

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st August, 1962.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*) and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meetings held on 21st, 27th and 29th March, 10th and 24th April and 2nd May, of this year, have all been circulated and unless there be any objection, they will be confirmed.

There being apparently no objection, each of these Minutes is confirmed.

AMENDMENT FROM OTHER PLACE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Other Chamber an amendment to the Pensions (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1962, and these amendments to this Bill have been returned to this Honourable Chamber for further consideration.

DOCUMENTS

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay:

The draft Supplementary Agreement between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and Esso Standard Oil, S.A., Ltd. relating to the lease of land at the Bridgetown Harbour.

Also, Plan showing areas of land at the Bridgetown Harbour to be leased by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to Esso Standard Oil, S.A. Ltd.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to Esso Standard Oil S.A. Ltd of those two parcels of land, part of the Deep Water Harbour and described in the Schedule to this Resolution for the operation of the bunkering facilities in the new harbour.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier:

A Bill further to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:—

WHEREAS small business men find it difficult to raise the required amount of capital to carry on with their business;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government establish a Small Industries Loan Board under the direction of the Ministry of Trade & Industry for the purpose of financing small businesses especially those of a Manufacturing nature, and including Artisans, Cabinet-makers, Upholsterers and other trades.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that there are a great number of applications made to the Waterworks Department for the installation of Water Services for as long as two years ago or longer, which have not been met due to insufficient plumbers to do the job?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government increase the number of plumbers with the object of relieving this unsatisfactory state of affairs?

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that employees with four or more children to support in the parish of St. Thomas who once worked with the Department of Highways and Transport have been laid off for quite a long period and that other persons have been put in their places?

2. If the answer to the above is in the negative, will the Minister carry out an investigation with a view to remedying same and with a view to ensuring that consideration be given to employees with families, in an attempt to stimulate harmony in this Department, and to avert a serious crisis from developing?

Also, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the Hon. Michael Starr, Canada's Minister of Labour is quoted in Jamaica as saying that there is a growing demand in Canada for skilled labour and skilled workers from the West Indies?

2. Is Government aware that there are 437 vocational schools established in Canada that are graduating 13,000

students annually and workers from Barbados should find no difficulty in being absorbed amongst the said workers?

3. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, would the Minister immediately set about negotiating with the Government of Canada with a view to recruiting workers from these shores since the Immigration Laws of Canada are non-discriminatory?

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the same hon. member propose to ask any other question today?

Mr. BATSON: No, Mr. Speaker.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to change the name of the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh Day Adventists to the Eastern Caribbean Conference of Seventh Day Adventists has completed its labours, but certain formalities have not been complied with, that is, the signature of the Chairman has not yet been attached to the Report, and I think it is because the hon. senior member for the City, who is the Chairman, is not in his place; so we will have to wait until later in the day for that formality to be completed and the Report to be laid.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill further to amend the Local Government Act, 1958, was read a first time.

Mr. M. E. S. HEWITT TO ACT AS DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. M. E. S. Hewitt, Solicitor, be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today's sitting of the House.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

12.25 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Honourable Minister of Education who, I observe, is not in his place; but perhaps another hon. member may ask the leave of the House to take charge of this Order. This Order is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with this Order, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to take charge of this Order and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted. *(After a Pause)*. Apparently, there is no objection and leave is granted.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: 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. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1962-63 No. 16

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$2,706 under three Heads of the Estimates, which Heads will be taken separately.

HEAD 18 — POLICE

Head 18 — Police — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 18 stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.
The question that Head 18 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 36 — MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

(5) SCHOOLS

Head 36 — Ministry of Education (5) Schools — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 36 stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the passing of this Head, but I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister and the Government as a whole that, in our community, I feel that the time has come when greater use should be made of the school buildings; and instead of increasing the cost of the community by, it may be, providing aspects of community comforts, some of these schools could be used. I understand that the policy of the Government is to charge people the insurance rates and make it obligatory for them to meet the cost of the insurance for a night when such people have to use these buildings. That makes it prohibitive for some organisations because some of them are non-profit organizations. I know of an organization with which I have to deal, it is not a question of a Government building, and we give the use of the building to persons on the net additional charge. The insurance people do not tell us that, as a condition of our insurance policy, we should not allow any person to keep a meeting, for instance, in the building. I understand that there have been some restrictive classes. Some of the fees are nominal and, in some cases, it is not dependent upon the purpose for which you want the use of the building. It may be that you are not making any money, but you will make it a condition to tell people that the only way in which they can use the building is if they are paying the relative insurance cost. I hope that the Government will investigate that matter so that we can get some of these buildings used for some of the voluntary institutions which have no buildings of their own, but which have to use other buildings. I think that that would be a step in the right direction.

The question that Head 36 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 45 — LABOUR

Head 45 — Labour — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 45 stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: In connection with this Head which deals with cane-weighing inspection, I am not making any complaints; I am merely drawing to the attention of the authorities that they should inform the inspectors of the whole purpose of their job. I have been dealing with this matter from its inception and I usually get complaints, some of which I ignore. Some workers complain that these inspectors grow a little too friendly with the authorities — with the cane weighers and people of the factory — and there is an element of suspicion at the factories that if anything goes wrong these inspectors would not institute the type of investigation they would like. I do not subscribe to that suspicious attitude, but all I am asking is that the Minister should see that the inspectors are made to go back to the original thinking that the whole purpose of having inspectors doing this job was to instil confidence among the workers, and that was the job which these inspectors were given. I do not want the inspectors to regard their job as a sine-cure and I do not suspect that they are insincere. All I am asking is that the inspectors should remember that it is

a public service which they are performing and they must perform it without fear or favour: and if they have to give a decision I am sure that everybody will respect them. I do not want to cast any reflection on any of these inspectors. All I am saying is that a note of warning is good so that the inspectors will feel that they are doing a service with which people will be satisfied, and that it is in the interest of the community. Some complaints do come to me; I am not a suspicious character and I do not run off with these complaints on the ground that these people are not performing their duties as they should perform them.
12.35 p.m.

I just draw that to the attention of the Government so that they would see that this service gives the up-to-date service that is expected from it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this is manifestly not an easy matter. It is a question of interpreting accurately what is involved in the expression of being too friendly with the factory people. When a man goes into a factory yard to perform a duty like this, he is not expected to go scowling at the factory manager or at the man who operates the scales. He has to go with a certain charm of manner, and he has to be polite and courteous to the factory owner, to his employees, and, of course, to the people who send their canes to be weighed. The main purpose of these inspectors, so far as I recollect, is to check the weighing of canes at factories, and to investigate any dispute that might arise out of the cutting or weighing of canes either from estates or from peasants, and in order to do this, inspectors visit factories as well as estates supplying canes and make weekly reports to the Labour Commissioner. They are also supposed to keep a diary showing the factories and/or estates visited each day, and containing brief reports of any dispute they may have had to investigate or any unusual conditions they may discover at a factory or estate.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any complaint on the part of an estate or supplier of canes, peasant proprietor or labourers, it would be, I presume, not on the ground that the inspector had a smile on his face when he spoke with the manager; it would be on the basis of whether or not the supplier of canes felt that the weight was accurate. If the complainants who approached the hon. senior member for St. Peter on this score could supply information which might lead to the view that cane suppliers are being robbed at the scales or anything like that, we should have to take this matter up immediately; but in his capacity as negotiator on behalf of the workers in his organisation, he himself knows that because he is on the opposite side of the fence to the employers, it does not mean, in a conference to negotiate wages or conditions of work, that he is not supposed to have a smile on his face at any time, or not to work on the basis of having, as far as is possible, some sort of courtesy and harmonious relationship between himself and both opposing factions. The fact that he may have a smile with the employer does not mean he is not going to give an appropriate record of the complaints of the people he is supposed to represent. It is merely a question that a person with his normal charm of manner would find it difficult not to appear gracious even in the midst of the most bitter dispute between his organization and the employers' representative.

May I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Government might have more to act on if the complaints with respect to these inspectors were made on the basis of not discharging the duties for which they were appointed in a proper manner more than on the assertion that they appear to be too gracious in dealing with the employers? The assumption is there that if a man appears to be over-friendly with the factory owner or cane weigher, the person who is sending canes may be suspicious that he is not discharging his duties effectively; but I prefer to investigate a complaint that there was suspicion with regard to non-accurate weights or something like that than to have to investigate one that cane-weighing inspectors should wipe all smiles from their faces and appear like Gestapo agents when they enter a factory yard, merely because they happen to be cane-weighing inspectors.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I tried to make my attitude clear on the matter. I think I made it clear that so far as my own inclination is concerned, I am not a suspicious character; so whether or not a man has a smile on his face does not affect me in assessing a person in the performance of his duty. I would say, however, that this is a matter in which inspectors were appointed to instil confidence in the persons concerned, because as you will very well understand, Mr. Chairman, prior to the workers being paid by the ton for canes, you did not have inspectors; so it was not really a task that was instituted to satisfy the workers, because the workers in the old days went by the simple method of being paid by the hole for which you did not need any check. This has now been done as a check, and so far as I am concerned, I do not have any doubts in my mind about the inspectors or cane weighers in a general way. In a specific way you may get any of these failures in human nature taking place, but I have sufficient confidence generally in people, that the point of not having a cane weigher would not in any way affect the general situation, though I would not be the one to advocate removing them, since you have had a good spirit of relationship between them. It is necessary to check to keep going; but I made mention of what has been reported to me in a general way, because it is good that when people make complaints about them in a general way without specifying, it does not do the person concerned any harm to know that some of these general complaints have been made by the persons for whom they were sent to work. These general complaints were made by some of the workers in a general way and not in a specific way.
12.45 p.m.

I agree with the hon. member. If it were drawn to me in a specific way, I would be the first person to raise the matter and draw it to the attention of the public. It is not any reflection on the cane weighing inspectors at all. All it means is that the inspectors — if it does not mean any more than this — are being watched by the workers for being a bit too friendly — and Mr. Chairman, you know what being friendly in its local colloquial sense means. Sometimes it means that you can be a bit too friendly for what some people like, but it is not any reflection on the character of the inspectors generally.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I am not suspicious of them either, nor do I think anybody is. All I have understood is that they do not spend sufficient time at a factory. Now, there are around nineteen factories operating and there are about six inspectors. An inspector can only be responsible for the weights of canes which have been weighed in his presence. When one inspector may have to visit three or four factories a day, it means that when he visits No. 1 factory, anything can happen to No. 2 before he gets there, and when he gets to No. 2 factory, anything can happen to No. 1 after he has left. Therefore, Sir, I do not feel that the doubts can be created by the absence as far as the inspector is concerned, because he is only one person and he can only visit one factory at a particular time. If anyone wants to do something funny, he has all the chance to do it in the absence of the inspector; therefore, the purpose which we are aiming at, we are not out for the moment to give the service 100% satisfaction. It may be a question of cost; but until you can see your way, financially or otherwise, to appoint an inspector to each factory so that he would be there from the time the factory begins operating or from the time cane weighing begins on a day until it ends, that will be the only way that one could believe that one gets justice being done to one.

If there are nineteen sugar factories and you have six cane weighing inspectors, it means that an inspector will have to visit at least three factories. The distance between one factory and another which he has to visit may be in some cases eight or nine miles, perhaps ten miles. You do not know what can happen during the time that inspectors are going from one factory to another.

We are not carrying out our aims and objects fully until we consider appointing cane weighing inspectors to each factory. I have understood some years ago that a par-

particular cane weigher at a factory lost his job by doing funny things. You do not have to do those funny things when a cane weighing inspector is on the spot. You only have to wait until his motor car number disappears out of the yard; then you have all the chance to do your funny things.

There is something which happens at factories. You bring in a load of canes on your lorry and there is a lot of traffic in front of you. At the same time the cane inspector will have to leave that factory and go to another. In other words, when a cane weigher cannot relieve the traffic too quickly, you have to wait until one load of canes is unloaded and then another, and when you get a big blockage at one of these big factories, you will have to wait practically the whole of a day so as to get your load of canes weighed. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am now complaining to the Government for this state of affairs and am asking them to go into it and see what can be done along these lines.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. senior member for St. Peter was casting any aspersions or anything of the sort at the cane weighers, the cane weighing inspectors of anyone else. What he meant to say was that when a cane weighing inspector appears on a premises to do his duty, he should do it in his official capacity, and if he is friendly with a cane weigher at his home, he must remember that when he is on his duty he should not adopt the same friendly attitude. That is commonsense because the people to whom he had to give satisfaction, such as the peasant and the cane cutter, can be very suspicious if they feel that there is too much friendliness between the cane weigher and the inspector. There must be some doubt arising in his mind if he sees too much friendliness and I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter was quite right in raising that question.

As regards what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, he thinks that a cane weighing inspector must be present at every load of canes being weighed. I do not think that is what is intended here at all. Do you mean to say that you must have a Food Inspector for every shop in the Island and when that Food Inspector turns up that you run and change the price? That is not their job at all. Cane weighing inspectors are to go around inspecting and by their experience, they are more accurate than you may think. They can tell how many tons of canes are on that lorry from experience.

Do not let us drift too far and accuse everybody. I think the sugar industry has had enough thrown at it already and I do not think the cane weighers who are appointed by the factory owners are put there to rob anybody. No factory owner goes and weighs cane; he pays a cane weigher to do the job and I do not think any factory owner would suggest to his weighers to rob anyone. That would not be fair.

There are nineteen sugar factories and they are large. I do not think what the hon. member is complaining about has taken place in Barbados in recent years. Let us keep this debate on a higher level and let us give justice to those people who are operating the sugar industry. Let us feel that they are doing a reasonably good job. However, that does not mean that we must not be vigilant. I commend the hon. senior member for St. Peter for bringing to the attention of the Government complaints which he has regarding the friendly attitude of cane weighing inspectors when they are on duty. They should be beyond suspicion when they are on duty; therefore they must adopt the attitude of showing that they are giving fairness to all.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the last hon. member who spoke misunderstood me. I am not accusing anyone for doing anything dishonest, but I would like to know what was the purpose of the Government appointing inspectors at all. If everything was going well relative to cane weighing, and so on, what caused the Government at that time to appoint inspectors? I ask that because I cannot see it otherwise, nor do I think the Government did it in order to find a job for a few persons.

Sir, I quoted a case.
12.55 p.m.

As I said, a particular cane-weigher lost his job through this very thing. I know of another plantation which has a scalebeam in the yard and weighs every load of canes before it goes to the factory. What causes the owner of that plantation to go out of his way to put down a scalebeam so as to weigh these canes? The peasant is not in a position, financially speaking, to be able to put down a scalebeam for the purpose of weighing his canes. I heard that one load of canes was weighed at a particular plantation and when it got to the particular factory it weighed less, but the lorry driver was instructed that if he did not get a ticket to the effect of the amount which the load of canes had weighed at the plantation, he should turn back with the canes. He did so. The manager of the factory called on the cane weigher to have the canes re-weighed and it was found that somebody had made a mistake. The hon. member can tell you everything which happens in Bridgetown, but he may not know everything which happens in the country. I live in the country. The mere fact that the Government saw fit to appoint these inspectors at the time showed that somebody was dissatisfied. I said at the time that we cannot appoint an inspector to each factory because there were quite a number of factories then, but some of these factories were going out of existence. I understand that another factory is also going out of existence.

However, Sir, since the factories are amalgamated you stand a good chance now to appoint one inspector at each factory. I do not have any canes to send anywhere so as to cause me to have any doubt, but you cannot prevent your ears from hearing things. As a politician, you should be on the listening spot, whether what you hear is right or wrong.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt about it that when it was first decided to appoint these cane-weighing inspectors, there was justification for that move. After the riots of 1937, the evidence before the Royal Commission, which investigated these disturbances, showed that there was considerable ground for complaint on the part especially of the small suppliers of canes with regard to the accuracy in the weighing of their canes. In a year or two after that, the Act was passed for the supervision of the weighing of canes at factories, and the responsibility in those days for supervising the factory scales rested on the Police. Then in 1951 the Police were no longer able to carry out that responsibility and these cane-weighing inspectors were appointed. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was a member of this House of Assembly then. There has been a decrease, numerically speaking, in the number of factories operating in the island since then, but never have I heard the hon. member suggest on any previous occasion that the Government should appoint an inspector for each factory. The hon. member says that he no longer sends canes to the factories himself and I do not know what could have happened within recent times to make him think that each factory should have an inspector when, for all the previous eleven years, this matter never occurred to him. At least it would take two inspectors to a factory. You could not expect one inspector to be at a factory from 6 o'clock a.m., when the factory starts, until all hours of the night, when the factory continues to operate. As a matter of fact, if the factories operate for 24 hours you need three inspectors to be on guard during the course of operation. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph would be the last person to suggest that one inspector should work for more than eight hours a day, and if the factories are working for 24 hours a day, you would require three inspectors at each factory. You would therefore need about 57 inspectors for 19 factories which would cost the Government about \$90,000 a year. It is extremely thoughtful of the hon. member to suggest that this Government could afford to spend \$90,000 a year on cane-weighing inspectors when the previous Government never saw fit to spend more than \$9,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I am not at all suggesting that either \$9,000 or \$90,000 would not constitute justifiable expenditure like this if the circumstances warranted it. If we had to spend a million dollars in this direction to make

sure that the small cane-growers got their just due from the factories, that would be justifiable expenditure. It is, however, strange that suddenly in 1962 it should be considered necessary for us to undergo expenditure to the tune of \$90,000 a year when, up to now, we are only spending \$9,000 on these inspectors. There has been evidence in the past — there has been well documented evidence — in which there have been errors in the weighing of canes sent to the factories and invariably those errors were in favour of the factories. That is why, Mr. Chairman, we maintain this inspectorate and that is why every single step is taken to ensure that these inspectors do their job thoroughly. In fact, all inspectors are given instructions to pay surprise visits to factories and syrup factories, and on each visit they are to recall one load of canes to be reweighed so as to ensure that accuracy is maintained. In other words, an inspector is supposed to have reweighed a load of canes which has been weighed some time during the day. While everybody will concede that there is the likelihood of errors being committed, yet it is hardly justifiable to expect that we should expend \$90,000 a year when for all the years the hon. member did not see, or he was content to see the sum of \$9,000 being spent on these inspectors and never said any word as to the insufficiency of the number of inspectors or that the number of inspectors should be increased. You cannot expect these 19 inspectors to work for more than eight hours a day and the Government is prepared to consider taking this suggested step provided that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph or anybody else can convince us that the gravity of the situation and the dishonesty in the current operation make this step necessary.

