of that sort. It is therefore natural that the Bridgetown City Council would benefit to a greater extent by this pooling. When I say that they would benefit to a greater extent, I mean that they would get more of the pool than the other two areas. It is therefore proposed that from this common pool the City should get 80%, the South 11% and the North 9%. If we apply these figures, these percentages of the amount I mentioned, \$1,819,287, it will be seen that if a common rate tax of 17.5 per cent were now in existence, the amount to be distributed to the Councils would be as follows:- The City of Bridgetown \$1,455,430, the Southern District Council \$200,121 and the Northern District Council \$163,736.

12.45 p.m.
Compare those figures I have just mentioned, Mr. Speaker, with those I mentioned earlier with regard to the Northern and Southern Councils. You will remember that I said that the estimated taxable income of 21.2% would apply to the Southern District; that would yield \$127,200 and the actual yield up to the 28th February was \$125,535. Compare the figure of \$200,121 which would go to the Northern District if we had a uniform 17.5 per cent rate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the Hon. Premier mean Northern District or Southern District?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I meant the Southern District. In the case of the North they would get from the Pool \$163,736; compare that with the estimated yield in the North of \$98,494; and the estimated yield at the 28th February, 1961 was \$100,442. I mentioned that, Sir, simply to show that this 17.5% which is the same as being collected now in the City would not work any hardship on the City; it would to a great extent increase the actual money which the North and South would receive. Going back to the first reason I gave for this amendment, I am quite sure that it will certainly make potential industrialists and even those who are now in the island operate very much more happily if these proposals were adopted. There would be a uniform rate, and certainly in a case of this sort where the yield was greater and the rate of taxation lower, it would make potential industrialists happier and act as another incentive to come and establish industries in Barbados.

A point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that each Council should benefit in proportion to its collections. That is to say, if a Council failed to collect trade taxes, that proportion which it failed to collect would be deducted from their portion of the yield from the pooling. We are at pains to state that, because it is human nature, if there is no provision of that sort made, that they might be rather slow in making their collections and expect to get their full portion of the yield from the Pool. We want to make it clear that in a case of that sort the amount they failed to collect would be deducted from their portion of the yield.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is that while the 80 per cent, 11 per cent and nine per cent will be written into the Act, if at any time there is a greater yield of taxable income which would provide for a further reduction in the rate, of course the whole matter will be reviewed again; so this is not exactly like the laws of the Medes and Persians. As the law now stands, the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is required to submit the estimates of taxable income before 1st April each year. He is hardly in a position to do that with any hope of accuracy before the latter part of March; therefore the Councils will always be forced to apply for an extension of the period for the submission of Estimates. It is therefore proposed to amend the Law to provide that the Councils should submit their estimates on or before the last day of April - an extension of a month - and that Councils may incur a limited amount of expenditure during the interval between the end of one financial year and the approval by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the Estimates for the following financial year.

That in short, Sir, is the reason and the views of the Government on this amendment to the Local Government Act. We have tried to show you the figures which in the case of the passing of this Act would apply, and that nobody would suffer any hardship; they would still have plenty of money, and in the case of the South and the North their position would be very much better; and having the hope of collecting a greater amount of tax from this source, they would be in a better position to carry out the services which they have to perform.

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

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I received this Bill yesterday afternoon. Although notice was given of it previously, it was only sent to me yesterday afternoon, and I have not had an opportunity of studying it, because this Bill needs proper study.
12.45 p.m.

Had I arrived before the Hon. Premier started the second reading, I would have protested then; but he has started and he has given some facts which we would have wanted even before to be able to study this Bill.

I go further and say that a Bill of this sort should have been sent in the form of White Paper to the Councils concerned. This is a matter for the Councils to pass an opinion

on. You should not leave it to the few representatives in the House of Assembly to say what they think about it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There are two points which I want to inform the hon. member of. First of all, most of us received this Bill on Saturday; I am not saying everybody. Secondly, a copy of the Bill was sent to the Councils. I am not sure of the date but as far as I can remember, it was sent week before last.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is not usual for the Hon. Premier to make statements which are in doubt in this House. He may make statements which he may be misunderstood upon. This Bill was given notice of when the Hon. Premier dealt with his Budget Speech. Does the Hon. Premier say that this Bill was sent to the Councils before it was given notice of in this House?