1.05 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the hon. member knows about the operation of a factory at all, but he is saying that one inspector has to work for twenty-four hours, and if he knew how a factory works, he would not have said so. Some factories start at 7.30 a.m. or 8 a.m. and close between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. No factory weighs canes for twenty-four hours, nor do you get a factory receiving canes all through the night, though the factory itself works through the night; but in order for the hon. member to try to make himself believe that he is saying something, he gets up and says that. You go into some factory yards and see canes on the tractors not weighed because they were not on time, and in order to be weighed first thing in the morning, they are left in the yard.

The hon. member also said that the inspector can call back a load or two of canes which have already been weighed so as to prove the weight, but he has me thinking, because I know that as soon as a lorry or cart is weighed on the weighing bridge, the canes go on to the hoist. You do not get lorries lining up after they have been weighed; you get them lining up before they are weighed; so I do not know how an inspector would be able to recall that load of canes which has already been lifted by the hoist and put on the carrier. I am telling the Minister now that I do not believe what he says.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely immaterial whether he believes what I say or not, but what I have said, I repeat. If these suggestions are impracticable and impossible, tell him to ask the Minister of his Government who instituted them. I repeat, Sir, that this is one of the instructions given to the cane weighers and one of the terms of their appointment. We did not appoint them; so if the suggestion is that it is impracticable, the people who instituted it were the people who were stupid enough to do it. This is what I have seen in the files and I have read from the files.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I always have to say to the members on the other side that they are always saying that the last Government did this and the last Government did that. If the last Government were Almighty, they would not be holding the Government now.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, nobody is saying that they were Almighty. All we are saying is that the Supervision of the Weighing of Canes Act was

amended in 1951 to appoint these six inspectors, and the terms of their appointment included this particular provision. In other words, when a man was appointed, he was sent a list of his duties, and this particular section reads as follows:-

"You will be required to pay frequent visits to sugar factories and syrup plants, and on each visit to recall at least one load which has been weighed already for reweighing to ensure that accuracy of weighing is maintained throughout the day."

That is one of the terms of their appointment.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you would have to put something in the appointment, but when you know that an inspector is going to call back a load of canes to be reweighed, I want the hon. member to understand that an inspector will never be able to arrive on the spot and find a lorry waiting to be unloaded. He will find some waiting to be weighed, and I would therefore like to know how he is going to call back lorries that have already been weighed, because as soon as they are weighed the canes are taken off by the hoist and taken to the carrier. I remember saying when these six inspectors were appointed that they were not sufficient, and that there should be more or none at all. I do not know if the hon. member was in the House at the time, but if he was, and can remember it, he would twist it in such a way as to make it appear as though I did not say anything. I remember saying on the floor of this House that more inspectors should have been appointed, because the six which were appointed could not do the job well in those days because there were a lot more factories than now. Up to now the hon. member has not said the reasons why the last Government had to appoint these inspectors. What is the good of having six inspectors and nineteen factories when an inspector has to visit three factories, and after spending two hours at one factory, he has to leave and go to the others? If people want to be funny, they can be funny during his absence; so we are doing very little. If you are up against this thing and want to catch somebody doing wrong, how are you going to catch him? It is just like a detective looking for a prisoner at his house until he comes back, but leaves and goes back to the station. All the prisoner has to do is to peep through a hole to see when the detective leaves, and then go somewhere else. You would have to be on the spot all the time if you want to effect these things.

The hon. member is always talking about the last Government, and it makes me believe that they are sorry the last Government is out. You only harp on somebody you love, not somebody you hate. You do not want to see or hear a person you hate, and all the time they make themselves look ridiculous by referring to the last Government. If the last Government did something wrong, they are going along and doing the same thing. I want the hon. member to think of what I have just said and find out if it is possible that what I have said could be true. If he is going along in the same trend as the last Government, he can do that.

1.15 p.m.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph does not really understand. I realise that he understands that this is age grouping and he has been moved from second standard to seventh standard and that is the only reason why he gets up on every occasion and wastes the time of this Legislature.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I object to the hon. member saying that I am wasting the time of this Legislature. What time am I wasting? Does he mean wasting his time?

Mr. YEARWOOD: What I want the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to understand is that what the Minister said about inspectors visiting sugar factories is perfectly true. At times the inspector goes and finds eighteen and nineteen cane carts already weighed in and he has to call two or three of them back on the weighbridge to see if the weight was perfectly correct. That is the only way you will find out if the cane weigher has given the correct weight or

not. The hon. member knows absolutely nothing about a factory and that is why he gets up and talks nonsense.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I object to that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph speaking on?

Mr. SMITH: I said on a point of order. I object to the hon. member saying that I am talking nonsense. The hon. member is a shopkeeper and he sat there and heard the Hon. Premier accuse shopkeepers of giving wrong weights and he did not even rise to defend his own shop. That makes me to feel that he is doing what the Hon. Premier said that shopkeepers were doing.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rose and made what I considered an intelligent point and it was not meant to degenerate in this type of argument which we are now getting. I was quite satisfied with the explanation given by the Hon. Minister and the point raised by the hon. junior member for Christ Church. It is a pity that it has degenerated to this because it gives the wrong impression. It is degenerating into slander: but it was not my intention to slander the inspectors, the cane weighers or the factory owners. It was raised purely with the intention of stating that some of the workers were talking about the friendliness which they saw existing between the inspectors and the cane weighers, and the workers saying that they did not like it. I do not want the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to prolong this debate. He was castigating the Minister on the wrong line by saying that the Minister did not know what he was talking about. The inspectors have been given the authority to order cane carts to be reweighed after they have already been weighed. They were given that authority. The hon. member said that it was not true. I know more about it than anybody else in this Chamber. After canes have been weighed at factories, the inspector can call them back and have them weighed. That is why I say that we are making too many exaggerations. The hon. member was exaggerating the point by saying that it is no use revisiting a factory because after the canes have left the weighbridge, they go straight to the hoist.

I think it is cheapening a debate to get it down to the point of who has flour to weigh. I raised the point so as to inspire confidence among the cane cutters and peasants. I was not speaking from the point of view of increasing the number of cane inspectors because I would be a stupid man to ask that you increase the inspectorate at this stage, because owing to the industrial atmosphere at present, the work which the inspectors are doing now is such that they are not pressed as they were pressed a few years ago, the reason being that there is a better understanding in the industry.

The question that Head 45 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$2,706 do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER No. 3

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the day.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF PARCEL OF LAND AND BULK SUGAR STORE

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to the Barbados Sugar Producers Association (Inc.) of a parcel of land situate in the City of Bridgetown together with the store known as the Bulk Sugar Store and other ancillary buildings erected thereon and the machinery and equipment standing on the said parcel of land or used in connection with the storing or shipping of sugar in bulk from the said store at the Deep Water Harbour.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: This Resolution seeks to approve of the lease of the Bulk Sugar Store which is capable of holding 80,000 tons of sugar to the Sugar Producers Association. The Sugar Producers Association has promised to sub-let it to Sugar Terminals Limited which is so to speak, a non-profit making company set up to carry out the actual operation of the bulk sugar operations. 1.25 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the entire area of land used for the Bulk Sugar Store and shipping facilities cover approximately 3.29 acres. The entire installation which costs approximately \$5 million was built from funds provided under the Price Stabilization Reserve Fund. While provision is made for a very small rental of \$5.00 a year, it must be borne in mind that the sugar industry pays a levy to the Port Department of \$4.00 per ton for every ton of sugar which passes through the installation. The amount estimated to be derived from the levy for the current financial year is estimated to be approximately \$640,000. The lease is for a period of 99 years with a provision for its termination by notice being given by either party of 25 years. There is also provision in the lease for a Maintenance Reserve Fund established by Sugar Terminals Limited to take care of the general maintenance and upkeep of the installation, as well as a Replacement Reserve Fund into which money is placed annually for the replacement of any machinery in this installation. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I hope that nothing I say will precipitate another debate like the last one we had on the last occasion. Sometimes some hon. members do not seem to do their home work but, when somebody else has prepared his papers, they say that they had the same answers. I do not accuse anybody of copying. What I say here now is not going to be anything new. It is not anything directed to this Government which was not directed to the last Government; I know that it is right that we should all share in common the contents of leases like this one now which comes before the Legislature, and that is as it should be so that we can discuss these matters against a background of commonsense and good judgment. The Hon. Minister states that there are two important Clauses, one in which you are making provision for a Maintenance Reserve Fund and the other is making provision for a Replacement Fund. The Hon. Minister has indicated that this is a project which costs this country \$5 million and I would like to say that the provision which is made in the contract is a sound provision for this replacement; but I know that there is a Clause in the contract which stipulates that when the amount reaches \$100,000, the tenant would not be required any longer to make this contribution unless the amount falls below \$60,000. I think that the Government should make its position quite clear in this matter. I say that the bulk installation has involved this country in the provision of

compensation to workers as a result of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour and that is one of the main factors of compensation, because the bulk installation has released more workers than any of the other sectors in the Deep Water Harbour. You can very well understand the reason for that. The general cargo is still coming and it is being unloaded by stevedores. The number of stevedores who went off are not as great as the number of produce porters and people associated with them.

An agreement was reached to accommodate these people. The Government should stop any kind of ignorance which is being despatched in certain quarters. I want to make my position clear. There are Government backbenchers — and front benchers — or Opposition members who may be ignorant totally of what has been passed in this House of Assembly. Somebody may be telling people that the Government passed money for the workers, that "X" million dollars have been passed and put into a fund and people have been thrown out of it. When you have a formula for it, the estimate is only the basis on what the production is likely to be. Somebody said that the \$1 3/4 million — I believe it was from the outside and, fortunately, I am not a member of the Opposition group; but some of the members of the former Government are giving the impression that they voted this \$1 3/4 million to this Government, the Government has not paid out all the money and that this money has gone in there and therefore they had more money to be given. I believe that that type of ignorance is being circulated, because some people ask me what has happened to the balance of the money. They think that the Legislature has voted \$1 3/4 million, but the amount which was paid out was only \$1 1/2 million, and therefore the other quarter million dollars is still there to be paid out. I believe that that sort of thing, that type of ignorance, is coming from sources which know better, but they still assume that. I say that the Government should make a statement about this matter. I sit on a Board and we have dispensed with the money we have and an audited statement has been made.
1.35 p.m.

I heard people say they were coming to me, but I am very frank and say to them that if I have the money they can come and take it up. I believe some would like to come, but they have not attempted it yet.

Mr. Speaker, there is another important matter which I think should be drawn to the attention of the Minister. The sugar industry is vital to the Barbados economy, and with the provision in this sector that had been agreed upon, and more so with what is taking place with Great Britain joining the European Common Market and all the like, I think it is essential that the Government should set up an *ad hoc* Committee to study some of the implications of these changes with a view to making an on-the-spot study of these specific problems. I will say to the Minister that I agree with this Resolution and these documents here, but as I said earlier, being a sugar producing community and doing our best to buttress the sugar industry — and I made this plea with the last Government which did not see the wisdom in it — the people connected with the bulk installation should make a contribution towards a Provident Fund for the workers in the Port and to some extent the workers in the sugar industry, and I will give my reasons.

Mr. Speaker, a situation like this was created in Puerto Rico, and the Puerto Rico Government made provision for what I have just stated. As I have said already in this House, time was against me, but I am to study the details of the Puerto Rico situation by going to San Juan. I have had some information from my colleagues here, but I will state to the Minister that the two clauses which you have put up on maintenance and replacement are material clauses dealing with machinery and buildings, but I am sure the Minister will be the first to agree that the human factor is as important within the context of this economic metamorphosis that is taking place in Barbados as the machinery. The Union made a demand in January 1961 at a public meeting in the Lower Green, and I made a plea here in this House. It is true that the plea was not heeded, therefore the Government was rejected. On these grounds, one can see that what I said

seems to have found public favour, and I would say here today that it is the duty of the Government to impose a levy or set up a Committee before they make the imposition to study the implication of the redundancy resulting from the construction of the Deep Water Harbour and the bulk installation, and to make recommendations to deal with that as a problem, and not to regard it as something of a normal situation and look upon it complacently.

Now the \$5 million that have been granted have been granted to put this thing up, Mr. Speaker, and the various Schedules "A" and "B" give an indication of what we have to deal with. The Schedule with the list of machinery and equipment under A, B, and C gives the structural machinery by a firm known as Spencer (Melksham) Ltd, and Richard Costain for the construction. These things have been put up at the disposal of these people. Now I would like this House to make a clear examination of what this contract means. The Barbados Sugar Producers' Association is an organisation of sugar-producing elements in this community, leasing this from the Government and turning it over to a body known as Sugar Terminals Limited; but in truth and in fact Sugar Terminals Limited happen to be some of the same people who operated as sugar brokers prior to the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. I would like to say to the Government that of the 158,000 tons of sugar manufactured in 1962, approximately 80% was handled by five brokers in Bridgetown, and to be precise the names are: Mannings, Plantation Limited, General Traders, DaCosta's and S. P. Musson. These five firms handle 80% of the total amount of sugar manufactured.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I would just like to correct the hon. member. There are only three firms; the firms of S. P. Musson, Manning's and DaCosta are all one firm, part of the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company which was incorporated in 1956.

Mr. WALCOTT: But for this purpose, they do not operate as the Shipping and Trading Company. For the purpose of shipping sugar, they operate as DaCosta and Company, Manning's and S. P. Musson, even though they form a joint stock company.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member and I do not have any grouse on this matter at all, but I have investigated this Company. I have been writing for a long time now a series on capital formation and monopoly in Barbados, and you will remember that about five years ago I asked a question of the then Minister of Trade who said there was no monopoly organisation in Barbados. This is not an indictment against the organisation at this stage, but the hon. member will also remember that they sell shares in their different stores of their particular undertakings, but the Balance Sheet of the Barbados Shipping and Trading is filed with the Registrar, and therefore it is really one company; and all these firms, no matter whether they are steamship agents, haberdasheries, ironmongers or lumber yards, were amalgamated in 1956, and they are known popularly as the Big Six, which the people in Barbados used to take as a term of abuse; they are really as a legal entity one single firm. The fact that they continue their old contacts, as far as I can see, does not alter the Balance Sheet and the Profit and Loss account which they submit to the Registrar every year as one firm. Again I am not quarrelling with the hon. member, but when he says that there are five people dealing with shipping sugar in Barbados, I must say that in truth and in fact, Plantations Limited as you know is a separate entity, and General Traders, as a matter of fact have now been bought by Plantations Limited; so that boils it down to two people shipping sugar in Barbados. General Traders owned by Plantations Limited, and Manning's, DaCosta and Musson's are one; so that leaves two, Plantations Limited and Barbados Shipping and Trading.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that their letterheads and contacts with shareholders or with Czarnikow in the United Kingdom are done through separate offices, but I am saying that there are only two firms dealing with it purely as a matter of information. It is a question of where he gets his information; I get mine from the Registrar.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I not only get my information from the Registrar, but I also know that these joint companies can change their name from Shipping and Trading and call themselves anything; but for the practical purpose of dealing with this specific matter of shipping sugar out of Barbados and acting as brokers, they act under separate and individual names as DaCosta and Company, Manning and Company, General Traders and Plantations Limited, and they have a joint company for which they have to file returns with the Registrar in dealing with the specific operation of these groups which they have.

1.45 p.m.

I am not at this stage going into the question of the formation of the company and whether we agree to have monopoly companies or not. That will be the subject of another debate. What I am dealing with is that the same persons who shipped sugar prior to the construction of the bulk installation are now shipping the sugar from the bulk installation store, and the public will have some idea about the matter that we made a demand for contributions from employers and from the workers too already on these grounds; therefore, this is nothing new which we are talking about. These people have shipped over 80% of the sugar in this country. The Hon. Premier has said that this is one company; therefore it makes it easier for us to get what we are to get.

This is no argument which we are going to debate on the basis that it is something new and we are asking somebody to put up something. This is no argument of our asking somebody who has decided to build and own a construction to put up something because the Government can get the money out by other means. I say, now that this has been done and is functioning, that the Hon. Minister must give consideration to the point which I have made because there is provision in this contract for the replacement of the machinery and the building when necessary, and there are workers involved in the Harbour and Sugar Industry generally; therefore, we feel that this company should be called upon now to make a contribution towards a Welfare Fund for the workers who now exist.

I do not want that to be confused with anything done now. I also hope that this matter would not give rise to the debate which we had just now on another matter which I raised. I am saying that this company can make a contribution. The workers already have agreed to make a contribution of five percent of their basic earnings and the employers have agreed to make a contribution of five percent. We feel that this bulk installation Company should be called upon to make a contribution and the way in which that contribution should be made should be by a sort of tripartite meeting between the company, the Government and the workers concerned. The Government at as early a stage as possible should set up an *ad hoc* Committee to study the implication of redundancy falling from the Sugar Industry as a result of mechanisation in the industry and the closing down of factories and the proposed reduction of factories, with a view to giving study to the specific problems of there being a wider redundancy and to making preparation to deal with such workers of what can be considered as those of able-bodied working ages. I do not think these things should be left to chance. I know that the last Government has been written already on these things; therefore, this Government is informed of these things and what they have not been informed of, they will be informed of by the workers' Organisation.

These things should not be left to chance. I am not the Leader of the Opposition; therefore I do not propose to lead a debate in opposition on this matter in this Chamber; but in all due respect to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I believe I know more about this matter than what other members will know because I am intimately concerned with all the details of this proposition. This is a proposition which the Barbados Workers' Union put forward from the floor of this House based on sound grounds for continuing the situation for the workers who are now there. That is the first stage.

The second stage would be open to anybody. I do not say that other members do not know as much as I in the setting up of a Committee to deal with this matter because that would be on a national basis and everybody in the community would know something about it. The specific matter which I rose on earlier is the one in which a specific contribution should be made for the workers in order to give them adequate rewards on retirement or on a question in which they have to retire through circumstances beyond their control.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Hon. Minister would be in a position, if not today, to say something about this. I say "if not today" because this Resolution deals with the approval of this lease and the points which I have made are points which I want the Government to study and to give study to as time goes by. The Barbados Workers Union would be the last organisation to make any impositions on the Sugar Industry which you would regard as unfair and burdensome. From all the facts before me I know that the bulk installation people can afford to make a contribution to the scheme, and they should be told so at an early date and should not be allowed to escape what is an inescapable social need.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, when I listened to what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has just said about his hoping that this matter would not give rise to the debate which we had just now, it is refreshing to those of us who have been here for some years to have listened to such a sound speech. I do not want the hon. member to take umbrage to that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I rise on a point of order. That remark did not apply to the hon. senior member for the City. I said some members: I did not think that meant all members.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do my homework. I think I have lived long enough to know when to waste time and when not to waste time. If I agree to anything, I just agree with it. Newspapers can howl and the people can say that I am a lackey for the Government; that matters nothing to me.

I would just like to draw to Your Honour's attention that I can remember when concrete blocks were first being made in this Island, that it was said that the people were going to suffer and it was also said when they were about to put in scramblers at factories that they would cause somebody to suffer. I will only say this. I commend the present organisation for running the Deep Water Harbour because apparently it is the envy of Trinidad and the other Islands; but when it comes to the actual Resolution before us, I just want to ask the Hon. Minister this question. I noticed quite recently that it took only people who are entitled to hold judicial posts in this country to decide that the Deep Water Harbour is not in Bridgetown, and I notice that this lease which this Government is entering into with this company has stated that the Harbour is within the City of Bridgetown. I am wondering if the Hon. Premier being the only legal brains on the other side can tell us where this Harbour is situated.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is true to say that Your Honour the Speaker is the oldest legal luminary whom we have in this House and in this Party, but there are, as a matter of fact, other legal brains than us existing in our Party. As a matter of fact, we on this side have all the legal brains existing in this Chamber. This is no undue reflection on the others of my colleagues. If the hon. member says that I am the only one person who can speak on this now, well then, I can see with him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I have always held Your Honour the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker to be away and above Party.
(1.55 p.m.)

As a layman, Mr. Speaker, I would like him to enlighten me on this point. In the Judiciary of this country

it was decided quite recently that the parcel of land which is now forming the Deep Water Harbour is not any part of Bridgetown. I have read and I noticed that cases were dismissed because it was decided that the Deep Water Harbour is no part of Bridgetown. What is the position, I would like to ask, if this lease is granted and something occurs? I do not know if we are right in entering into a lease with regard to something which does not exist now. I say this in reference to what was said by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. What the hon. member has said is quite correct. I have had on several occasions to smile and try to correct people who actually had the courage to say to me: "Frank Walcott is the one who prevented us from getting the money. He made them put it back into the Treasury."

I think it was a wicked thing to make such remarks in relation to a man who was valiantly defending the cause of the workers. My colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, can tell you the same thing. I have no doubt that somebody or other was the instigator of it. But that is all stupidity. Even if it were suggested, nobody would say that the money should be taken back from you.

Mr. Speaker, this is a business proposition and you have people of some business acumen. Some people may ask: "What are you doing in renting this land at \$5 a year?" They are forgetting the revenue that you are getting from it by having business people in the position. I want to know what is the legal position as to where you are now, having heard the judgment given in the highest Court in the island, that this place is not in the City of Bridgetown. Will it be appropriate for you to amend your laws before entering into this lease in relation to this property in respect of which the judges have held that it is not in the City of Bridgetown?

At this stage, it now being 2 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 2 p.m. of the clock and it is hardly likely that this debate will be completed within ten minutes. This sitting is accordingly suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock.
2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present, and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell having been rung a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Questions for Oral Answers. At the last sitting of the House answers were laid to Question No. 4, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and to Question No. 20 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. As to Question No. 4, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph may proceed.

PROGRESS REPORT ON HOUSING SCHEME AT LAMMINGS PLANTATION

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will the Honourable Minister, at his earliest convenience, make a Progress Report on the provision of a Housing Scheme at Lammings Plantation in the parish of Saint Joseph?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

"Investigation into the purchase of 2 acres 3 roods 20 1/9 perches of land at Lammings were entered into by the Housing Authority and it has been discovered that the owners of the land have been living out of the Island for a long time and that two of them are now dead. In order to obtain an indefeasible title it would have been necessary to acquire the land compulsorily.

2. The proposal to purchase the land, has however, been reviewed due to the fact that there are house spots vacant in the same parish; also for the past two years a number of the Authority's houses erected in rural areas have remained unoccupied. It is not now therefore proposed to proceed with the purchase of land at Lammings for the provision of a Housing Scheme.

Mr. SMITH: As a supplementary question, I would ask the Hon. Minister if it would be possible to acquire this same piece of land because it is not agricultural land; it is grass land and rocky land. I ask if the Minister would not consider buying it immediately for the purpose of the same scheme or for some other scheme.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: There are house spots near to the Housing Authority's houses not very far from Lammings, and they are not even occupied. I do not think, therefore, that it would be wise for the Government to invest money in more land when there is land up there today at present not being occupied. If we had any land in the vicinity and there was a demand for land, then the Government would give consideration to it; but at present there is land in house spots near to Lammings Plantation and there is no necessity for buying any more. You would be having more land unoccupied, and money which could be used for more essential purposes would be used for this purpose.
2.40 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, again as a supplementary, will the Minister let this House know where this land is supposed to be that is unoccupied, which is near to Lammings?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, there are ten unoccupied spots in the Bissex Hill area.

Mr. SMITH: Again as a supplementary, I wonder if the Hon. Minister can tell us the distance apart from Lammings to Bissex.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I do not know the distances from one place to another in Barbados very well, and my opinion of close distances and that of Barbadians is very much different. Even if it is in the vicinity of two miles, I would consider that relatively close.

DANGERS EXPERIENCED ON ROCK HALL ROAD, ST. THOMAS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 20 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas re dangers experienced by pedestrians and vehicles in traversing Rock Hall Road.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Honourable Minister aware of dangers experienced by pedestrians and vehicles in traversing Rock Hall Road in front of the Almshouse, in the parish of St. Thomas, due to the fact that numerous branches of trees overhanging this highway thereby make the road mossy and slippery after a rainfall?

2. Will the Minister therefore take immediate steps to have such situation remedied in order to avoid a major catastrophe?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"No. At the time of inspection this section of road showed no signs of being mossy or slippery.

2. The overhanging trees have been trimmed."

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, this road becomes mossy after rainfall.

Mr. SPEAKER: It must be a question.

Mr. BATSON: Is the Minister aware that after heavy rainfall the road is mossy and therefore makes it dangerous for vehicular traffic?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, as I said, at the time the inspection was made, there were no signs of moss, possibly due to dry weather, but I have taken the necessary precaution to trim the trees in case the road remained slippery due to the shade; so that all chances of being mossy due to shade have been eliminated now that the trees have been trimmed.

Mr. SPEAKER: So far as I am aware, no Replies to other questions have been laid, and accordingly the House now proceeds to Private Members' Business.

The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. member for the City: to resume debate on a Resolution re the Premier's Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. On the last occasion, it will be recalled that the hon. and learned Premier was speaking at 4.30 p.m. when Government Business was resumed. The Hon. Premier may, if he so desires, now resume.

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON PREMIER'S FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGET- ARY PROPOSALS

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, at the time of the Suspension of this debate on the Budget Proposals and Financial Statement which I made in this House on 26th June, 1962, you will remember that at the time of the interruption that I was speaking on the question which has been so much to the forefront of public discussion, and which out of all the proposals which I made at the time of introducing the Financial Statement has given rise to the most excitement.

The impression which is created by some of the promoters of what was established as the first brewery in this Island is that the Government decided to put on some kind of duty on beer to make it difficult for the shareholders in that industry to get any kind of dividend from its operation. As I said on the last occasion, Sir, I made absolutely no specific imposition on any individual undertaking. The consumption duty, which is not an import duty or excise duty, which was put on at the time was one which was put on all beer sold in this Island regardless of its source of origin. 2.50 p.m.

That is something which I want made abundantly clear. It is most unfortunate that a certain gentleman whom I did not join issue with, who was in an enterprise in the Island — and I am merely concerned with the financial stability of the territory — should elect to summon extra-ordinary meetings of shareholders, to which I have already referred as being purely political meetings, in order to give the impression that the Government was making some kind of political football of the gentleman turned out of the brewery which has been operating in this Island during the last nine months. The present position today, Sir, is that the price of locally manufactured beer is considerably below the price of imported beer. Prior to the coming into operation of the brewery, the Government raised a considerable amount of revenue from import duties on beer coming into the island whether it was actually sold or not in that financial year. Therefore if an agent or an importer decided to import, let us say, 100,000 cases of beer into the Island, he paid duty on it whether it was consumed or not, whether it was taken off the shelves or the counters or whether it remained there.

I still maintain, looking at the matter at the time when the concessions were granted to the brewery, that any company which can declare in its prospectus the kind of dividends that they in their wisdom — that is the promoters of the company — stipulate that they would be in a position to pay, would be doing violence to the spirit of the Pioneer Industries Act, because the spirit of the Pioneer Industries Act is to encourage and foster the establishment

of such industries in this Island which without incentive legislation — the incentives which are supplied by the provisions of the Act — the companies would find it uneconomical and unprofitable to establish in the Island. That is the essence of pioneer legislation, and under that legislation enormous concessions are made to such industries in the interest of employment and in the interest of expanding the gross national profit of this territory.

These concessions, Sir, are in the nature of exemption from customs duty on the importation of machinery and raw materials, exemption from companies tax and income tax on the earnings and profits and dividends of the company. Those are the main concessions which are usually granted when one obtains pioneer status; but then sometimes some industries are not satisfied with these concessions because if they can find a gullible and unsuspecting Government they would try to extort greater concessions from the country than the concessions accorded by the Pioneer Industries Act — and this is precisely what Banks did. They had a concession made in their favour long before they began scratching the foundations of the factory; and as far as I know, before they decided where the factory was to be sited at all and before they began production the Government of this Island in accordance with a request made by them raised the duty on imported beer from 28 cents per proof wine gallon to \$1.13 per proof wine gallon from preferential sources, that is, from Commonwealth suppliers because we have Imperial Preference in which there is a discriminatory tax against people who are outside of the Commonwealth. As I said, the duty on imported beer was raised from 28 cents per proof wine gallon to \$1.13 from preferential sources and it was raised from 35 cents per proof wine gallon to \$1.20 per proof wine gallon in the case of that imported from non-preferential sources. The new duty therefore was something like 85 cents increase per proof wine gallon or ten cents a pint, or roughly speaking, eight cents more on a three gill bottle.

Hon. members of this House would remember that there was no beer factory in Barbados when that was done. I have the letters right here on the file to show where the House of Assembly was not aware of what was going on until they introduced the Bill in here, except that there was an advertisement in the newspaper from somebody who put in an application before this company did so. That company was within the Caribbean Federation as it was then called. The other matter which brought this to the attention of this House was the Premier at that time coming into this House and amending successfully the Customs Tariff Act to impose an increased price on imported beer of eight cents per bottle. We did not have all this public outcry then and there was no justification for it because Banks was not in production; Banks had not yet started to build a factory. Before they began talking business to the Government of Barbados they made it clear that they were not going to discuss the erection of the factory until the Government showed its *bona fides* or *mala fides* — it depends on how you look at it: good faith with what the Government was doing or bad faith with the people of Barbados by increasing the price by eight cents per bottle.

Banks went into production sometime in 1961 and the price which the public had to pay just for Banks to condescend to talk with the Minister of Trade was eight cents a bottle more for imported beer.

Sir, this occurred at the time when there was another potential brewery in the form of the Caribbean Development Company, the manufacturers of Carib beer in Trinidad. They had an application before the Government, and the Government paid absolutely no attention to them, and made absolutely no attempt, as far as I can see — unless they got together like Nicodemus at night; but as far as the record goes, there was no attempt to bargain with the Caribbean Development Company to see whether they would be prepared to come in and manufacture beer in Barbados on terms less unfavourable to the Treasury of this Island and less unfavourable to the consumers than the extortionate terms upon which Banks beer was to be placed on the unwilling public of this Island.

Sir, I make no apologies for any of my Budget proposals. I only want to say that I did not make any reference, kind or unkind, to the directors, promoters, shareholders or anybody concerned with Banks Breweries. The record is there. The records of this House can prove that.

They have decided to play politics: but if they want to play politics, I think the public ought to know the background of all of these things. They sponsored two political meetings for the Barbados Labour Party; one was held at Banks Breweries and the other was held at Queen's Park. As I have said before, after I made my Budget proposals, they decided to sponsor these political meetings.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. For the sake of the record, I think I should correct that statement. There is no truth in any meetings being sponsored for the Barbados Labour Party, by Banks Breweries or anyone connected there.
3.00 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. junior member for St. George has said that the statement is not true. The hon. member being who he is and being a paragon of truthfulness and the soul of rectitude and public morality, therefore the statement I have made is untrue. If you take it from the hon. junior member for St. George, it is untrue; but if you look at it in the light of the facts, you will see if it is true or not. Ordinarily, the annual general meeting is held once a year. The extra-ordinary meeting which was called of the Brewery and the shareholders was a disgrace to industrial development in Barbados for the simple reason that the poor shareholders were hoodwinked into dressing up in their Sunday clothes and they had to listen to a political harangue from one of the directors of that Company. It was at that meeting that the statement was made that the Brewery was made a political football, and the gentleman, with crocodile tears in his eyes, decided that he would withdraw very reluctantly in order to save the Brewery and in order to sacrifice himself on the altar of good industrial relations in Barbados. But he omitted to tell the shareholders that this great sacrifice which he was making was earning him something like 56% on his investment over a period of eight months. He also omitted to tell the shareholders that he had threatened his fellow directors that he intended to sell out the Brewery to an English firm, that this bluff was called off by his fellow directors, and they said that no matter how bad the Brewery is doing, they were willing to take a chance.

Mr. D'Aguiar - I am not afraid to call people's names - said that he would not say he would not sell his shares, but he would honour the firm's wishes. He could not very well withdraw his proposal to sell the shares locally and he gave some of the directors the option to purchase the shares which he made available to some of the shareholders. Before the political meeting which was sponsored on behalf of a political party, he wanted to buy back the shares and he only conducted the meeting because he did not get back the shares. If he had got back the shares, there would not have been any meeting. It is very strange to me that they are trying to scare off the shareholders of this concern when he himself made 56% profit out of the transaction. You can work out 56% out of \$180,000. No firm in the world could pay a dividend equal to one-fifth of that. Secondly, it does appear to me that if you are sincerely interested in the promotion of your product, in promoting sales, you do not try, unless you are playing politics, to create an image in the mind of the Barbadian public that your product was too expensive to the Barbadian public. I will contrast his behaviour pattern with the people who import beer. When the Government raised the import duty on beer at the behest of Banks in its embryonic stage by 8 cents a bottle, the agents of Heinekens beer, misguided as they are, and the agents for Tennents beer and other agents of imported beer, did not issue any press release and try to impress the public that their beer was too expensive. They accepted, although some of them questioned the motives behind the imposition of the tax. The then Premier said that Barbadians were drinking too much beer. His reason for putting the tax on the beer was that rum was a local industry, Barbadians were not drinking enough rum and they had to put a tax on beer. The

beer will be a little more expensive and people would revert to drinking rum.
3.10 p.m.

It is on the record of this House, and the hon. junior member for St. George cannot deny that, because we are not all new boys in here. Some of us were here and sat down and heard it, and it is unfortunate that it is on the records that the Hon. Premier said that Barbadians were not drinking enough rum. There is a document which is missing, Sir, but I think I can speak inferentially..... I have found it, Sir, and members can judge from this document which is dated 20th January, 1959, whether the Premier was speaking the truth or whether the real reason for raising the import duty on beer was as I have said. The document reads as follows:-

"To the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour,
Office,
Government Buildings.

Dear Sir,

Applications and Proposals for the Establishment of a Brewery in Barbados

Further to discussions held with you this morning with the following meeting, yourself and your Permanent Secretary, Mr. Lui Stephen Psaila, Director of Banks Breweries, Georgetown, British Guiana, Mr. A. G. Shepherd, Manager of the Barbados Development Board, Mr. D. G. Leacock and Mr. L. A. Corbin of Messrs. S. P. Musson Ltd., we now set out our proposals for the establishment of a brewery to manufacture beer and stout. This approach is to be regarded as our formal application for the necessary concessions which are essential from Government before any such project can be launched. It is proposed to establish a brewery at a cost of approximately \$1.5 million to be financed jointly by Banks Breweries Ltd. and local shareholders for which purpose shares will be offered to interested parties and the public. Banks Breweries Limited of British Guiana who are very conversant with local conditions are producing a first-class beer which has been widely accepted in our territory."

Then they go on to give some statistics about the sales in British Guiana which they said exceeded half a million cases of beer per annum, and the proposal here was to follow the same pattern set by them in British Guiana where at present they have approximately 3 1/2 million shareholders with a minimum of \$50 in one dollar shares. It is felt that this would give considerable support to this industry here and impose widespread interest on the part of the public. This has undoubtedly been a big factor in British Guiana in making it a big success.