Mr. STRAUGHN: I too rise on a point of order, Sir. I am not aware that we of the Northern District Council have received any separate copy of the Bill. That is something to check on. There must be a mistake somewhere. As far as my receiving a copy of it, I received mine on Saturday. What I remember is that the Local Government Commissioner handed a copy of it to us in discussion a few days ago, around Friday.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, I did not intend to convey the idea that each individual member of the Council was sent a copy; but my impression - I may be wrong - is that a copy was sent to each Council. (A VOICE: When?) I do not know the date, but my impression was that it was sent late in the week before the last. As regards members receiving their copies, the hon. member seems to have got his last night. I got mine on Saturday.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise on another point of order. If the Hon. Premier makes the statement - and he lives in Bank Hall - that he got a copy possibly on Saturday and I got mine yesterday afternoon late, then something has gone wrong. I got mine yesterday afternoon late. I do not know where this thing about getting yours on Saturday has come about.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that it is not fair to the Council to be bypassed on a Bill of this sort. I am a member of the Bridgetown City Council and there are eighteen of us. Two of us got copies last night. There are others in the Northern and Southern District Councils who are similarly treated. A financial matter is implicated in this Bill. The figures which the Hon. Premier furnished just now could have been embodied in the White Paper which should have been sent to the Councils for their study. However, if the Hon. Premier is prepared to go on with the Bill, I am prepared to say something; but I do not think it is fair to this Honourable House and to the Councils.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not want to push anything down the throats of hon. members. I have just been reminded that other members did not get theirs because delivery in the suburban and rural areas is usually a day later. The hon. junior member for St. Michael got his on Saturday.

I rise to say this: If hon. members did not get theirs until yesterday afternoon, I am prepared to postpone it for further consideration if hon. members are willing to come on Thursday and let us do it because, as you will notice, it must be passed in time to be effective as from next month.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I can see the willingness of the Hon. Premier to compromise. There is no need for unnecessary haste because the Bill amends the time from 'before the commencement of every financial year' to 'on or before the last day of April'. Therefore, I suggest that it can be got through by that time without coming here on Thursday. I know that the Hon. Premier has in mind the visit of the Prime Minister of England on Tuesday next and therefore, he may not want us to meet that day.

I certainly say that he must have been mistaken about sending a copy of it to the Council. Even if a copy of the

Bill was sent to the Councils, the hon. member will agree with me that while one or two members in each Council would be *au fait* with figures of this nature, it would be absolutely right for the Government to be able to give these figures so that each Council could study them and make a contribution. If the Hon. Premier would agree to postponement for further consideration until Thursday next week, between now and then each Council could very well meet and express a view on it. No harm can be done by that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Section 15 of this Bill says that this Act shall come into operation on the 1st day of April, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one. 1.05 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, on that ground I am going to move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed. I would like to ask the Hon. Premier to postpone the consideration of this Bill and have the House adjourned to meet next Monday. Next Tuesday would be out of the question because we will be very busy. By Monday we would have been given a reasonable time for all the Councils to study this Bill. I therefore beg to move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say this: next Monday will be the 27th March and that would not give sufficient time for the Bill to reach the Other Place. Therefore, I want hon. members to think again with regard to my proposal for meeting on Thursday.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the Bill itself extends the time to one month by which the Councils can send their Estimates to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. In other words, as the position stands now, the Commissioner of Inland Revenue has to give us certain figures by a certain date and the Councils have to send their Estimates to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The date has been extended to the 30th April. That being so, I am suggesting that there is nothing wrong in postponing the consideration of this Bill in the circumstances. The Bill has to take effect from the 1961-62 Estimates and you can change the date in the Bill for sending the Estimates to the Cabinet. Having extended that date, you give time between the sending of the figures from the Commissioner of Inland Revenue to the Local Government Councils; you give time for the Councils to be able to deal with the matter.

I am not a lawyer; you have already extended the date for a month.....

Hon. M. E. COX: It appears to me to be a very simple matter. If the Bill is passed on the 1st April, or if it is to come into effect on that date, and you pass the Bill on the 20th April, it is still effective as from the 1st April.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is what I am saying.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this juncture, there is a proposed amendment before the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Having extended the time between the working of the Local Government and the Government for a month, on whatever date you pass the Bill you can say that it comes into effect as from the 1st April. The Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is correct. The working of the Councils must take place according to this Act. I am suggesting that it would appear much nicer to have this Bill postponed, and now that the Hon. Minister of Trade has made that suggestion, you need not postpone it until Monday. It becomes effective as from the beginning of the month. Now we are acting wisely and the Bill can go into effect from the date suggested.

My grounds for the postponement are (1) that we did not receive this Bill in proper time and (2) the matter should be sent to the Local Government Councils for discussion and expression of their views. It is a matter of democratic principle to postpone the consideration of this Bill. I am sure that the Premier will postpone the consideration of this Bill in the circumstances.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Is the hon. member saying that he did not get that copy which I instructed to be sent

to the Chairman of each Local Government Council? Or is he saying that he did not get it at an early time?

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is just last week that a copy was sent to the Clerk by the Local Government Commissioner and that copy was sent after the declaration in the Premier's Speech, after the declaration of what the policy of the Government would be, and the amendments which would be made after it was introduced in this House. (Hon. M. E. COX: That is as it should be.) I cannot say that that is as it should be. I would like to say that if the Government proposes something in the way of a new form of taxation, then the Government should say "It is proposed to do so-and-so and we should like to hear the views of the Councils on it; we require an answer not later than such and such a date." If the Councils did not send you an answer by that certain date, then you would have extended the utmost courtesy to them and nothing else could be done. I am not fooling the hon. member; I am in here as an individual but I do not take it that you should ride roughshod over the Councils. I can answer on any figures. 1.15 p.m.

I am *au fait* with them, but I doubt whether any member of the Local Government can answer them, because I have been watching, wondering and thinking how best this can be done. I do not want to say any more at this stage.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Can we say then that we will meet next Thursday, because Thursday will be too busy? Meanwhile I will send you the figures, and will have enough copies done so that each member of the Councils can get one.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I heard the hon. senior member for the City say that his Clerk had a copy of this Bill. I do not know if the Clerk of the Northern District Council had a copy of this Bill, because I was sent one only yesterday afternoon. Only Wednesday last week the Commissioner attended the meeting of the Northern District Council and merely hinted what was going to happen with regard to the amendment to this Bill. He never told us that a copy had been sent to him or to the Clerk. If the Clerk of the City Council had a copy, it is not fair to the Councillors of the Northern District not to have had a copy, because they should be acquainted with this Bill. I do not know if the Chairman was sent one before hand, but I am sure that I have not seen a copy, nor did the Commissioner tell us that copies were circulated to us.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I have a brief comment to make on that. I am not personally conscious of the fact that a copy was received by the Clerk of the Northern District Council. I am hoping that the postponement would be for a reasonable length of time so that all three Councils will be able to meet. We have not set the precise date of postponement, but I think a motion should be made to give enough time so that the three Councils involved can meet and discuss the Bill.

The question that further consideration of this Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE SOIL CONSERVATION (SCOTLAND DISTRICT) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Soil Conservation (Scotland District) Act, 1958.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Soil Conservation Act in three respects. The Objects and Reasons point out that the principal object of this Bill is to enable the Director of Highways and Transport, the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department and the Town and Country Planning Officer to be appointed as members of the Scotland District Soil Conservation Board without reducing the present number of the unofficial members of the Board, as the Board has intimated that these officers would prove of great assistance to the Board.

Clause 2 of this Bill seeks to give effect to the above proposal. As the Director of Highways and Transport is at

present one of the five other members of the Board, by making him one of the *ex officio* members, the reduction in numbers effected by paragraph (b) of that Clause will not affect the number of the unofficial members of the Board.

The remaining Clauses of the Bill seek to correct minor drafting and typographical errors contained in the principal Act.

As one can see, Sir, this is a slight amendment giving certain status to certain Heads of Government Departments, because it has been found that in the overall planning of that area, certain officials are needed to plan comprehensively. As you will see from the Bill, Sir, there are five unofficial members at the moment, and whereas in truth and in fact this will be reduced to four, yet the other member will still have his unofficial cognisance. Section 3 of the Principal Act is amended by deleting paragraph (b) and substituting a new paragraph (b) which reads as follows:-

"The Senior Conservation Officer, the Director of Highways and Transport, the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department and the Town and Country Planning Officer; and".

It is also amended by deleting from paragraph (c) of subsection (2) thereof the word "Four".

The remaining amendments to the Bill are contained in Clause 9 and Clause 10. Clause 9 reads as follows:-

"If any owner or occupier of land subject to the Order fails or neglects to carry out any Order or any measures provided by such Order within such reasonable time as the Director of Agriculture shall determine, the Director of Agriculture may subject to the provisions of section 16 of this Act....."

Section 16 is not the appropriate Section. This amendment therefore seeks to correct that error. I do not know if it was inadvertently put in: but in carrying out the terms of the particular Clause, it has been found that instead of Section 16 it should be Section 15.

Again Clause 10 reads as follows:-

"If the Director of Agriculture decides, after consultation with the Board, that for the purpose of carrying into effect any proposal made under section 5 of this Act -

(a) any measure necessary to give effect to the proposal should not be the subject of an Order made under section 6 of this Act; and

(b) such measure is within the public interest, he may, subject to the provisions of section 16 of this Act...."

There again it should be Section 15 and not Section 16; so those are two slight errors which should be amended to give the true meaning of the Act.
1.25 p.m.