"The concessions required are -

1. Tax holiday for a period of seven years under the Interest Free Ordinance;
2. Duty-free importation of all building materials and equipment to be used in the manufacture of beer and stout;
3. An excise duty on beer manufactured locally of 12 cents per liquid gallon imperial for a period of not less than the tax-free holiday;
4. Duty-free importation of all packaging material used, such as bottles, cartons, crown corks, labels etc.;
5. Permission for the importation of brewery plant and equipment from any source required including the United States of America;
6. Duty-free importation of all materials and ingredients for use in the manufacture of beer and stout; and
7. The raising of the import duties on foreign beer and stout to conform with the recommendations of the

Federal Customs Union Ordinance, namely, 60 cents and \$1.20 per gallon on other beer and stout respectively."

I want to repeat, Sir, that this was their proposal in 1959. The factory started in 1961, and long before the ground was even broken at Clapham, the Government had clapped on an import duty even in excess of what Banks Breweries themselves had asked for, because the import duty which the Government put on was \$1.13 preferential and \$1.20 non-preferential. What Banks had asked for and which up to now they are still committed to was 60 cents preferential, so that British beer would only have a duty of 60 cents or roughly 4 cents duty additional in order to make it unprofitable for people to buy imported beer. This is the purpose of discriminatory tax; you put it on to discourage a person from buying a certain product. Do not forget, Sir, that a lot of people consider that commission merchants and so on are unnecessary, but let us remember this: the commission merchants in Barbados, the Roebuck Street man, the small shopkeeper in the country — I do not want to say Barbadians because it does not matter where they come from — are the people who contribute income tax, import duties and companies tax to the community, and when you do this kind of thing, you are discriminating against the people who have been here ploughing back their profits in the country over a long period of years, educating their children in Barbados, and not even going to Trinidad for a holiday. Some of them only go to Bathsheba, far less going to Switzerland or anything like that; and when you put on an import duty, you are venturing into the unknown and instead of bearing these evils, you are flying to others that you know not of. This is the way I look at things when it comes to weighing very carefully the considerations for granting pioneer status.

Mr. Speaker, my point of view is a very difficult one to put over, because there are some people who feel that you must have industry at any cost even if it means that Barbadians are themselves discriminated against, once you are bringing in foreign investment. We want foreign investment in Barbados, but it does not mean that we have to make ourselves doormats, Sir; it does not mean that people necessarily expect us to spread out the red carpet so much that we become part of the red carpet itself and we are trodden over. You have to weigh all the factors very carefully. In all this, I am very glad to see a brewery in Barbados, but they must take the time from the Government like everybody else, and not get up and play politics with the Government. Politics is our game, and they are not good at this game. We are better at this game than they are, and the proof of the pudding is in the eating. No industrialist can come here and play politics better than the hon. senior member for the City or this Party over here, because in this sphere we are supreme in this Island, and you have to recognise supremacy.

3.20 p.m.

Give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. Do those things which you are supposed to do; not what you do in other countries. It will not happen here and we do not intend that it should happen here. No industrialist should choose to take the time from people like the disappointed director of Banks Breweries; they should take the time from the Government which is doing everything possible to assist in the promotion of industries. If you do not want to take the time from the Government, well then, stay out. I will not shed a tear over that kind of friend, because that is a 'fair weather' friend; and we do not want 'fair weather' friends. If they would want to take the time from the Government, they would recognise that all sections of the community have gone out of their way to help them, so much so that we have deprived ourselves as taxpayers of the privileges of having lighter burdens of taxation because when you give away \$500,000, when we are losing something by the establishment of that industry to the tune of \$1/2 million which is over 2 1/2% of our revenue, you should recognise all of these things. Therefore, every single industry coming into this Island has got to look at it in the special considerations which surround this development.

The letter goes on to say this:-

"With reference to number seven," — No. 7 is where they asked the Government to discriminate against imported beer long before they began to put up a factory and, as far as I know, began to purchase the land — "it is considered that the present duties in Barbados of 28 cents and 35 cents per gallon on British and foreign beer respectively, plus a four cents package tax, are too small to allow adequate protection from imported beer."

That was on 20th January, 1959. Do not forget that Dr. Cummins came to the House and told hon. members that the reason why he had put on this tax was because Barbadians were not drinking enough rum. I am reading this letter and any other hon. member can read it, including the hon. junior member for St. George. I am not concealing anything. The gloves are off; this is a ding-dong battle. They said that the duties are too small to allow adequate protection from imported beers.

If Banks beer cost the same to produce as imported beer, Banks Breweries without getting a single concession from Government would have been able to sell their beer at least two cents a bottle cheaper for the same size of bottle. Most of the beer which we get here is Dutch beer and it comes from non-preferential sources. They could have sold Banks beer three cents cheaper, but they wanted more than that. They wanted something like eleven cents a bottle differential without any kind of concession. They could have come in here, put up their factory, paid income tax and still had a discriminatory tax of as much as three cents a bottle.

That was not enough; they wanted several concessions from Government and the sting was in the tail. They said to the Government: "I do not care what you tell the members of the House of Assembly; before we begin to put up a factory we want you to charge eight cents more on a bottle of imported beer." Here it is: we have an increase in Civil Servants' salaries which is taking us \$4 million more. They talk of our breaking faith with them. We have not even carried out the letter of the law in reducing the tax on beer from non-British sources. At that time they said: "We recommend the raising of the import duties on foreign beer and stout to conform with the recommendations of the Federal Commissioners." At that time there was the report of the Orion Committee, and in making these Budget proposals the only departure which I have made from the Orion recommendations is that I did not lower the duty on imported beer to 60 cents which would be a further whittling down of the concessions made in favour of Banks Breweries. Far from lowering the duties, I put on a consumption tax on all beer which would send up the price on imported and local beer by the same money. According to the terms of the agreement, the import duties on beer could have been lowered to 60 cents. This is what I said in my Budget proposals:

"I propose to reduce the tariff on beer and ale, stout and porter from \$1.13 preferential and \$1.20 general to \$1.03 and \$1.09 per gallon respectively. In effect, there will be no charge in the customs duties on beer and stout, but there will be a consumption duty which will apply to both imported and locally produced beer and stout."

They went on to say this in the letter:-

"It can be pointed out that in British Guiana the local brewery enjoys a differential of \$1.15 a gallon on all British beers and \$1.80 on foreign beers between excise and import duties and in Trinidad, Carib beer enjoys 65 cents differential on British beers and \$1.28 on foreign beers."

In Jamaica, 84 cents a gallon and in Barbados the discrimination in favour of Banks Breweries is \$1.02 per gallon and the imported beer also has to pay package tax which is probably another six or eight cents. The method by which I have arrived at the overall figures I have already stated. Let us say that they enjoy a differential of about \$1.20, but tomorrow morning I could cut that down to 70 cents, below Trinidad, Jamaica and everybody else. Some hon. members may ask why I did not do that. Well, I was

not concerned about penalising Banks Breweries, I am concerned about revenue. Banks had signed an agreement suggesting that the differential should be 60 cents a gallon. The last Government made it over a dollar and when they went into production they were told: "We know that a Customs Union would mean reducing this differential to 60 cents." The import duty should be reduced to 60 cents because the Tariff Customs recommended that for the end of the year. Beer coming from Trinidad or from any British source could have come in here only at 60 cents a gallon. Beer from these sources have a total discrimination in favour of Banks of well over a dollar. How then can one of the directors of the local Brewery say that the Government was breaking faith with the Brewery because they had some kind of understanding with the last Government and so we are breaking faith? Let me get this clear once and for all so that everybody will know exactly where he stands. Anything which I see that the Government is committed to, I regard and I am prepared to honour it. I am having some trouble right now with the Northern District Council in trying to make them understand that any agreement which has been entered into I have to honour. They are a young Council and I have written them a long Minute to the effect that as a matter of principle, any binding agreement which has been entered into by a previous Council must be honoured. As I say, they are all young and inexperienced and I have to guide them on questions of policy. What I say about the Northern District Council applies to this Government as well. If any inducement were offered to anybody, as long as I am satisfied with its legality, whether I agree with it or not, this Government will be prepared to honour that agreement until we have an opportunity legally to change it. We do not intend to alter the conditions of service of any Civil Servant just because we do not like a man's face or his politics or what, but I want to say that I do not regard any agreement made behind a tamarind tree in the dead of night as binding on this Government. Do not tell me that you have had an understanding which cannot bear the light of criticism in this Chamber. We have had an understanding that in respect of the Bagatelle quarry, the Minister's name must not be called when they came to a decision about that quarry. As long as somebody was put in an unfavourable position where they were relying on this legal contract with the previous Government, constitutionally we are bound to follow it until we can change it if we disagree with it; but do not bring this tamarind tree agreement made behind somebody's piling in the dead of night and say that you have an understanding with that. I have to look at Government documents, Government files and the official records in this Chamber. I do not feel myself constrained to go around and find out what sort of agreements have been made. The only people apparently with whom we have broken faith right now are the taxpayers because we have the right to reduce the tax on local beer, but I have not decided to do that yet; however when the new Customs Union comes in, whatever the Customs Union says to do, we will have to do. That is therefore a word to the wise; until the Customs Union comes in we do not find it necessary to reduce the margin of difference between the local product and the imported product. I have tried to act with these people more favourably than they deserve.

I have in my hand the Prospectus of Banks Breweries (Barbados) Limited and I want to read from the Prospectus. The Company was incorporated in Barbados on the 19th March, 1959 under the Companies Act 1910 of Barbados for the purpose of brewing and bottling beer. The total capital has been estimated at an amount of \$2.1 million made up as follows:-

Cost of preliminary Expenses	\$100,000;
Architect fees	60,000
Cost of buildings	407,500
Supervision as per Estimates prepared by Banks Breweries Ltd, British Guiana	1,282,500
Preliminary Expenses and Expenses of this issue	35,000
Working Capital and contingencies	215,000

That was the invitation to the public to subscribe their hard earned money to Banks. In this Prospectus they set out this:-

"In keeping with this policy of encouraging investment in new industries, the Government of Barbados has granted the Company the following exclusive concessions," 3.40 p.m.

"(1) Under the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958:-

(a) A Tax Holiday which means that the Company will not have to pay Income Tax or Trade Tax for a period of seven years from the date when sales commence and that any dividends paid in Barbados in respect of profits made in such period will not be taxable in the hands of Shareholders."

That was misleading statement No. 1; it is not true. When I said the other day that there is a law in the United Kingdom and America about making statements in a prospectus, it is because companies which have high promotion departments or the services of promoters or good advertising people available at their disposal can go and put over anything. I am not saying that Banks did it in this case, but you can judge for yourself. You can put over anything to the public because you can induce a person to contribute to a company. This started as the South Sea Bubble way back in the 18th Century where they had to pass the first restrictions against joint stock operations. There is gold in El Dorado; so what happens now? You get respected people in the community, stockbrokers and so on in the United Kingdom going to gaol for slipping up for what they say in a prospectus. You have to be careful of what you say in a prospectus, because the penalty for making a fraudulent statement in a prospectus is detention in gaol. That is the penalty in every industrial country.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I would like thy Hon. Premier to read that part again, because I was not quite clear.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will read it again because people think I am making wild and irrational statements. I do not want to repeat what I said, but I will read what the hon. member has asked for.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member did not make a point of order, he has only asked the Premier to read over something.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: "In keeping with its policy of encouraging investment in new industries, the Government of Barbados has granted to the Company the following exclusive concessions:-

Under the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958:-

(a) A tax Holiday which means that the Company will not have to pay Income Tax or Trade Tax for a period of seven years from the date when sales commence, and that any dividends paid in Barbados in respect of the profits made in such period will not be taxable in the hands of Shareholders."

I say that statement is untrue, and the hon. junior member for St. George can get up and tell me that it is not an untrue statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: He cannot do so unless he is on a point of order or elucidation.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I think I will be granted an opportunity to speak after the Premier on this matter, and I will not interrupt him at this stage.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member will not have any opportunity to speak after me. The one person who will have an opportunity is the hon. senior member for the City, because as far as I understand this is his Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I must thank the Hon. Premier for clearing up that point, because I was a bit confused.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am saying that that statement is within the prospectus and it is an untrue statement, and

I am prepared to say in a court of law that that statement is untrue and appears in a prospectus. I introduced a Bill, I think it was last Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, and when members come to debate that Bill, they will see how the statement is untrue. I will continue to read:

"(b) The right to import building materials, machinery, and equipment for the Company's brewery free of all import duties."

That statement is true.

"2. By an order made under the Customs Tariff (Amendment) Act, 1959, the right as pioneer manufacturer to import materials of all kinds for use in its production free of all import duties."

That statement is also true. I am not trying to say that they are all untrue statements, but I am saying that the statement where they said that the Government had given them, not a guarantee, but had granted to them these concessions — and it was not a misprint either — was an untrue statement. Why did Mr. D'Aguiar not tell his shareholders this at the political meeting he held when he parted company from them? They then showed that the Demeraro brewery had captured 84% of the beer market in that country, leaving only 16% to imported beer, and they hoped to do the same thing in Barbados. They stated that the local brewery will capture 80% of the local sales; so when you study that, the last Premier ought to have known, if they intended to capture 80% of the market, he would be losing 80% of the import duties which the Treasury was then deriving from foreign beer; but they did not tell the public anything about this. They said: "Oh, you are not drinking enough rum; so we will put eight cents on beer." But even that eight cents was to be wiped out soon. They then went on to make statements about the quality which I make no pretensions as to whether they are true or untrue, because I am not a Banks addict.

The most interesting part of their prospectus, Sir, is the one which deals with the profit estimates, and I want to read that. It is as follows:-

"Two detailed profit estimates have been prepared to Banks Breweries Limited of British Guiana. Estimate 'A' is based on total sales of one million gallons per annum. Profit estimates are based on an anticipated selling price to the distributors of \$3.50 per carton containing 24 ten ounce bottles of beer, and \$5.25 per carton of forty-eight six-ounce bottles of stout. The anticipated price to the ordinary retail shops is \$4 per carton of beer and \$5.70 per carton of stout, and to the consumer in the shops, 20 cents per ten-ounce bottle of beer and 15 cents per six-ounce bottle of stout."

They said that the man on the street was supposed to get Banks beer at 20 cents a bottle, and stout at 15 cents a bottle. What did it actually sell at before the tax?

"Profit estimates 'A' and 'B' are printed at the end of this Prospectus.

In the estimates of profits no account has been taken of the possible sale of 'malt beverages', but the production and sale of this item might considerably improve the profits. It could be produced profitably to sell at 10 cents per six-ounce bottle in the ordinary retail shop."

I want to stop there and digress for a moment. You will remember that I said last week that Banks Breweries had applied to the Government for pioneer status to manufacture a malt beverage. The hon. member for St. George corrected me when I said it was stout.
3.50 p.m.

Now, Sir, what they put in their prospectus was that their malt beverage was to sell at ten cents a bottle which was the same thing as aerated beverages, and they said that by selling them at ten cents a bottle, the profit margin which they were going to make in the brewery — to quote their words correctly — "the production and sale of malt

would considerably improve the profits of the company".

When they put up the proposals to us a couple of months ago, they said that malt beverage was to be sold at fifteen cents a bottle. They told the public that they would sell it at ten cents a bottle, but they wanted pioneer status to manufacture it. They further told us that they were not going to employ one additional person or invest any more capital. Whether it is malt or molasses I do not know.

I have been to dances and singings and I have seen malt beverage. There is one called 'Crown Malt'. I do not know if it has an alcoholic content but it was sold at 45 cents a bottle. What we told them was this. The differential between your selling malt and the price of the imported product was so great that you did not need any protection, and therefore in view of the fact that the purpose of the pioneer industries legislation was to relieve the unemployment in this Island, in view of the fact that you have been exempted from income tax in normal circumstances, we did not see what benefit our giving you pioneer status will be to this country because you yourself have said in writing that you did not intend to employ one single worker in the production of this product. Hon. members will be able to judge whether we were right or wrong. That is what we said and we communicated our decision in writing to the Directors of Banks Breweries.

Not one word was mentioned of this at the big political meeting which they held under the guise of a meeting of the company. That is absolutely fantastic. I have seen young people who are working for not so very large wages going to dances and buying malt at 45 cents and 50 cents a bottle. The Directors of Banks Breweries said at first that they were going to sell it at ten cents a bottle, but according to what they told us they said that they were going to sell it at fifteen cents. Now, the difference between what they told the public in their prospectus and what they told the Government in 1962 in my opinion — and I am merely expressing my opinion: it may be worthless — was not due to any cost in production or rise; what they felt was that if they had put it at ten cents a bottle it would be too competitive with the people who were making beverages here and who had to pay income tax and companies tax.

This is a non-alcoholic beverage which they propose to make. Why should they not pay tax too? Why should Barbadians be inflicted with taxation when people come in here and are granted pioneer status to do certain things and then they want to do other things without paying taxation? Is it because of the acquisitiveness of certain capitalists in the region, the acquisitive instinct of making money just without showing what benefit it would be to the community? That was our approach to the matter and I make no apologies for it. Therefore, we refused the application of Banks.

That was something for them to tell the shareholders if they had a case, but they did not elect to tell the shareholders about that. They said not one mumbling word about this. Banks beer was costing the taxpayers of Barbados \$500,000 per year because that would be the effect on the revenue of the Island if they had continued uninterruptedly in the way they were going on. They were costing us that money. That is money which we would have got in if we did not grant them the concession to come in and manufacture beer. We were getting that money and from the time Banks Breweries started production, down went the revenue and up went the profits of Banks.

Profit Estimates (A) discloses an anticipated net profit of \$318,116 which might be disposed of as follows: Dividend of 10% on share capital of \$1.6 million, \$160,000; to build Reserve Fund \$158,116, making a total of \$318,116. In other words, the first year they could pay 20%, but they decided to put away a certain amount to the Reserve Fund.

In Profit Estimates (B) they anticipated net profit of \$897,000 which was to be disposed of as follows: Dividend of 30% on \$1.6 million of share capital, \$480,000, reserve fund \$417,600, thus making a total of \$897,600. If they did not put aside any money so as to build up the Reserve Fund they would have made 60% profit.