I do not think that I should say anything more on this than to say that some work has been done in the area and it is a matter of roads, the removal of houses and many other social questions; and it is thought that with the unofficial members, we should have the members of those Departments who have something to do with this area. It takes a lot of planning; and Government wants everybody, especially the Town and Country Planning Officer, on it, so that from time to time, they would know what has happened instead of calling them in *ad hoc* manner. When you bring them in in *ad hoc* manner, it would mean that their background to the situation would be not so good; therefore, it is thought wise to have a Committee comprised of these Heads of Department. That is all I have to say. If hon. members want to ask questions, they can do so. The other two sections more or less deal with slight typographical matters.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I think the Objects and Reasons of this Bill are quite good. The idea is that such Heads of these Departments should get together and negotiate one with another so that when they are carrying out a construction, they will know what is going on and that will prevent a lot of roads having to be dug up after they have been laid. The Director of Highways and Transport would be in a position to say which side to put the road and all like that. Sometime ago, the Waterworks Department laid a main on Morgan Lewis. When Mr. Collett, the Soil Conservation Officer, came to carry out his work in that area, the land had to be pushed from one place to another; therefore, all the work which was done by the Waterworks Department had to be pushed aside. If the Engineer had known what was in Mr. Collett's mind, that water main would not have been laid down at that time. It would have been laid down after the land had been pushed around. Having these Heads of Departments on this Board is wisdom; therefore, I think the Bill is a good one.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I want in my small way to lend my highest commendations to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture for introducing this Bill. I am most happy to see how these difficulties which have come up in the way of experience are made right now.

I speak of this now because it would be particularly interesting to know that I did make mention of this in two Budget debates. I made mention of it when speaking on the Budget of 1959 and that of 1960. I do know that the Highways and Transport Department and the Waterworks Department were interested in knowing that there was a comprehensive scheme as far as the Soil Conservation unit is concerned. The only way that we could do it is by proper coordinated planning and by having these first hand contacts. Because of that, I would say that this is a shining example of what is meant by planning and coordinating. I think it is highly commendable.

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

On motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 6 were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.
1.35 p.m.

MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) 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 the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a comparatively simple one. It is a Bill in connection with which there is some legal doubt as to whether the vehicles, such as the fork-lift trucks which are to be used solely in the Deep Water Harbour area, would have to be subject to the payment of a licensed tax under the Act. These trucks do not go on the road; they are intended only to be used in the Deep Water Harbour area. In order to make the position quite clear and to exempt them from the payment of this tax, this Bill has been brought down to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act with that object in view. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, although the Deep Water Harbour has been practically finished, I am glad for this

opportunity to ask the Hon. Minister one or two questions. Was there not some agreement that the heavy trucks conveying stuff from the quarry to the Deep Water Harbour should use certain roads? If there was such an agreement, has that agreement been cancelled or changed? Does the Hon. Minister know that these trucks are not using these particular roads, but they are using any roads? Further, I want to draw this to the attention of the Hon. Minister; I should have drawn it to the attention of the Police quite recently, but I believe it would come with better grace as having been drawn to the attention of the Minister. There is a Section in this Act which says that nobody should use a motor vehicle without carrying a silencer on it. The Hon. Minister will be aware that these vehicles are being used without a silencer and they make a lot of unusual noise.

Will the Minister cause these people to keep to the roads which it has been agreed they should use; and, secondly, will he draw to the attention of these people that it will not be in their interest to have these vehicles going through the roads and making this tremendous amount of noise? I would like to know if the hon. member knows about that and what he proposes to do in the circumstances.

As to this Bill, although the Deep Water Harbour is nearly completed, these vehicles have to be used within the area. If they attempt to trespass on the highways, then people are going to be prosecuted for using them on the highways. If they are using an area which has not been declared a highway, then that is all well and good; but if they go outside of the area and they trespass upon a highway, what is the position? How is it when they have to go out of this area for repairs?

The Hon. Minister has said that it was a rather complicated matter for the lawyers, but when you have such a matter it is a paradise for lawyers. If you exempt these vehicles from taxation, then you must make it clear in an Act that you exempt them. What happens, I ask again, when they go out on the highways? What is there to stop the Police from saying that these vehicles are using the highways now and they have not been licensed to do so?

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, although the Minister has said that this Bill deals mainly with the fork-lift type of truck, you have a five-ton truck down there which is going to be used solely within the confines of the Deep Water Harbour area. Are we going to define that area to mean the area which is enclosed or the entire area of land which has been reclaimed or from the market down? You will have to define the area. Is it the Minister's intention to define the area to mean the enclosed area or some larger area? The hon. member, who has just sat down, has suggested that they are going to do repairs on this site and I presume they will be carrying their own spares. If that is the case, they will probably have a shed where they will be carrying out the repairs to their vehicles. However, the point is whether the Minister has in mind what area will be determined as the Port Area. Is it the enclosed area or a larger area?

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, while I am in agreement with this Bill, yet I can see the need for incorporating in it at least two Schedules. In the first place, by so doing a greater measure of assurance will be granted, and it may be that the Objects and Reasons of the Bill may be more strictly adhered to.

1.45 p.m.

What guarantee, for instance, does the Hon. Minister have that these will solely be used at the Deep Water Harbour or as outlined by the hon. member who has already spoken, and whether it is defined strictly how far the Deep Water Harbour area extends? It may be interpreted to mean the access roads, although that would be a very liberal interpretation. In my view, Sir, I think that in the first place there should be a Schedule setting out what vehicles are exempted from the provisions of the Motor Vehicles and Motor Traffic Act, 1937, Schedule 1 should contain the definition of the vehicles and Schedule 2 should set out clearly what is meant by the area of the Deep Water Harbour. If this Bill had two Schedules incorporated, it would be a means of interpreting this Bill more clearly.

Mr. Speaker, I can well see that the object of the Bill is a good one and it will serve a good purpose, but it should be a little clearer by having two Schedules setting out the two points which are most material.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the remarks of the hon. senior member for the City with respect to noisy trucks, I should like to say that there are other trucks besides those belonging to Costain. What I should like to draw to the Minister's attention are these tractors. Only last night one passed my home, and one can imagine how I felt with the gully below pulling and the tractor above pushing and shaking. I am sure that if the drivers of these tractors drove more slowly along the roads, they would not cause as much vibration to the buildings or create so much noise; besides, they have no right putting these things on the Highway at midnight. The hours should be stipulated so that they would not disturb the neighbourhood from its rest, and I hope that the Minister will draw it to the attention of the Police and let them know that these tractor drivers must not exceed the speed limit, even at night. They can do it in the day because everybody is awake; but at night when one is tired, sleepy or sick and these things pass along the road, they can be very annoying. I hope that the Minister will see to that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have heard that those vehicles used by Costain's do not keep to the roads to which they are apportioned. I will bear what the hon. member has said in mind to make inquiries about them; but as far as I know they have not been rerouted. They still have to come along from Bagatelle, travel through Grazettes or through Cave Hill area and down St. Stephens' Hill, through Deacons Road and into the Harbour area. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Therefore they have no right using the Eagle Hall Road.) I do not know, but I will look into the matter. Since the new road has been constructed, maybe the route has been changed, I know that the Director of Highways and Transport did write them along that line, but I will have to enquire into it for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker; I can now tell the authorities, the people who look after these matters, of the complaints that hon. members have made, but I personally have had no letters written to me complaining about the noise that these vehicles keep. I have heard some and they are very noisy, but I will also look into that matter for the hon. member.

The hon. member has said that if these vehicles go off the roads, they would automatically have to pay a tax, but it seems to me reading from the Act that they will be in a similar position to motor vehicles used for tilling the soil. We have vehicles which are used solely for the tillage of the soil which are exempt from taxation, but surely if these vehicles go on the road to be repaired or travel from one estate to another, they are not subject to taxation. Because they go on the road on an occasion does not mean that they are not used solely for the tillage of the soil. The legal term of "use" would mean everyday use; that is how I look at it.

Mr. Speaker, if these vehicles travel on the road to be repaired or move from one plantation to another, that would not make them liable for taxation. Very often we meet tractors and ploughs and so on, but that does not mean that they are being used for something other than the tillage of the soil because when they do they are subject to taxation; so vehicles used in the Harbour would be in the same category.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, would the hon. member say that a tractor pulling five cart loads of canes or moving a house is used solely for the tillage of the soil? I am not pontifically laying down what the law is, but I am asking the hon. member what is his opinion on it, because he opened up by saying that the lawyers were not quite clear on this matter and were trying to remedy the situation now. If they are not quite clear on the situation, I am asking you to say if they have made it abundantly clear to you that when you have amended it this way that they would be free from taxation.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The tractors that haul canes have to carry a licence plate and similarly if they are used for carrying houses, automatically they pay taxes, because they would be on the road for that purpose. If they are on the road simply for repairs or moving from one plantation to another but are used solely for the tillage of the soil, they would not be taxed; but as soon as they carry canes, they are not used for the tillage of the soil, but for some other purpose, and therefore they have to pay taxes and carry a licence plate. All we have done is to add to that section "not only vehicles used for the tillage of the soil, but vehicles used solely within the area of the Deep Water Harbour by any employee as defined in section 2 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960"

1.55 p. m.

If the hon. senior member for Christ Church reads the Act, he will see where that is defined. I do not think there would be any difficulty.

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

On 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. BRYAN in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called separately and passed.

On 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 RATES OF INCOME TAX BILL, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to settle the rates of income tax for the year 1961.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to settle the rates at which income tax is to be assessed and levied in the year of assessment 1961. The rates are the same as those levied last year.

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called separately and passed. The Schedule of the Bill was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

2.00 p.m.

On resumption.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I see that there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: There is an oral reply to Question No. 29, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter but I observe that the hon. member is not in his place.

We will take now the oral reply to question No. 31, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

1. Will the Minister state how Government proposes to finance the Scheme, envisaged in the recent Speech from the Throne, for providing houses for rental by aged and needy persons?

2. Will the Minister further state whether the Capital necessary for housing of middle income groups, is available locally and, if so, from what source or sources, or will it be sought elsewhere?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The replies are as follows:-

(i) A sum not exceeding \$20,000 will be provided annually from the Labour Welfare Fund to meet the cost of the Scheme.

(ii) A system of mortgage is being considered whereby local or foreign capital could be attracted from private sources for lending money for the construction of houses.