This is what they told the public. The net profit made by Banks Breweries in British Guiana on the first year's operation was \$717,814.57 on a sale of 585,000 cartons of beer equivalent to 1.05 million gallons.

I want to turn back a little. They said that it is estimated that Banks Breweries of Barbados would sell 500,000 gallons of beer or half million gallons in the first year. I just referred to the rising to one million gallons within the first five years which they said that they would be making. The gross profit before money was set aside to the Reserve Fund was 59.5% on nearly 60% and that is what they expected to make long before the pioneer period elapsed. They expected to make a profit of something like 60% and 20% in the very first year.

What has happened now? Nothing has happened; therefore let them go ahead and make the profit. If they want to get their produce sold, they should stop going around day after day in the Press in their anxiety to embarrass the Government of this Island, telling the consuming public that their beer is too expensive. I want to tell the consuming public something now: I do not care how many meetings they choose to have with the Minister of Finance, the tax on beer is not coming off — that is as clear and it is as true as John III: 16 — before the 31st March, and it may not come off if the finances of this island do not warrant any relief in this direction. You do not put on a tax as a joke. These projections were made after very careful estimates, taking everything into consideration — the elasticity of supply and demand and every conceivable form of calculation. A period of nine months is not sufficient time to show what the operation of the tax is going to have on the economy of the Island, far less eight or nine days as they want to stampede me into taking off the tax. Which Minister of Finance allows an industrialist to tell him what tax must come off? In other words, you must follow the words of the calypso: "You are wasting your time." I am taking this time to say that if there is anybody who has broken faith with anybody else, it is Banks Breweries who have broken faith with their own shareholders and the general public. They say that for revenue reasons which were within the legal and moral authority of the Government, because we put on a consumption tax, we were breaking faith with them with this tamarind tree agreement and making a political football of the company. To say that, nothing could be further from the truth. I have no personal animosity against any of the directors of Banks Breweries; I choose my friends and they choose theirs. I do not approve of some of their friends and they do not approve of some of mine. It is the principle of the maximum social advantage for the community as a whole. Your tax policy is as much a part of your political philosophy as any kind of legislation you can introduce for social benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I was drawing your attention to the statements which have been made in the prospectus and, as I said before, the prospectus is the sort of Manifesto of the Company. A Manifesto is the prospectus of a political party. The prospectus of a Company is the Manifesto of the company. The reason why I spend so much time on this matter is that I said last week that they had said they would make a profit of 20% and eventually 46% and the director said that he never said so. They may not have said so in terms of percentage, but on the figures published in their prospectus it shows that the profit was in the region of 60% instead of 45% and that is the kind of industry which was given pioneer status. We will not take away their pioneer status because we will honour the terms of an agreement which has been entered into; but as far as these *sub rosa* agreements are concerned, I am not concerned with them or with any undertakings given at luncheon parties, dinner parties or at any clandestine meeting between any undertaking and the Government of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot make my position any clearer than that. Having dealt at some length on that I can only give words of advice to the present people who are running the company. If they want to increase the sales of their products, they should desist from allowing anybody to make any political football of the company. They should desist from impressing upon the general public that the Government has made their beer too expensive to drink. I would

suggest that the kind of advertisement they should make is to say that Banks Beer is worth twice as much as what is being paid for it. I would say that even if the public had to pay a dollar for the beer, the company was still doing them a favour; but they, in their anxiety to be political say: "The Labour Party is in its revival and therefore let us call a meeting in Queen's Park and one in Clapham and tell the public that the price of beer is too high." They did not realise, Mr. Speaker, that in carrying out this invidious campaign they were cutting their own throats. I do not want to hear any more rum talk in this country. The sooner they get down to doing their job, the better it will be for them. I would only mention that in the United Kingdom the duty from rum, beer and tobacco account for 58% of the Government revenue of that country. The English people, or I should say the people in the United Kingdom, have battle-ships to maintain, and navies both of the air and of the sea to maintain. They have to keep the Empire going and they have to keep the flag waving as much as they can. 4.10 p.m.

They have to indulge in atomic research, and this gives you, Sir, an idea of the tremendous task of running a Government; 58% of all these funds expended in the United Kingdom come from rum, beer, whisky and tobacco. When you look on this side of the ocean and the picture here, you find that we derive perhaps less than 20% from these duties; so there is a lot of leeway to make up. I would be very dishonest to pretend that this is the last time in the history of or in our life time that we are going to see any increase in the duty of rum, beer and tobacco, if the standard of living of the people of this Island is going to be raised. Whenever we are in a tight corner, I would prefer to put the duty on rum and beer than on food and clothing. Some hon. members would have been only too glad to see me do that. I do not think they themselves would do it, but they are trying to encourage me to put taxes on food and clothing, because they want to see us out of office; but they forget that I eat and wear clothes too, and that children have to eat and wear clothes. I do not have to drink rum nor do children have to drink beer or smoke cigarettes; but they eat food and wear clothes. The Producers Association in British Guiana has called for one cent increase in rice. The price of rice in Barbados is 30% to 35% below what it is in Antigua and the other Islands that do not have as high a national income *per capita* as we have in Barbados; people who work for less pay more for rice. Despite all that, despite the \$133,000 we started off with in June by being short after the Budget Proposals, we had nearly a \$2.9 million gap between our revenue and our expenditure or *vice versa*; we were minus \$3 million. After the Budget Proposals I reduced it to \$133,000, but we had certain commitments cropping up during the past few weeks which may make it even more. Despite all that, this Government intends to see the price of rice does not go up. In other words, somewhere or the other I am going to find \$180,000 without increasing taxes to subsidise rice, because I realise school children eat rice; but do not come and cry any crocodile tears to me about rum in this year or any other years; it is a different matter altogether. Do not let the hon. member for St. Joseph or any other member tell me to tax shoes, because I am not interested. I am not interested in taxes on rice and matters of that kind; that is like getting blood taxes when you tax people's food, although there are some commodities on which they have to pay package tax. Unknown to the general public, we subsidise sugar all the time, although sugar is produced right here in Barbados. I did not do anything about that.

Hon. members made proposals in the course of the debate on this Resolution. I do not know if the hon. senior member for the City is going to be in his place, but I take some of the proposals seriously and some I do not take seriously at all. Some of them I will consider. Hon. members have suggested ways in which additional revenue can be raised, and I am prepared to listen to any proposals that come from any quarter, because I am not omniscient, all-seeing and all-knowing, and therefore if anybody gets up and makes a suggestion, I shall make a note of it and examine it critically and see what can be done. There is no necessity as far as I can see to impose any more taxes on the people of this country for the rest of the financial year; so members can relax a bit; but the more commitments

are created on the Treasury of this Island, we will have to meet the cost of these items from some source.

We are at the present moment discussing with other Governments the possibility of getting assistance from them. We do not turn up our noses and say we do not need milk like the last Government which was offered milk and declined to accept it. If we get milk for children, we will take it. We are not too proud to take milk to save the taxpayers some money. If we can get machinery and equipment, we intend to take it. I am in business with whoever is giving away. This is the part where we have no pride at all in this matter. I dare say if Russia decided to give away something, we would have to think twice before we declined. We would have to think very seriously if the Russians came in here tomorrow and said they are going to give us \$15 million, as long as they do not want to do like some industrialists and tell the Government how to run the country; but we know from experience that they usually want to have strings attached. If they would give money away without any strings, I would take it from Russia too, and I would not apologise for that; but when you have to pay for something, it is a different matter.

If hon. members on the opposite side make a suggestion, I will listen to that suggestion, because we have to pay for something; and any source we can get money from we are prepared to examine dispassionately, without rancour and without malice. The only reason why I have gone at great length and taken great pains to explain to members of this Hon. House the details and the motives of the recent tax imposition, is because very misleading statements have been made in public and in the Press which might make a certain amount of despondency and alarm not only amongst local inhabitants of this Island, but in the ranks of those who may be prepared to assist us from abroad.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Hon. Premier realising that we will have to close this debate at 4.30 p.m. continued until 4.25 p.m., resulting in a lot of unnecessary filibustering. There must be some reason why he does not want us to be heard. The debate started and I had no intention whatever of joining in the debate on his Budget Speech. I think the Premier and everybody in Parliament is aware of this, and it was because my deputy, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had handled it so well, and it was not at all necessary to add to anything he had to say; but now hearing the sort of speech you would expect from a platform, the Hon. Premier last Tuesday started off by saying that Mr. D'Aguiar would discover that he was a different sort of animal to Jagan in British Guiana. Jagan in British Guiana would say all this on a public platform, but he would have to rely on the cover and protection of Parliament. We were promised a statement by the week-end on Banks but nothing has happened and before I left somebody telephoned me.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the only reason why I have not released the statement on the operation of Banks Breweries is that I did not think it a matter of courtesy to this House that I should release a statement having started off a debate in this Chamber, and I am sure Your Honour will agree with me; but if the hon. member wants it down in writing because he could not digest it in the way it was served up to him now, he will have it very shortly. He need not have any fear.
4.20 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: You have heard all these promises and he said that it was coming at this week-end. Somebody rang me on the telephone and asked me if it were possible to pin him down to this House that I should release a statement or which Tuesday in which month in which year. We are accustomed to these promises.

Sir, I want to read Dr. Cummins' speech in Parliament on 3rd March, 1959.

Look at the cowardice of his act! Imagine the Hon. Premier in his responsible position telling people in the industry like Banks Breweries all these things. This copy of Hansard is likely to come into the hands of industrialists

all over the world. He has seen the flight in industrial capital from this country. Now he is bringing this country to a form of despair. If you would only judge his cowardly manner by the way he dealt with it today knowing that he was protected by Parliament! You heard him saying last week that he was a different animal to what they had in the jungles of British Guiana. Look at the way he has got behind the walls of Parliament to do a company injury knowing that all that we in this country can depend on is industrial capital and industrialists coming to the country. The Hon. Premier knows what is taking place in this country with our population. Can we continue to depend only on the canes which we grow? He knows too well that to increase production you have to take people out of the land. The hon. member lives like some trapped animal. Look at him there! Look at him like some trapped animal with his coat torn and his tail hanging low!

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We are getting a great deal of amusement from the hon. member. What the hon. member wants me to do is to get up and stop him, but I would like the hon. member to continue in the same strain because I have to pay \$1.50 for this kind of exhibition.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Premier is always referring to the group of rolling stock of the Barbados Labour Party. He is trembling like a trapped animal as to what is going to happen. Already he sees the smoking timbrels of battle; he hears the war cry and the howls. He knows it as he runs this country into danger and hunger. He proposes to call himself the Minister of Finance. Is the Minister of Finance made by the *Advocate*?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, you get all this type of filibustering.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order by the Hon. Premier, but I warn the hon. junior member for St. George to discontinue with the use of the word "cowardly" in relation to any member of this House.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, if you think it unparliamentary I will discontinue using it and if you think what I said was unparliamentary to the Hon. Premier, I will withdraw it.

This is not likely to happen to any responsible member that calls himself a Premier. He talks about the prospectus of Banks Breweries. That prospectus has been in the hands of every solicitor and lawyer of this Island. Every solicitor had the opportunity of perusing the prospectus of that company and advising their clients whether to put money into the company.

Anything that you do is done in the name of bringing in revenue. You snatch the bones from the jaws of the hungry police dogs. Look at him sitting there like a trapped animal with his teeth bared and breathing loudly and with his eyes narrowing to slits! This means nothing to him, what he is doing to the quarter million people in this country. Look at him there with his large body like a chained elephant with arches like William Tell. He talks about Mr. D'Aguiar and Banks Breweries in here just like a coward.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am warning the hon. junior member for St. George. That is very close to the border.

Mr. MILLER: The debates in Parliament should be an inspiration to the country.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. George has just said that the debates in Parliament should inspire and I humbly support him in his exhortation.

Mr. MILLER: I thank you very much.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. George so speak that his debates in Parliament would inspire.

Mr. MILLER: Next Tuesday would be the 28th of this month. That is when we are hoping to bring this Session to an end for a break. All of Tuesday last, the Hon. Premier in his reply has been speaking on one thing — Banks Breweries and Mr. D'Aguiar. He has not said one word in reply to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who took part in this debate. Nothing is forthcoming from the Hon. Premier of this country on that; nothing at all. He has spent two full days on a matter of Private Members' Business in an attempt to destroy Banks Breweries. He knows that this country may probably be two decades in trying to recover from this.

The Hon. Premier just spoke of the company wanting to manufacture malt. He knows that that was rejected by the last Cabinet. It is on the files in front of him. It was rejected when they applied for pioneer status. (Hon. E. W. BARROW: Which file?) The file which you have there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. George address this Chair.

Mr. MILLER: Very well, Mr. Speaker. They appealed to the last Government for pioneer status to manufacture malt and we said "no". The Government was changed in the meantime. We spent more than three quarters of an hour reading out the conditions of the existing Act on this Statute Book with reference to pioneer industries. The Hon. Premier asked what that had to deal with, but he knows very well that the hon. senior member for St. Philip criticised the last Government for failing to bring about legislation to make it easier for companies to come in. He knows that what we gave Banks Breweries was never given to any other pioneer industry. The Hon. Premier knows that an industry like Banks would involve 50% in risk capital. He is deciding what profit it should have. All that I fear is what harm it would do to the country.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I will pass the file over to the hon. member so that he can read it. Let him see what they say.

Mr. MILLER: That is the type of vulgarity which we get from him. I would have no part to do with that. He said earlier today that I corrected him last Tuesday.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before I ask for leave to suspend the sitting at this stage — and hon. members know what it is all about — I would like to ask for leave to give notice of a Resolution which came down too late to give notice of at the proper time.

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

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$1,876 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63 Part I — Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1962-63, No. 16, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

This Resolution is to be dealt with in Committee of Supply at the next meeting of the House.
4.30 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, at this stage, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members are aware of the reason for the suspension of the sitting at this stage; it is for a meeting of the Barbados Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in the Other Place. The question is that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour. Hon.

members in favour of that will say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. This sitting is accordingly suspended for thirty minutes.

On re-assembling,

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS AT THE DEEP WATER HARBOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the House had reverted to the consideration of Government Business. When we were last dealing with Government Business, Order No. 3 was being discussed. The Order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:— To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to the Barbados Sugar Producers Association (Inc.) of a parcel of land situate in the City of Bridgetown together with the store known as the Bulk Sugar Store and other ancillary buildings erected thereon and the machinery and equipment standing on the said parcel of land or used in connection with the storing or shipping of sugar in bulk from the said store at the Deep Water Harbour.

The Hon. Minister had moved the passing of the Resolution and that was seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. The hon. senior member for St. Peter contributed to the debate and the hon. senior member for the City was speaking when we adjourned for lunch. The hon. senior member for the City was speaking but I observe that he is not now in his seat. Does any other hon. member beside a Minister desire to speak on this Resolution at this stage?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, most of the criticisms, as far as I can recall, on this Resolution, did not centre around the provision of the Resolution itself, but were made in reference to certain aspects of the question of displaced workers. The hon. senior member for St. Peter seized the opportunity to refer to rumours which were rampant with regard to the terms and conditions of these displaced workers and also to reports which seem to purport that people who were entitled to receive money as displaced workers did not receive it. I think I might seize the opportunity to explain to the House what the position is. There are only ten remaining cases to be reviewed by the Displaced Workers' Allowances Board out of the total number of 1,080 persons who were entitled to receive some financial consideration of the amount of money made available for this purpose. Of these ten persons, one is a displaced worker who has a small remaining allowance of \$27; he has not yet come in for it and the cases of the other nine persons are at present the subject of review between the Displaced Workers' Allowance Board and the Barbados Workers' Union. The total amount of money distributed up to the end of July is the sum of \$1,555,019.85; the administrative expenses of running the Board to the same date amount to \$14,437.56 and the balance in hand to the credit of the Board now stands at \$14,943.42 to be utilised as I said for sundry claims for these remaining ten workers as soon as the discussions are over. Of the 1,071 workers whose cases have been dealt with, 283 are lorry hands, 66 sugar workers, 173 sugar porters, 148 stevedores, 5 tally clerks, 7 work clerks, 15 launchmen, 20 ship workmen, 169 steamer warehouse porters and 324 lightermen. From the displaced workers there were 48 stevedores and 68 longshoremen.

Sir, in view of the wide currency which is being given to a lot of these malicious rumours and unfounded propaganda — we have actually been told by some of these displaced workers that they have been told by members of the former Government Party that this disbursement should be an annual affair: and the workers themselves seem to think, when they hear the total amount of money disbursed, that since, in individual cases, only \$1,800 or \$2,000 was disbursed, it means that the totality of the money would reach a considerable amount much over a million and a half dollars. In view of that, we have decided to publish a statement showing the name of each displaced worker who has received compensation from this Fund and the amount of money he has received so that the total of \$1 1/2 million which has been disbursed will be accounted for, in that the public will be able to see the name and the amount which each individual got out of the total. That should put an end

to this malicious and unjustifiable propaganda that people who have been entitled to money had not got it or that the total amount which had been made available to these people had not been disbursed.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this point, I would appreciate it if the hon. member would refer to the lease and not take more of the latitude which he did not crave but which I allowed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I quite appreciate that. As I said at the beginning, the burden of the criticism made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter did not centre on the Resolution, but that the hon. member had seized the opportunity to refer to some aspects of the disbursement by the Displaced Workers' Allowances Board. I think that what I have said will satisfy hon. members that the steps which we propose to take now will demonstrate beyond the slightest shadow of doubt that the Board has discharged its responsibility and that further money will be disbursed in respect of the cases of these ten people.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for the City had raised the question as to whether this land at the Deep Water Harbour was situated in the City of Bridgetown. That question arose out of a recent court case in which somebody was charged with some offence and the hon. member asked the Hon. Minister to state whether this Resolution was in order when it states that this land is now situated in the City of Bridgetown. I ask this question in the absence of the hon. senior member for the City because he may want to know the reply which will be given to his question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seeking a legal opinion?