Mr. BRANCKER: How many houses does the Minister contemplate providing at a total of \$20,000? as regards those houses, will they be built of timber, concrete or what sort of material? What description and according to what plans will those houses be allocated?

2.30 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: As far as I remember when I introduced the Bill, I gave all of these facts and figures in connection with this scheme. I made mention of twenty-five houses, and the type of prefabricated house which is contemplated is at a cost of approximately that of the type of house which the Housing Authority provides.

Mr. BRANCKER: Does the hon. member appreciate that the number of twenty-five houses must be inadequate having regard to the age of the needy persons who would stand in need of such houses as this scheme is proposed to finance? The number of twenty-five houses is manifestly inadequate. Does the hon. member disagree with my suggestion that this number is inadequate?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I think the hon. member will appreciate that this is only the beginning of a scheme. Since we cannot do all at one time and we do not have the resources financially or otherwise to perform such a task, we will have to do it gradually over a period of years. Within the limit of our resources, twenty-five houses is the most which we can provide.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question ready to be dealt with stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. I observe that the hon. member is not in his place.

The reply to Oral Question No. 30, asked by the same hon. member, is ready to be dealt with. Again, I observe that the hon. member is not in his place.

The next question ready to be dealt with is question No. 21, also standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. Again, I observe that the hon. member is not in his place. I should like to say that unless some other hon. member asks, on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, that the debate be deferred, the question will lapse.

Mr. BRANCKER: In thanking Your Honour for your reminder, may I ask that this question be allowed to stand over until the hon. senior member for St. Lucy is in his place? And may I also make a similar request on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Peter who has been granted leave?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business. Under Private Members' Business, Orders Nos. 1 to 18.

RESOLUTION re INVESTIGATION INTO THE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN BARBADOS

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 15 be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is therefore to resume debate on the following Resolution:- Resolution relative to an exhaustive investigation into all phases of the Sugar Industry in Barbados by the Sugar Enquiry Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr. Carl Goldenberg. On the last occasion when this Resolution was being debated, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew was speaking.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I really think that it would be necessary to bring down a Commissioner to go into the Sugar Industry, in all its phases, in order that these people who work in the Industry, even those who are connected with the Deep Water Harbour, should receive the benefit. Some of these people who will not be any longer employed in the Sugar Industry, have worked in the industry for many years and now they have to give up their job and seek some other calling. I think that if we were to bring down a Commissioner to go into all these phases of the Sugar Industry, he would be able to make proper recommendations for each and every one. As far as I have seen, there are many people who will be out of employment.

I have heard that there is a Resolution for \$1 3/4 million coming down to this House for the purpose of distribution among those who were employed in the Sugar Industry. I want the Government to realise that the money should be distributed not only among those who were working around the wharf, but also among those who were working on the trucks at the various estates. All of these people should get the benefit of this distribution which will be of assistance to them in time to come. The estate and factory owners have already said that they are not the people who have built the Deep Water Harbour; they have said that it is the Government who has built the Harbour and therefore their hands are clean and they are not going to pay one penny to anybody. They are saying that it is the new system which has caused these workers to be laid off. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, a great hardship will be created on these people throughout the island.

2.45 p.m.

I would like to see some preparation made to give those sugar workers who have been laid off some gratuity or pension. You have taken \$4.80 out of the Labour Welfare Fund and put aside for the benefit of the workers in the sugar industry. If that \$4.80 were not deducted each and every man would get a little more on his salary; but this is taken out for cases of emergency; to build houses and to help them when they retire from work. When a man retires from the sugar industry, he should receive a certain

amount of money as gratuity because he has come to an old age and cannot go any more. It hurts me to see men and women who work for 40 or 60 years in the sugar industry only get \$1.80 per week when they retire at 70 years, when so many millions of dollars have been taken out of the sugar industry and put aside for them. That money instead is distributed in many directions, whereas the poor man who has worked so hard heading, cutting and bringing canes to the factory still gets \$1.80.

Mr. Speaker, the Deep Water Harbour is almost completed and there are hundreds of men and women who will be laid off. I do not know how the Government is going to distribute the money I see in the newspaper among them but I am asking them to consider from the biggest to the smallest. They should find out from the factories, and from the bond houses how many have been laid off, how many lightermen and those who worked in the shippings, loading and unloading sugar, and each should receive either a pension or gratuity which would be of some help to these poor people.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has set aside for the Rehabilitation Fund. The factory owners have taken their money and spent it to enlarge factories and to buy things which the factories need. There are people who did not work in the sugar industry but who are receiving part of that money. If I were in Government I would set up a Social Security Scheme and take a certain percentage of the money worked for by every man and woman each week or month, so that when that man or woman gets to old age, they would not be a pest about the streets. I understand that such a scheme operates in the United States, Great Britain and Canada. I am sure that if such a scheme existed here, poor people would not receive \$1.80 a week. The people have sent us here to put our opinions to the Government whether or not they are accepted. If we want to remove poverty from our doors, such a scheme should be instituted.