Mr. GODDARD: No, Sir, I would not seek a legal opinion in here.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the matter of the Port not being in the City is at present occupying the attention of the Crown Law Officers of the Government. I may say that on the day after it was announced in the Press that the Court had arrived at that decision, the Port Manager and myself referred the matter to the Crown Law Officers for their opinion and action to be taken in order to make sure that law and order can be maintained within the area of the Port.

5.15 p.m.

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

THE BOUNDARIES COMMISSION ACT, 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Boundaries Commission and for matters connected therewith and incidental to the same.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, one of the promises which this Government made to the electorate of this Island at the time of the recent General Election in December, 1961, was that as soon as possible after taking over the control of the Government of this country, we would introduce legislation for the introduction of single member constituencies for the purpose of representation in the General Assembly of the Island.

A Bill of this kind takes some careful and mature consideration, and we have been working on the provisions of this Bill for some considerable time, and two weeks ago, I moved the first reading of the Bill in the House of Assembly. Before we can introduce single member constituencies, it will be necessary for us to re-allocate the boundaries of the constituencies of the Island on such a basis as may be recommended by a special body of persons appointed for this purpose. This Bill at the present moment has nothing to do with the Local Government elections, but it may be possible to consider, under a separate amendment, maybe, to the Representation of the People Act or whatever relevant legislation there may be, the re-allocation of the constituencies even in Local Government.

I would like to make it clear that the purpose of this Bill is to create a Boundaries Commission to look into the constituencies for the purpose of elections to the General Assembly of Barbados. In British Guiana, our nearest territory in the Caribbean where there has been a recent re-allocation and re-distribution of seats, the examination was done by a judge of the High Court of the United Kingdom. We are moving towards independence very steadily. As a matter of fact, the date on which we get independence in Barbados is entirely a matter now where we do not regard we should ask anybody for independence. That was the approach of the last Government; but when this Government is ready, we will notify the United Kingdom Government of the date on which we intend to celebrate our emancipation from the settled colonial status under which we are now established; so I want to make that point clear. Everything this Government does is with a view to having the full control of our own destinies in our own hands. We do not think that the people of this Island can in any way achieve their full political, constitutional and economic personalities if we are in any way inhibited or restrained by having to refer matters, which we consider ourselves to be the best judges of, to some group of individuals who, for historical reasons have so long presided over our destinies.

The reason why Barbados is not getting independence this year are mainly two. The first reason is that we want to advance towards independence along with our brethren in the other Caribbean territories around us, the Windward Islands and the Leeward Islands. The second reason is that we have to set the affairs of this country in order before we begin thinking of spending money on independence celebrations. In anything that we do as a Government, we pay due attention to the constitutional proprieties, but I would like to assure hon. members that I have not referred one single matter since I have been head of the Cabinet of this Island to the Colonial Office to find out whether we can get permission to do so-and-so. In so far as another country may be assisting us whether in the form of technical co-operation or in the form of assisting in the way of loans, naturally we can only do that with consultation; but this country has for a considerable period of time enjoyed a constitutional form of Government which has been in advance of the rest of the Caribbean, and that prerogative of ours has only been put into cold storage during the tenure of office of the last Government which always ran up to the Colonial Office to ask permission even if they wanted to leave the room. I make this statement now, Sir, without fear of contradiction either by Her Majesty's Government or any other Government.

I have already been assured by two Secretaries of State that whenever Barbados is ready for independence, the British Government is not going to stand in its way. Constitutional forms do not feed people. As I heard the now Prime Minister of the independent country of Jamaica state in 1947, that is some fifteen years ago, at a meeting which I attended, he said that philosophy does not plant yams. (A VOICE: But philosophers do.) Neither do philosophers, and constitutional lawyers unfortunately do not necessarily connote economic emancipation. If we have not in this Bill taken recourse to asking an individual, whether it be a High Court judge or any other person, to come down from another country in order to divide up our boundaries for us, it is not that this Government wants to act in any manner which is unconstitutional. Indeed, Sir, we would consider it in the light of our present state of development unconstitutional for us on the eve of independence to ask somebody to come and tell us how our boundaries should be delineated, and in this Bill therefore, we have put the power of demarcation, delineation and recommendation in the hands of the members of the House of Assembly under His Honour the Speaker. I mention that because I am sure some members will say we should bring in somebody from outside.

5.25 p.m.

If you believe that you have control over your own destinies, it is an admission of inferiority to suggest that you are not to be trusted to do certain things yourself. That is a conception which was shared by a certain section of the community right here in this Island. If the last Government

wanted to do anything, they had to get some kind of expert to come from an overseas territory to tell them what to do although they were the elected representatives of the people. The only thing I commend them for was the acknowledgement of their incompetence and lack of knowledge of how the country should be run. We are not omniscient in everything, and there are fields of enterprise and fields of endeavour in which it is still sometimes necessary for us to get someone to give us advice, whether we like to take the advice and follow it; but in a matter of fixing boundaries in an Island in which all of us have been born and certainly brought up and in which we hope to enjoy many more years of political activity, it would be monstrous to suggest that we need someone to tell us how to amend our own premises.

In this Bill, it is proposed that the Speaker of the General Assembly should be the Chairman of the Commission; that a Deputy Chairman should be appointed by the Governor in accordance with the advice of the Premier and that the remaining three members should be members of the General Assembly appointed by the Governor — two in accordance with the advice of the Premier and the other in accordance with the advice of the Leader of the Opposition.

As soon as the Boundaries Commission therefore is appointed to carry out its work, His Excellency the Governor in accordance with the formality which I have just enunciated will be expected to get to work and make a report to this House, not to any Commissioner or anything like that. Then the House will consider the Report and make the necessary amendments. The necessary amendments to the Representation of the People Act would be then introduced and then we will have single-member constituencies.

It is competent for the Boundaries Commission to get any kind of advice whether legal or practical that they desire. There is absolutely no restriction on that. It is competent for the Boundaries Commission to get somebody from another territory who may have some experience to give evidence or make recommendations to them; but the power and authority resides with this Chamber. I want to make that clear.

I think that the other provisions in the Bill are merely corollary to the main provisions that the Boundaries Commission should be constituted under the Chairmanship of Your Honour and the representatives of this Chamber playing a prominent part.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I think that every member of this Chamber will agree that this Bill was long overdue. When we were in opposition with the present Government, this matter was an annual debate in here calling on the then Government to set up a Boundaries Commission for this very purpose. I need not reiterate the reasons which were propounded then because they stand equally good today: I will just state some of the comments which were made from time to time. The one which stands out most in my memory is when it was said that we should be representing people and not cane fields. As it is constituted today many members represent cane fields in relation to those who represent people such as those representatives in St. Michael and Christ Church.

The present set up dates back to 300 years when the Island was divided into parishes, and St. Michael, though it was equal in size approximately to Christ Church and St. Philip, was represented by only two members. Then they divided it into St. Michael and the City of Bridgetown and gave two members to the City, two to St. Michael and two to the other parishes. That was quite good in those days; but long past is the time when representation of St. Michael and Christ Church has been adequate. By no stretch of the imagination can anyone say that two members can represent the 35,000 people in St. Michael and two members should represent less than 4,000 people in St. Andrew or St. Joseph.

This Bill had to be brought up today and it is left to this Government to fulfil their promise. I commend it and I am glad that they have been able to do this in the very first session and they have not left it over until next year although we cannot have a bye-election on this; therefore this cannot come into play until there is another General Election. By that, I mean if there is to be a bye-election, I take it that the existing method of representation would pertain. If there is to be a bye-election in any one parish, we will continue with the present method of representation until the next General Elections.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the constitution of the Boundaries Commission is a wise one. This is a small Island and you could not show me any commissioner from outside or within who would know the facts more fully than those people who have been representing the people of this Island. It is the members of this House who do the campaigning: so they know the division of this Island better than any commissioner you can appoint and it should not be a Herculean task for them to come to an early decision and return their report to this House.

I commend the Bill; but I would ask the Hon. Premier, although he mentioned that this is not for the purpose of Local Government, if he paid any attention to the fact that a revision is absolutely necessary if we are to have a Federal Election. It is true that we are not in a Federation now, but we are actively considering that question now; and although he should not make a decision until the Federation is formed and we know how many seats are allotted to Barbados because that is another discussion to take place, what I want to point out is that what is most alarming is that we had a Federal Election for the entire Island, and Mr. Speaker, as it was said then, if by chance we had a bye-election in Barbados, do you realise the cost which this Island would have been put to in order to find one representative to go to the Federal Parliament?

5.35 p.m.

The entire island would have to be canvassed all over again. It was unfair, but it suited the purposes of the last Government because it was said that if it did not suit them to change it, why should they change it? This is the time to do this thing and let us do a good job. I commend this Bill because it is a Bill which is absolutely necessary so that we do not go into another General Election as we have gone on in the past. I do not know if there will be a recommendation or if it will be in the terms of reference of the Commission to state whether there should be more seats than are now existing in this Chamber. (MEMBERS: Read the Schedule.) I have been told that I should read the Schedule. Well, Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference should be so wide as to permit the Commission to make a recommendation for the widening of this House, if in the division that is necessary.

I could not see how a proper division of 35,000 electors in St. Michael could be made and with 16,000 in Christ Church there could be adequate representation of people and still maintain the method of 24 members in this House. I think that if it can be done then it should be done; but I do not think the Commission should be hampered in coming to a better conclusion or a more satisfactory arrangement for the representation of people if it is deemed necessary to increase the number of members of this House for that purpose. Let us get it straight. We wish equal representation as near as possible. Do not let us come back here with a recommendation that for one representative in the metropolitan area, there should be 10,000 people and that the number of representatives in St. Andrew should be two. I say: let us come over and let us recommend or widen the powers of the Commission to do an extremely good job along these lines. Let us represent people and not areas of land. There are vast numbers of territories in St. Andrew and St. Joseph and they are not entitled to any greater representation than in the metropolitan area or in Christ Church, St. Philip or St. George. I have been told that the scope for widening is not here and I hope that the necessary amendment will be made. Mr. Speaker, I will not be able to speak again but I am quite sure that, after what I have said hon. members will take it up and if the necessary amendment is made for that, I shall support it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would give way, I am not replying now, but I just want to clear up something which was said during the course of the debate. The hon. junior member for Christ Church asked whether there should be the same number of seats. I do not share the view that the Schedule imposes a limitation on the number of seats. If hon. members would look at Section 10 of the Bill, I believe - it is really Section 11, - they will see that reference is made to the Representation of the People Act, 1957.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is speaking on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is absolutely correct, Sir. In Section 11 on page 4 of this Bill you will see this:-

"The Commission shall review the boundaries of the constituencies into which the Island is divided under and virtue of sub-section (1) of Section three of the Representation of the People Act, 1957, and within six months after the date upon which the Commission is appointed or within such further time as the Governor may, on the application of the Commission through its Chairman determine, submit to the General Assembly a report showing the constituencies into which it recommends that the island should be divided in order to give effect to the Rules set out in the Schedule to this Act."

In Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Representation of the People Act, it tells you into how many constituencies the island is divided. The Boundaries Commission itself merely delineates the boundaries and makes a recommendation in order to decide how many constituencies there will be from time to time. Due regard will be paid to the recommendations of the Boundaries Commission; but the Report of the Boundaries Commission will, in some instances, involve an amendment to Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Representation of the People Act. (*ASIDE*) If the Commission says that the island should have 28 constituencies - I am explaining this because the hon. member who spoke in an aside just now, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, is one of the persons who corrected the hon. member who queried this point, Section 3 of the Representation of the People Act is the one which we will go to when we want to know the number of seats. The Bill does not say that the island is to be divided into as many constituencies as there are members of the General Assembly, but into as many constituencies as there will be under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Act of 1957.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Premier will listen to hon. members and then reply generally. As I said earlier today, hon. members must do their home work. This Bill is one which proposes to deal with something which should have been dealt with before. I agree in principle with this Bill, but I will speak on certain Clauses with which I do not agree. In this Bill it is proposed that a lawyer is to be the Chairman of the Commission and a lawyer is the Speaker of the House of Assembly. I hope that the position would be the same even if the Speaker of the General Assembly was not a lawyer. I do not feel, however, that every lawyer is *ipso facto* knowledgeable on all matters.
5.45 p.m.

For that reason I say it is a very welcome change that has been made that you can get a Commission to deal with something like this without bringing somebody from England or somewhere else to make heavy weather of something that is extremely light. I would say that this Commission can report in three months working half day each day and having enough time to go sailing or have some other recreation. This is a slight job. The difficulties are not going to be in this, and I will say more than what the Hon. Premier or the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said. I do not agree that Barbados is in need of any more members in the House of Assembly than twenty-four. Barbados is fully represented on the basis of twenty-four members for a population of 240,000 people, and we would be going crazy if we want to make them more.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I made it clear that the Commission should have powers to state whether the number should be more or less, but I do not want to hamper the Commission.

Mr. WALCOTT: We are giving guidance here now to the Commission. Members must understand their Parliamentary duty. The Commission is not a bear behind something that is going to fly out. I am a member of this Assembly of twenty-four members, and I say that Barbados is fully represented by the twenty-four members to 240,000 people; therefore I agree with the Schedule. I agree with the Hon. Premier in his statement and decision in making it a Parliamentary Commission of which the members of Parliament would know something. Where I take issue with the Premier is on the method of appointing the Commission. I have no objection the Premier asking the Leader of the Opposition to nominate a person, I do not believe the Premier would ignore the composition of this House, but I have an analytical mind and the present composition of this Chamber could not give the Leader of the Opposition alone the right or the privilege to nominate a member because 25% of the total membership of the House forms groups other than the group which the Leader of the Opposition represents. If you are making it a Parliamentary Commission, my submission to the Premier is that he has the right to nominate the Deputy Chairman, and I hope that in view of the fact that he has to advise Government on the appointment of the Deputy Chairman, he should see that the Deputy Chairman should also be a member of Parliament and not an outsider, because if you are making it a Parliamentary delegation, do not let us believe that there is somebody outside wiser and who knows more than somebody in here, and therefore we should appoint that person to take your position, Mr. Speaker, because if you become ill, which we hope will not take place during the course of this Commission, it would make it extremely difficult if the substantive holder is not in Your Honour's high position, or somebody from outside not commanding the same mutual respect and honour which Your Honour would have from being an elected member of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, if the Deputy Chairman is going to be the Deputy Speaker, therefore the Premier would already have nominated the Deputy Speaker who is a member of his Party. Then he has two other members to nominate, and taking into consideration the other distribution of the members of the House, I would say that it would be giving the Leader of the Opposition more representation within this context than his present position deserves, because his position would have been a minority position. It is not sending him on a delegation or asking him to choose a delegation; it is asking him to choose one of his equals in Parliament, and therefore it would be ignoring the other composition of the House. For example, in the Party of the Hon. Premier there are fourteen seats, and there are ten other seats in the Assembly. Of the other ten seats four are members of the Party of the Leader of the Opposition. By that composition his position for Commission purposes, since you are making it a Parliamentary Commission, could not deserve the right to do that nomination, because in that instance he would nominate a member from his Party, and therefore it would mean that it would not reflect the present composition of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that the Leader of the Opposition should not be given this privilege, but by the method of this Commission it ignores the composition of the House, because if you had to go by the members of the House, the membership of the Opposition could not be deemed to have the right to serve on the Commission more so than other members who are not members of the Government Party, because they are in the minority; so it is only the Parliamentary procedure with which we agree. If you did not have a person known as the Leader of the Opposition, he would not have the privilege of being asked to nominate somebody, because in our context our composition in Barbados so far has always been the minority. In the United Kingdom where this method has been used or where you have an approach like this, whenever you have an Opposition in the House of Commons it is very substantial. For example, when the Commission was set up in England, the

Labour Party had something like 200 members and the Liberals had six; so they had to ask the Leader of the Opposition to nominate somebody. The same thing does not apply here, and I do not see that under this constitutional set-up this can be done unless the Premier is going to say that the composition of the Commission is going to be spread right over the membership.

In this House of Assembly, for instance, I am not affiliated to any Party; there were two defections from the Barbados Labour Party which means that that Party now has three members, two members are in a wavering position, and if I wanted to lead an Independent Opposition, I would ask them to come over with me, and our status would only be a fraction less; but we have no composition in the Independents. I feel that the Premier should review the Clause which deals with the Leader of the Opposition, or increase the membership of the Commission so that it would give a better reflection of the present composition of the House itself.

Mr. Speaker, I join issue with the Premier on another point. I am not like the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and that is why I say that Barbados does not need any more members, because I am bold enough to say that this job can be done easily. If they are afraid of saying how the constituencies should be divided, I am not, and that is where I do not agree with the Premier in his draft. I do not agree with the Rule which speaks about the electorate. That, in my opinion, is not a sound basis for giving proportionate representation. Proportionate representation must be based on the number of people who live in that area that are eligible to go on the roll, not those that are on it now. I am not going to agree that because there are only 35,000 people on the roll, that is therefore what it is. In my own parish of St. Peter with a population of 10,783 roughly, my view is that we are entitled to a seat, and St. Lucy is also entitled to one seat because their population is 8,800 and one seat in St. Joseph. I am not thinking about members, I am thinking about posterity. This was in operation for about.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, is the hon. member a one-man Boundaries Commission now?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir; I am a one-man Boundaries Commission, and the reason why I am that is because when you read the Rules, you will see that the Island shall be divided into as many constituencies as there are members of the General Assembly, which means that you want the Island to be divided into twenty-four constituencies.
5.55 p.m.

The Island shall be divided into as many constituencies as there are members of the General Assembly.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I am trying to explain to the hon. member is this. I had quite a lot to do with the drafting of it and I have records of the United Kingdom, Trinidad, Jamaica and British Guiana legislation, some of which I have here with me. It was never the intention, according to the Schedule, that the Island should be divided into as many constituencies as there are members of the General Assembly. That was interpreted to mean this General Assembly. That is why I referred the hon. member to the Rule.