In the Resolution which the hon. member has tabled, he is asking that Mr. Goldenberg be asked to investigate the sugar industry in all its phases, and I trust that if he comes to this island he will do what is just. I hope too that the time will come when we will not have to send out for a Commissioner to go into such affairs, but we would be able to look after the interests of the poor ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, there is also a lot of money in the Price Stabilisation Fund. What is the use of keeping all that money? Such money should not be taken to build the Deep Water Harbour, but should be circulated among poor people. If we are taking money from them, we must put it to good uses so that they can receive the benefits, because they are unable to take care of themselves. They have chosen us to look after their welfare, and if we fail to do our duty, they will perish.

2.55 p.m.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I have seen that myself. I have seen with my own eyes houses built in my district out of the same money and the poor people were unable to meet the rent and those houses are now shut up and the poor people are outside of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage, I must tell the hon. member that the Resolution with which we are dealing is relative to an exhaustive investigation into all phases of the sugar industry in Barbados by the Sugar Enquiry Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr. Carl Goldenberg. I think the hon. member is really not discussing this matter now. He is talking of national insurance and housing.

Mr. CORBIN: I will get back to the point. There are many people whom I have seen waiting for the benefits from the sugar industry. They are out of work and I hope that Government will speed up as fast as possible and grant them some benefit so as to relieve their suffering conditions. I hope that they will be relieved from their situation. Some of them told me that they are not working and things are hard with them. I have told them to wait because I believe that Government is trying to help them. But they say that while the grass is growing the horse is starving.

We now have to pray that He who is good will keep us all alive. A man told me that he was employed in the sugar industry for 45 years and now he has been laid off. I am asking Government to speed up with that Resolution. Try to have the money distributed so that those poor people will get something to keep them from suffering. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the time will come when it would be better for the people of this island, because I understand that the Deep Water Harbour when it is in full operation would be able to save more money in the merchants' pockets. I hope Mr. Goldenberg would soon be here to take up this matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was looking around to see if any other hon. member is desirous of speaking on this Resolution. I take it that since your offer has not been accepted that I can now make a reply.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on point of order. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture, under whose portfolio this subject falls, is desirous of making a contribution to this matter.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I thought other hon. members would have taken part in this debate and that it would not have ended so abruptly, so much so that some of the notes which I have made on this matter, I do not have them with me now. However, be that as it may, I can still make a contribution although it may be small.

In the first place, this Resolution is relative to an exhaustive investigation into all phases of the sugar industry in Barbados, by the Sugar Enquiry Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr. Carl Goldenberg. Who is he? What has he done? What strike has taken place? What are the Unionist doing in Barbados? Workers all over the island are paying their dues into the funds of the Union. Is not the Union working on their behalf? What is all this now? Has something gone wrong of which we know nothing? The Secretary-General of the Union says that he recommended this and that for the workers. Apparently, the Secretary-General has not been doing his job because someone has taken it away and I see here that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is saying that he wants Mr. Carl Goldenberg to come down here because something is wrong in the sugar industry. He says: "Let me bring him down and ask the House to support him." This is what he states in the Resolution:

"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 takes 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 the cane farmers, to undertake a most exhaustive investigation into all phases of the sugar industry in Barbados."

Well, Sir, I am happy to say that only a week ago I happened to be in Jamaica and I can tell you now that they want twelve Mr. Goldenbergs up there.
3.05 p.m.

Everything is wrong in Jamaica, especially in the same sugar industry to which the hon. members refers. It is absolutely foolish for people to get in this small island and attempt to fool other people about what is happening in Jamaica, when in truth and in fact, things are so remote there that you cannot make any comparison. I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that inch by inch, square mile for square mile, we lead Jamaica and all the rest. I am a proud Barbadian, I am no sycophant who would exchange Barbados for somebody else. I am proud of every Barbadian; I want to tell you that when you make these comparisons you must not let people look at Kingston; and as to the seventy miles where I went - ha, ha, you are making fun! Goldenberg, Goldenberg, you are making sport! (Laughter)