Mr. WALCOTT: You can give that interpretation but you can also give my interpretation. This is not only open to one interpretation. The hon. member has in the Bill itself:

"The Commission may depart from the strict application of rule two of these Rules if it considers that it is desirable to do so having regard to the difference between urban and rural areas in respect of density of population."

"For the purposes of these Rules the expression "electorate" means, in relation to a constituency, the number of House of Assembly electors (within the meaning of that expression in regulation two of the Registration of Electors Regulations, 1955) whose names, with respect to that constituency, appear on the register of House of Assembly electors that is in force on the date on which the

Commission commences its review under and by virtue of section eleven of this Act."

Now, the Hon. Premier may say that the Commission need not be bound to interpret this part of the rule to mean only the present membership but they can also make a recommendation for which they recommend that the Island should be distributed on a higher basis than the present membership.

The hon. member said that I am a one-man Commission. There is no point at this period of our existence anybody coming along and making the public believe that they need more than 24 people to represent them. I am not going to fool them that we need to amend that because that would only be increasing the ordinary administrative expenses of this country. I maintain that the present composition of the Barbados Assembly is quite enough and you can divide the Island up into constituencies for the same twenty-four members. The whole idea of single-member constituencies was not to give you more seats; it was to rationalise the whole situation in which you have dual membership. You can understand why that was the situation. In the olden days, they were the horse and buggy days. There were no taxis and to get from St. Lucy to Bridgetown you took eight hours. However, today when you talk in terms of population, you talk in terms of thousands, and there is no constituency in Barbados in which it would be difficult to get in touch with all the people if you put it down on the proportionate basis of which the Government has in their Bill. It says: "The electorate shall, so far as practicable, be equal in all constituencies."

As far as I am concerned, I do not care if the population distribution is equal. However, you have to look at the distribution of the population. In Bridgetown, there are 11,000 people. Bridgetown would be entitled to a seat. The Island can be divided on the basis of St. John, St. Thomas, St. Peter, St. Lucy, St. Andrew and St. Joseph having one seat each, that is to say, those six parishes would have six seats, each having one representative. The City would have one. That would bring it to seven. The composition of Christ Church with 33,000 people in it would be entitled to three seats; therefore that would bring the membership so far to ten. St. George will have two, St. Philip two, and that will bring the number to fourteen. St. James also with their population will have two to make it sixteen and St. Michael with 80,000 people and where the shift of the population is would be entitled to seven or eight seats.

That is the only sensible distribution which you can have; if not, you are not ready for the change. Do not go in for anything for which you are not ready. Tell me at this stage why a candidate cannot canvass ten thousand people. Tell me why you say that you can only canvass five thousand people for one seat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at one time previously, it was used against you or towards you; but we who come in here are dealing with people and you should not think when you come in here that this is a place where you come to retire. What hon. members have to realise is that if you enter into this political life you cannot have a boundary in Barbados on the stupid basis of dividing the parishes into two. Let us say, you are dealing with the parish of St. Michael; you should divide it into two, and call one part St. Michael North and the other St. Michael South. Then when you go to another parish, you find another member only having 1,000 people to play with. When you keep a mass meeting, you talk to more than 1,000 people. Now, you are going to tell me that you want to divide up parishes which have a population of only 10,000 people with all the little children, school children and everybody else.

This is nothing which has been constituted on a population basis. St. Michael has 37,000 people on the electorate. I do not represent St. Michael, but it is stupid for anyone representing St. Michael to say that he is representing 35,000 people when you have thousands of people in St. Michael who are not registered but who are eligible to be on the Registration Roll. If you were to make registration compulsory, you will see what you would get on the roll.

St. Michael has a population of 80,000 people. What is the average number of people that is eligible to vote? You must also bear in mind that if the recommendation which I have put forward that the voting age be reduced to 18 years was to be accepted, it will also increase the eligible people to be registered; therefore you have to consider how many people would be put on if the age were to be reduced to 18 years.

You can get that information. The number of people of nineteen years and over in this Island's population is regarded as something like 23,340. People between the ages of 45 years and 49 years are 33,000, between the ages of 60 years and over, 21,000, between 0 and 4 years, 31,000, between 5 and 15 years 32,000, between the age of 15 and up to 19 years, 23,000. Therefore, Sir, you find under the age of 18 years that there is something like 86,000 people and if you add another 20,000 people, you will have roughly about 100,000 people; therefore, what would fall in the number eligible to vote would be 140,000 people and above. 6.05 p.m.

On the basis of 140,000 with 24 members, you can see what is the total membership. It will be less than 10,000; therefore nobody should quibble about having a population basis on that score. This is something of which I have made a study to show that if there is anybody who says that Barbados is entitled to have more than 24 members in the General Assembly, I say 'No'. Jamaica has 40 odd members with a population of nearly 1 1/2 million. The total population of Barbados is not as big as that of Kingston and St. Andrew in the metropolitan area; but on the basis of the population of Barbados and representation in the House of Assembly *vis-a-vis* representation in the House of Commons, that would run into nearly 100 members. Some years ago it was a luxury for Barbados with 59 votes to send back two people in St. Andrew and in St. Michael you had 400 votes representing 80,000 people. That was before we were interested in these things; but today 24 members can give adequate representation.

In the Northern part of the island they said they did not want anything to disturb the equilibrium and in any distribution they would be dividing St. Lucy into two. I say that it is a matter for the Commission when they sit; it will be a Parliamentary Commission, and the Premier said he will nominate these members. His Party must be able to print a Manifesto saying what were our views on single member constituencies. Is it that our policy should impose a greater membership than our present representation? It should not be for the Commission to decide if Barbados must have 24, 30 or 40 members; that should not be within the power of the Commission.

As to the parish of St. Peter, if we go on a purely arithmetical basis of dividing the seats, St. Peter would be more entitled to go over the number; because if you say that you want one member for every additional part exceeding a certain number, we would have two seats in St. Peter. As a representative of the General Assembly, I do not see that this General Assembly can really justify the claim for a total membership exceeding 24 members in 1962. What I have done is what the other members have been entitled to do, that is, to know the population distribution of the island; to know how many people there are in the area which you represent and put forward a case for that. The Electorate cannot be the answer. I hope that the Hon. Premier will not take the same line as the Premier in the last Government took, that is to say, not to pass anything which would dispossess him. The last Government said that they were not in favour of single member constituencies. I think I said that it was in the last Government's Manifesto. The Party did not say anything to the contrary but in 1946 they said that they believed in single member constituencies. (Hon. E. W. BARROW: They said that in 1951 too.) I hope that the Premier will not do like the last Government Party. I am sorry that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not now in his seat. I have heard it rumoured that if you divide the constituency of St. Michael, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would get more seats with all the public assistance he can dish out. On this matter of public assistance, I would like to see the hon. member come down to St. Peter and dish out that public

assistance; he can dish out old clothes like wild fire down there.

You do not want to put an iron curtain around yourself. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is my personal friend.

Mr. GODDARD: On a point of order, I think it would be more in order for the hon. member to talk about Social Services in this matter of giving away clothes.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, it is a question of Social Services. No developing country can develop without social services or without socialism. I want to say that any man who says that he is a Conservative is poles apart from me. If I could not beat a Conservative at the polls then I am not worth while. You have to know how to beat people; however, sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. 6.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, somebody asked me why I do not come into the City, but I will ask him why he does not come to St. Peter. I am not throwing out any challenge, but if anybody wants to challenge me, let him come to St. Peter if he wants me to come to the City. I do not think that a member should give up a particular constituency which he has been representing to show that he can get in in another constituency. You can only sit in one seat at a time, and any member who tries to sit down in more than one seat would be asked by Your Honour to conduct himself properly. That is why I say it is not a challenge to any hon. member, but a challenge to commonsense, and I say to the Hon. Premier when he talks about Federation that we will have to lead the other people. I know the mentality of the people in the Leeward and Windward Islands, and if you stuff up Barbados, they will think of padding up too. There are members who came here for the first time who may ask where they stand if you divide the Island on a single member constituency basis. These are considerations that Party politics involve, but not constitutional matters. You are looking for safety, not for a constitution; so if you are looking for a constitution, it is not a matter of safety, because you can get another seat.

Mr. Speaker, why should Christ Church not be divided? If there are sectors of this community with the feeling that the hon. junior member for Christ Church can reflect their point of view and sentiments, I do not see why he should not have a seat in this Assembly; but if they are in the minority, they will get minority representation. I do not think, however, on that minority representation that he could represent the broad masses of people that my point of view would be in consonance with; so if you have to concede a seat to someone who is stronger, there is nothing wrong with that and it is a question of persuasion. Maybe some person like myself can go into an area in which he is strong and say that he can represent the people better than the former member. I do not feel that on the basis of the electorate there should be more than twenty-four members, unless you want to spend money stupidly, and I would say that if you are hard up for cash and you are going to create seats for twenty-five, twenty-six or thirty members to accommodate any extra members, that would be madness.

The metropolitan area of St. Michael, Mr. Speaker, is a hunting ground for politicians, and any member who could not retain his seat would not be worth his salt. The metropolitan area is a ground for Socialists. Attlee went into the toughest district as a Socialist and remained there until he went to the House of Lords. I know the hon. senior member for the City would not like me to say this, but at one stage I thought the City was heavier than what it was. There is a shift of population now from the City to St. Michael, because the City at one time had about 15,000 people, but some of these have now shifted to St. Michael in the housing areas built up at the Pine, Cave Hill and other places, so that St. Michael now carries a bigger population. And with the development of the rural areas, you will also create that situation. The type of developments you would have outside the City and metropolitan area would make some of the rural areas become better areas for representation.

I feel therefore, Mr. Speaker, that Clause 4 of the Rule should be deleted, because it has no meaning. This

Rule says that "for the purposes of these Rules the expression 'electorate' means, in relation to a constituency.." Why are you having a Boundaries Commission based on the electorate? It should be on the population and not on the electorate. You have 35,000 people on the roll in St. Michael when there are 80,000 people in that parish; so that is not the basis for determining it. When you find the distribution of population is so even in Barbados, it makes it easy. The electors in Christ Church was 14,000, St. George 10,000, St. Philip 15,000, St. John 8,000, St. James 7,800, St. Thomas 8,500, St. Peter 8,300, St. Lucy 8,700, St. Joseph 6,000, St. Andrew 8,700, but the number of people in Christ Church is 33,000, St. Philip 17,000, St. George 18,000, St. Michael excluding Bridgetown 81,000, Bridgetown 11,000, St. John 10,900, St. James 13,500, St. Thomas 9,900, St. Peter 10,700, St. Lucy 8,800, St. Joseph 8,500 and St. Andrew 7,000 making a total population of 231,000.

When you get that situation, Mr. Speaker, then I am submitting that our population is distributed evenly in certain parishes and it makes it easier for a Boundaries Commission to work on a population basis than on an electoral basis.

If you are going to take the population basis and determine your electorate, the age groups would give you that, and the reason why I say that is because in another two to ten years you cannot assume that the average electorate is going to be different. It must be similar because the disparity of ages in this Island among the same number of population is even. You do not know that in ten thousand people that you are going to find 50% at one age and only 10% at another age. People do not seem to procreate on such an uneven basis. For that reason, the only way you can have a Boundaries Commission with proper terms of reference is to have it on a population basis, and then I would use the phrase that has been used in the Bill "as far as is practicable". If you use the term that the population as far as is practicable be the determining factor, I think you would do better.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be fair to the other members of this Chamber to have a Parliamentary Boundaries Commission in which the Premier could not give wider representation than is now envisaged here, because it would savour too much of restricting it, in that the Leader of the Opposition would not be entitled to give advice to the Government. Twenty-five percent is more than sixteen percent, and if you give 16% representation in an Act, therefore in the same Act mention should be made of the 25%, and that is again part of the original argument for a Boundaries Commission, because it has to reflect the present composition of the members in the Chamber. I have been canvassing in this House longer than the majority of members here, and I have been a member for seventeen years and should know something about boundaries. There is no constituency in which I have not been in this Island at one time or other and supported a successful candidate; so I know the whole Island. 6.25 p.m.

I do not think that I would be pleading for any personal position, but as a parliamentarian, I cannot see how you are going to have a Boundaries Commission which is to be selected from Parliament when it is not going to reflect the views of Parliament as a whole. If the Boundaries Commission is representative of all sections of Parliament, then, for practical purposes you can very well say that its recommendations will be freely accepted.

Sir, those are my views. As you know, I am in favour of single-member constituencies; therefore, this is a question of which I am in favour in principle.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church spoke about a division for Federal Elections. As you know, I was the one person who suffered at the hands of this monstrosity which you had in this Island when you turned the Island into one constituency for the Federal Elections. I got more votes than five of them put together, but because of the monstrosity which you had, I was not elected. The Government at that time was doing something because they wanted to keep somebody out. However, sometimes failure brings

its compensating good. As I have said, I agree with the principle of the Bill but those details which I have mentioned are extremely important in making the Bill workable.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the big bone here, the whole idea aback of this, after careful study of the Objects and Reasons is that you want to be a little more liberal by way of representation to the adults of this country.

Now, there is one thing — I do not know what is aback of this. For instance, you say that the report must be submitted within six months after the date upon which the Commission is appointed and then you go on to say 'or within such further time as the Governor may on the application of the Commission through its Chairman, determine'. Why mention that? There is no restriction as to time because you can put on a further time of six months and then when that is out, you can put on another period of six months. This is not going to work.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that this period of six months is not going to work. He will be interested to know that in first draft which we had of this Bill, the period of time in which this Commission was to report back was ten weeks. I pointed out to the draftsman that the Trinidad legislation was amended at a time when they had already decided on the date for the election and therefore they had to report in ten weeks. However, I did not see how for people who have jobs to do as must all the members of this side have to do and in the centre, not to mention the Chairman, you could expect members, unless they were going to work every single day on this alone, to report in ten weeks. The idea of putting it at six months is to make the Boundaries Commission understand that they cannot sit down on this matter indefinitely, and one of the reasons why this Boundary Commission is to be appointed from representatives of this House is because any member of this House would be free at any time to get up and ask questions as to the progress being made. The extension of time does not mean another six months but a reasonable time. Having a Boundaries Commission comprised of members of this House, we will have the advantage of being able to ask questions from time to time.

If the hon. junior member for St. George thinks the period of six months is too short, I only inform him that our original Bill — the one which was submitted to Your Honour for your comments and it was Your Honour who drew it to us that the period of ten weeks was not a sufficient time having regard to the occupation of hon. members of this House — contained a period of time of ten weeks.

Sir, I rise and explain all of that now because unfortunately, I may not be in a position to answer the hon. junior member for St. George at a later stage because of other demands being currently made on my attention.

Mr. MILLER: Why should the Hon. Premier elect to leave this Chamber at this time?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I never elected to leave the Chamber at this time. I will only tell the hon. member that several members on this side are capable of dealing with anything which he or any hon. member of that side is capable of raising.

So far as that matter is concerned, I took up a great deal of time in replying at length. This is a matter which I was personally concerned with and which we are perfectly aware of and, as I have said, I think it was Your Honour who drew it to our attention that the period of ten weeks which we had in the first draft was too short.

Mr. MILLER: What I am worried about, Mr. Speaker, is not that the report is to be submitted within six months, but as you have it, you are giving six months, then the Chairman can make application for further time — possibly ten weeks — and it can go on and on like that. You want to examine this. It is stated: "or within such further time as the Governor may on the application of the Commission through its Chairman, determine". You can ask for another year, or even two years.

The Hon. Premier was very clever in answering the questions. He stated that it must be completed in six months. However, while it is stated here that the Chairman must report in six months, the Chairman can apply to the Governor for an extension of the time; therefore, it can continue for another two years. We have reasons to be unhappy about this. So, Sir, we cannot say from this if a report will be submitted to us in six months' time, a year, or even two years. As it stands here, this can struggle on and take five years. There is nothing in this document or in this Bill to say that it must be submitted back to this Chamber within six months or a year.

We want to be more specific about this. The Hon. Premier spoke at length and this is where the creaking machinery fails always. All the Caesars die because of this: all the dictators die because of this attitude.

You talk of your widening the scope of representation of the masses. You say that this Boundaries Commission must be handled by members of Parliament. We of the Barbados Labour Party agitated for this representation when we were elected to this country.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. George should be the last person to talk about the period of time. We said that the Commission which is to be representative of this House of Assembly should report within six months. They kept the electorate of Barbados waiting fifteen years. Does he mean to say that we will keep it fifteen months? However, it is really immaterial so far as that is concerned because you cannot have a Boundaries Commission reporting for a bye-election; it will have to be for a General Election.

What the hon. member for St. Peter is worrying about, I cannot understand. He said that they were agitating for a revision. This Bill does not say that the persons elected to the Commission must be persons from a particular Party. I am not giving any undertaking now because I do not think it advisable or expedient to give undertakings now. However, according to the Bill, the Leader of the Opposition can nominate an Independent if he so cares; I can nominate two Independents or a member of the other Party along with one from my Party. The point which is important is that we are not bringing somebody from Scotland to tell us how to divide up our boundaries.
6.35 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, is that a point of order or a speech? The "Objects and Reasons" state that it is proposed that the Speaker of the General Assembly should be the Chairman of the Commission, that a Deputy Chairman should be appointed by the Governor in accordance with the advice of the Premier and that the remaining three members should be members of the General Assembly appointed by the Governor — two in accordance with the advice of the Premier and the other in accordance with the advice of the Leader of the Opposition in the General Assembly. You therefore have two out of five members being members of the Government Party, and then you have the remaining three appointed by the Governor, two on the advice of the Premier. Therefore you have four members out of the five of the Government Party, and then the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is the last who would have the privilege of appointing himself. That is the type of dictatorship which you have; you cannot say otherwise. On this Commission, you have four out of five seats to be held by members of the Government Party which has fourteen members in this House. It is not now a question of Party; it is a question of the island and you have fourteen elected members who are members of the Government Party and you have four seats on this Commission. What twisted democracy would permit of such a thing — in a Parliament like this where we are discussing democracy? The representation of the people is an important canon of democracy. This Commission is to be comprised of five members, four of which are members of the Government Party and one from the Opposition. And the Government has fourteen seats in this House. We are denied representation.