Mr. SPEAKER: I take the hon. member very seriously.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am very serious. I took the time out in order to make enquiries, to investigate and see things for myself during the days when I was in Jamaica. I had no social life; all my time was spent in getting information so as to be able to make a comparison. (Mr. CRAWFORD: You went at Government's expense.) You went at my expense; you are making sport. (Mr. CRAWFORD: You must have been drinking.) We recently had Mr. Mc.Kenzie and now the hon. member is asking for Mr. Goldenberg. I, personally, do not see eye to eye with everything that Mr. Mc.Kenzie has done; nevertheless, it is an improvement on what we had before. Quite recently I was asked by the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour to sit in at discussions with the Trade Union, and the Secretary of the Union was very mindful to call to the Minister's attention certain recommendations which were made by Mr. Mc.Kenzie. He certainly used the proposals made by Mr. Mc.Kenzie as a basis for his negotiations with us, so that they must have some merit as far as the Union in Barbados is concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. May I remind the House that the hon. senior member for St. Peter took no fewer than three occasions during Private Members' Business to criticise most adversely the Mc. Kenzie Report.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I have nothing to say about that; that is true. But when he came to negotiate with us, he used certain things which Mr. Mc.Kenzie used as a basis for his negotiations. That is a matter of fact. When he negotiated certain things like severance pay, provident fund and so on, he agreed with Mr. Mc.Kenzie. The General Secretary of the Union was against the setting up of a one-man Commission; he said that he thought there should be a three-man Commission and he also thought that the matter should be publicly aired; but certain recommendations made by Mr. Mc.Kenzie he took as a basis for his negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I did not know that this debate would have been sprung on us today and therefore there are certain things which I have not got with me. Mr. Mc.Kenzie has taken time to show you some of the weakness and the strength of the industry. You cannot expect to agree with everything one man says; at times, however, it is just a weakness you may have and in the report there may be a tower of strength. You can say what you like; the sugar industry in Barbados today is our mainstay. It has been for a long time and, as I see it, it will be so for a long time to come. We should have this industry in such a manner that the workers and the people who are in it will share the benefits. If you will just allow me to digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I will give you an experience which I had only last week. I remember when I was a member of the now defunct Congress Party, that we spoke occasionally of introducing a proportionate profit-sharing proposal in Barbados where agriculture is concerned. I took the opportunity last week to visit the Secretary of Agriculture in Puerto Rico where this matter was very much spoken of. All that literature I have in my possession, and I would like to read it to the House. I had a very long interview with the Secretary of Agriculture in Puerto Rico, who would be the equivalent to my Permanent Secretary here, on this matter. It has nothing to offer as far as Barbados is concerned. I went there in high spirits and I thought that I would have been able to bring back something which I could introduce in Barbados. I thought, as some other hon. members thought, that people were being robbed and that if we could introduce this proportionate profit-sharing scheme in Barbados, we might be able to do something for the workers generally, and perhaps it would be as an incentive to the workers. I want this House to believe me when I say that I was never so much depressed in my life as when I heard the story told of that particular scheme. At the moment when the Secretary was relating the story to me, if a photographer had taken a picture of me and you were to see it you would realise that I was most depressed. It was just that the Secretary was giving the facts of the particular scheme and how much it had cost the Government; that is the most recent thing I have had. Therefore, when people are making statements they should make statements which have a modicum of truth or fact

in them. Nobody is saying that we do not want to know more of the working of the sugar industry; as a matter of fact, I want to know more of it. I ought to say that attempts are being made for us to have a sugar economist to be attached to my Department. I do not want everybody to have the facts of the sugar industry and then we do not know anything about the industry. We must have an agricultural economist so that he can tell me what to do and when to do it.
3.15 p.m.

We are not lazy in that particular aspect of things, but what I want to say is this: this Mr. Goldenberg as sponsored by the hon. senior member for St. Philip has Jamaica in a mess, and we do not want any mess down here. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that even if Jamaica has lost any money in sugar, she has got her bauxite now which can redeem her....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I think that the hon. member who is now speaking occupies an important position in agriculture in the country, and it is not good for him to say that Goldenberg has Jamaica in a mess. Nobody should make a remark like that. I think that the hon. member should be able to quote some facts to demonstrate.....

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Oh, no? My interpretation and yours is apparently different.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: And will always be.

PRESENTATION OF REPLY TO GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

At this stage, 3 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER received a Message by the Sergeant-at-Arms that the Excellency the Governor was awaiting the House in the Council Chamber to present their Address in reply to the Speech which he delivered at the opening at the Legislative Session.

Mr. SPEAKER and the House, preceded by the Marshal bearing the Mace, proceeded to the Council Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER read and presented to His Excellency the following Address which was passed by the House in reply to his Speech.

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly desire to thank Your Excellency for the Speech delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature for the Legislature Session, 1961.

The House note with satisfaction the financial stability and economic advancement of the Island and the many Constitutional changes and other matters referred to in Your Excellency's Address and beg to assure Your Excellency that all these and other matters submitted to them will be given their careful consideration and support, during the Session.

His Excellency delivered a Rejoinder.

Mr. SPEAKER and the House returned to the Assembly Chamber.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion, when it pleased His Excellency to receive this Honourable House in the Council Chamber, and we delivered our Reply to his Speech at the opening of the Legislative Session, His Excellency was pleased to make the following Rejoinder.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

I thank you for your respective Addresses in reply to the Speech which I delivered on the occasion of the opening of the Legislature in January, 1961 and for your assurance that all matters submitted to you will be given your earnest consideration.

(sgd.) J. M. STOW,
GOVERNOR.

21st March, 1961.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday 30th March, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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