Mr. Speaker, the whole thing is so farcical when a decision has to be taken on the representation of the people from time to time. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that you will be the Chairman of this Commission. I have been working with you for the past number of years; but if you have any influence it may be a question of changing to somebody who has had to do with registration. You want to deal with somebody who has been working with boundaries and toying with these things. As to your working Committee, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if you have any influence on it at all. You should have on this Commission someone who has had to do with Elections and who is familiar with boundaries. You could have four or five members: but you will need somebody on this Committee who has had to do with boundaries. I would go so far as to say that the Commission should be allowed to co-opt people who could assist them. What I am unhappy about is that it is farcical to say that the Commission should report within six months after the date upon which it is appointed or within such further time as the Governor may determine, when you can quite see that the Governor can extend the period. There is nothing in the Bill which states that if the Commission fails to report within six months the whole Election Campaign would be fought as it was fought on the last occasion. No provision is made for that. Today the period may be fixed for six months, but the Governor can grant eight years. All of this is the crude, ugly machinery which falls to the name of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I have made my point and I feel that I would be failing in my duty if I did not do so. It is false to mention a period of six months when the Government can extend the time for eight years. There is nothing to show that we will have an Election on the basis of the present position if the Commission fails to report in six months.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member distinctly heard the Hon. Premier say that this matter will be dealt with before the next Election.

Mr. MILLER: That is what the hon. member has promised; but he also promised to lock up all the machinery, crushers, Directors of the Bagatelle quarry and everybody connected therewith and from that day until now the quarry has been delivering stones to a Government Department such as the Hospital. The hon. member also promised last week that he would issue a statement about Banks Breweries and I was asked by a friend on the telephone to ascertain whether he meant that the statement would be forthcoming at the weekend this month or at the weekend next month. Who would rely on any remarks made by the Premier? He has denied something which has gone down on the tape and you cannot erase it; therefore do not place me in the awkward position of trying to remind the Premier of these things.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir, I have unswerving respect for the Chair, but in this year of grace the Deputy Premier of this Assembly has said that we have been given a sacred undertaking by the Premier. Mr. Speaker, I can imagine your embarrassment.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. It appears to me as if the hon. member thought I was referring to the two past Premiers, but I was referring to the present Premier.

Mr. MILLER: I know that that is lip service to the present Premier. I really do not want to ride to town with my colleague. When you are on the boundary you can be as redundant as you like. Do you tell me that the Premier is like the Pope? Does the Deputy Premier tell me about the word of the Premier? Who on earth believes that?
6.45 p.m.

Nothing in this Bill states that this Commission will terminate its work before the end of the Session, which can be five years or another four years from now, and in your

Manifesto you promised in it three years. Why didn't you elect to write it in this? Mr. Speaker, it might not always be convenient to look in your direction, and we are suffering from the glare of the light that hangs on the left of your Chair. Anyhow, Sir, I leave this to the thinking members of Parliament. I am sorry I have had to exchange a little warmth with my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, one of the few members with some balance of that of a statesman in this Parliament and of that organisation of the Government Party; but, Sir, this is what we are up against and all this is done in the name of Christianity and of Christian democracy. There is nothing we can do and there is no use taking a vote because the division would mean exactly nought, and that has been the position in the past. Though the Commission is to take six months, the Chairman of the Commission can appeal to the Governor for an extension, but he can extend it for two and a half years because there is no fixed ceiling or limit, and six of us are denied representation on this Committee, and this is done in the name of Christian democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I think you would understand my sentiments and the manner in which I express myself on this. I am not afraid to confess my unchanging connection nor am I prepared to surrender my chains and loyalties to my Party, and it is in that strain and light that I speak on this occasion.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, in most countries, there comes a time in the history of all nations when a revision of seats and consideration for the re-distribution of seats in a country has always been thought of. I hope that my voice carries far enough that you can hear me, because the amplifying equipment seems to be out of order at the moment. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think I remember very vividly that during the last Session there was some sort of motion before the House to consider single member constituencies. The ruling Party in Government made their electoral promises, and if I remember correctly, they did promise such a revision or at least consideration of single member constituencies. I speak under correction, not being a member of the ruling Party, the Democratic Labour Party. Well, the time has come when the House now has a Bill presented before it for such consideration. Undoubtedly there must have been reasons prompting the presentation of such a Bill, and anyone who has a nodding acquaintance with the difference in population among the several parishes which are really constituencies in this Island, can easily see that the metropolitan parish of St. Michael, the neighbouring parish of Christ Church and maybe other parishes.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member prepared to give way?

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am always prepared to give way.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is very kind and gracious of the hon. member. We propose to go on until about 7.30 p.m., and I should therefore like to ask at this stage to suspend Standing Order No. 5 in order to continue the Session until that time and then to adjourn for good.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, I should like to know from the hon. member whether he wants to stop now.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am only moving the suspension of Standing Order No. 5 that you can go on talking; otherwise the Sitting comes to an end at 7 o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would not come to an end; it would be suspended for forty-five minutes. I made a ruling earlier that such a motion must be made before 7 o'clock. The hon. member has given way, and in view of that, is the Hon. Leader of the House asking for leave to make the motion?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not have to give notice of it; I merely have to make the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: We may be at cross purposes, but I only queried whether the hon. member was asking permission now to make the motion. If so, that leave is granted.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 5

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended.

Hon. A. DaC EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter who gave way may now proceed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, as I said, there must have been reasons that would normally account for the presentation of such a Bill as the one we now have before us, and I was beginning to make the observation that in the heavily populated parish of St. Michael and in one or two of the other parishes of similar size contiguous to it like Christ Church, the time would normally come when a re-distribution of seats would seem just a fair thing. 6.55 p.m.

Like any other hon. member who has spoken, I am not prepared to address the House from any personal interest whatsoever on this motion before the House. It does not matter to me whether in the event of the redistribution of seats I lose my seat. It may happen to somebody else or to several people; so if I happen to be one it would not matter: it would be in the interest of the Island as a whole.

However, Sir, I still have something to contribute as far as this motion is concerned. In the first place, as I have said, it is about time to review this constitution and we have got to face up to our responsibilities as far as this new bit of legislation is concerned.

I will not join any issue, Sir, concerning the time limit imposed upon the Commission and attempt to convince this House that in my opinion the wording of the Objects and Reasons which says that the Commission is supposed to report in six months and that there are possible extensions is something about which we should concern ourselves, because I do not think it is worthwhile anybody talking about that. I agree with the Hon. Premier that if a bye-election takes place within this term, the election would be fought on the Representation of the People Act as it now stands. Therefore, it does not matter if this Boundaries Commission does not complete its work before the prorogation of this House for the holding of a General Election. That is a fact. It is just wasting time and holding the House to ransom to think you are making a point when you are talking about that.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. junior member for St. Peter is aware that by the Representation of the People Act, the period of time for a session of this House is five years. In the Manifesto of the Government Party, it is stated that the duration of the life of this House will be for a period of three years; therefore, I do not agree with the hon. member saying that that is not a matter worthy of consideration.

Mr. Speaker, you will forgive me; I know that this is just a point of order on which I am speaking. You will also remember that mention was also made elsewhere by the Hon. Premier when he was questioned about the date of the election that he said it would depend on how soon the Boundaries Commission sent in their report.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter proceed. It is always a difficult thing to decide whether it is a point of order until the hon. member has said most of what he had to say.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, the Premier of Barbados under our present constitution can say whether the term of Par-

liament is five years or even two days. Whenever the Premier in his opinion decides that he will not carry on any longer and chooses to tell the Head of the Administration of this Colony that in his opinion this House should be prorogued, it will have to be prorogued.

Any schoolboy knows that. Why waste time? If the Hon. Premier has given notice to the electors that in three years' time he is going to come again to the electorate, well obviously, he must know why and we must understand normally that as long as this Boundaries Commission makes a report within three years, it is no use talking about having a six-month extension, a three-month extension or another year's extension. That is just wasting time. If you cannot see that, you are purblind.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that there must be reasons behind this Bill and as far as I remember, it was the intention of one Party of the Opposition in Parliament to press the then Government for the creation of single-member constituencies. I remember one time hearing that one Party pressing for such provision was accused of playing the game of the Conservatives. I was sitting where Your Honour now has the privilege of sitting and half of the other side confirmed it.

Sir, I agree with the creation of single-member constituencies. Double-member constituencies is now an anachronism. I do not know if there are still a few of such constituencies in the United Kingdom. There were a few, but I do not know if they have gone out of existence. Certainly, they are an anachronism and the Island must now be divided into single-member constituencies.

I do not agree with the Hon. Premier when he interprets what I see here in the Schedule to mean that it is within the powers of the Commission to increase on the number of existing constituencies. The Hon. Premier said that he may have one interpretation and the Boundaries Commission may have another. I absolutely do not agree with him and for obvious reasons.

This is Paragraph 1 of the Schedule:-

"The Island shall be divided into as many constituencies as there are members of the General Assembly."

Now, the Boundaries Commission is going to read this. They have not divided yet and this is a direction to them before they actually begin with the revision.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order. I do not think the hon. member is serious on that. The Bill is not yet law; so it cannot be a direction. If and when this Bill becomes an Act of the Legislature, then the Schedule becomes effective — not before. It could not lend itself to that interpretation.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, we are passing a Bill. We are not a Boundaries Commission in here. No Boundaries Commission has yet been set up, but we are passing a Bill which is intitled an Act to provide for the establishment of a Boundaries Commission and for matters connected therewith and incidental to the same.

This is the authority for the setting up of this Commission. This Bill which will soon become an Act of the Legislature will have to guide the Boundaries Commission if they get nothing else. Mr. Speaker, as you know from your position, in passing this Bill, this Schedule is going to be passed. When the Bill is passed, what is in the Schedule is law. The Schedule will be read unless amended and it will be read by the Boundaries Commission before they begin to do their work. That is what they would read. 7.05 p.m.

And I hope they can read. Upon reflection, they are all members of this Honourable Chamber and this is what they will read:-

"The Island shall be divided into as many constituencies" not as there are to be members but "as there are members of the General Assembly".

If the word "are" means "are" — yesterday or tomorrow it is still all right. What else can it mean? It is not worthwhile our labouring this matter. The members of the House are not many legally trained hon. gentlemen, but they are all possessed of commonsense.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member will concede that he is misinterpreting the provisions of this Schedule. If he would refer to Section 11 of the Bill on page 4 he will see that this is what it says:-

"The Commission shall review the boundaries of the constituencies into which the island is divided under and by virtue of sub-Section (1) of Section three of the Representation of the People Act, 1957, and, within six months after the date upon which the Commission is appointed or within such further time as the Governor may on the application of the Commission through its Chairman determine, submit to the General Assembly a report showing the constituencies into which it recommends that the island should be divided in order to give effect to the rules set out in the Schedule to this Act."

Then when you turn to the Schedule of the Act it says this:-

"The Island shall be divided into as many constituencies as there are members of the General Assembly."

All it means is that if the Boundaries Commission recommend that there should be six constituencies or sixty constituencies there must be, in consequence, a similar number of members of the Assembly.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Let us reduce that to the absurdity. For argument's sake, if the Boundaries Commission recommended less than 24 constituencies what will the position be? The Commission will be under your Chairmanship, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this Schedule is more than an ordinary guide to the Commission. I quite agree with my colleague with reference to the observations I see here in the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill. It says:- "It is proposed that the Speaker of the General Assembly should be the Chairman of the Commission: than a Deputy Chairman should be appointed by the Governor in accordance with the advice of the Premier.....". I could not begin to agree with that; today we do not suffer from any inferiority complex and we need not seek to have imported people in Barbados to tell us how this country should be divided as far as our constituencies are concerned. Although we are just peeping around the corner of independence, the Speaker.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I should like to inform the hon. member that in so far as this provision in this Section is concerned, it is taken more or less from the House of Commons (Redistribution of Seats) Act, 1949, of the United Kingdom. If you were to refer to page 3 of this Bill you will see this Caption: "Bill for the Boundaries Commission Act, 1962, Comparative Table". The enactment on which this particular provision is based is "The Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago — Annex to the Trinidad and Tobago (Constitution) Order in Council, 1961: The House of Commons (Redistribution of Seats) Act, 1949 of the United Kingdom, to which I have already referred, and the Jamaica (Constitution) Order in Council, 1959. If you were to refer to the House of Commons (Redistribution of Seats) Act of 1949 you will see that the power is placed in the hands of the Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition in precisely the same manner as it is proposed in this Bill.

Mr. HUSBANDS: And in precisely the same way as I said before the hon. member spoke, I disagree with it. To begin with, the House of Commons has no Deputy Speaker. The Chairman of Committees may act in the place of Mr. Speaker, but we have a Deputy Speaker, not an acting Speaker, whereas the Chairman of Committees in the House of Commons acts as Deputy Speaker. The Deputy Speaker is endowed with 99, something per cent of the powers of the Speaker. I do not agree with this. The Deputy Speaker should act in your place in case you cannot attend to the activities of this proposed Boundaries Commission. 7.15 p.m.

If we are saying that we are independent minded as we hope to be, I could not hope to approve of such a provision. Naturally, Sir, I approve that the Boundaries Commission will have the authority of a Commission of Enquiry and would have power to summon proper evidence and all that, because I do not think there could be any argument as far as that is concerned; but again I agree with the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. senior member for St. Peter that this matter is just sticking to a particular form of drafting. I do not think that when you look at the numerical strength of the present Official Opposition in this House, it really warrants the authority given to it in this Bill. Members have gone through the fact that they are so few in number, and that is so material, because the Opposition in Parliament right now is about ten, four of whom form the Official Opposition and of the other six there are three Independents and three belonging to another Party.

When you speak of the Leader of the Opposition, you think of him as speaking for the Opposition, but I do not think he has very much force behind him. I think the drafting was a copy of a draft; it may be a very good original from which it was taken, but in actual practice when you think of the force that is now being granted to the Leader of the Opposition for his Party, I think the rest of us in the Opposition are not taken very much into account, and therefore I think the Leader of the Official Opposition is a rather fortunate member to have been granted this authority under this Bill. That is my observation which has been shared by those who have preceded me and struck a similar note. It must also be remembered that the Commission is not only going to divide the Island into constituencies, but it is going to name them. It is not going to be St. Peter South and St. Peter North, because St. Peter itself might not be a constituency anymore as it is a small parish. I am sorry the hon. member was not here to hear how I began my address, because if you go by numbers, certainly we would not be entitled to more than one seat. As he said, we are just on the borderline, and 1.1 is nearer to one than to 2. They are going to have new names; so it is an entirely new departure being made from the Representation of the People Act, I believe, Sir, there is going to be a conflict.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, may I interrupt the hon. member if he would give way? You will note, Mr. Speaker, that we have suspended Standing Order No. 5 for a specified period.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no specified period.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I said at the time that we would go on until about 7.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was not part of the motion; it was just an intimation.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What we would like to do at this stage is to postpone this debate in order that we may finally dispose of two small items appearing under Orders Nos. 5 and 6, one of which is the buying of a piece of land for highway improvement, and the other being a small amendment to the Public Health Act. This debate obviously will continue for some time, Sir, and neither Your Honour nor the staff has had any dinner and we do not want to be responsible for their health. Either the hon. member will make the motion or I will make it myself that the debate on this matter be postponed at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not at this stage, because the hon. junior member for St. Peter simply gave way to hear what the Hon. Leader of the House proposed to say. I would suggest that we allow the hon. junior member for St. Peter to complete.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If he goes on for another half an hour and we have to do these other matters, we will be here until 9 o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes; but we are at the service of the people.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I sincerely hope the hon. member would remember that.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I think when it comes to Local Government elections, a Bill will have to come down to amend the existing Act in relation to Local Government, because as you know, Sir, for the purpose of Local Government, the Island is divided into electoral districts, and the district of St. Michael is divided into wards. In the Northern and Southern Districts there are no wards. For the purpose of Local Government you have six parishes sometimes coming together to form a district, and you also have three parishes in some cases and four in some cases. That is a very complicated state of affairs and you will have to amend the present Representation of the People Act very soon in respect of Local Government. That undoubtedly can be done, I hope, as expeditiously as possible.

There is one thing I must observe and no hon. member has yet hinted at it. I hope it is not being understood that I am making a case in defence of any member, least of all myself. Apart from coming to the House of Assembly and making legislation, members have from day to day to attend to the individual political needs of their constituents, and I used to always wonder how much of that sort of personal representation the representatives of the metropolitan parish could do. Certainly I do not think it could be as much as a representative could do who is responsible for a smaller constituency unit. Now I do feel that it will be possible when an increased number of representatives is allocated to St. Michael that more personal representation will be done. The day to day political chores that go unnoticed mean a lot to your constituents, but at the same time you have the law of compensation. If you take the rural districts and increase them in number, by the law of compensation it is going to be a more tiring job for a rural representative to serve his constituents as faithfully as he did in the past.

7.25 p.m.

I visualise that St. Peter and St. Lucy will have one representative each. Who knows? I am not indulging in reckless anticipation, but I can foresee that small constituencies like the parish of St. Joseph which presently has two representatives — may be, another part of St. Andrew will be attached to it to have one representative.

As I see it, I can see a lot of shiftings. I agree with the point made by the hon. junior member for St. George. Although I appreciate very much that we are masters in our own house, and that members of the House would really be the Commissioners, I do feel that there ought to be some system of attaching to the Boundaries Commission someone who has already familiarised himself with a business of this sort, someone who has had to do with the setting up of boundaries. I remember when a Commission was appointed to divide the present existing constituencies in certain districts that the Government made use of the services of a gentleman who was entrusted with making the issues.

I have no idea whatever what composition this Commission would be. I see that the Government is appointing some of the members and the Leader of the Opposition is appointing some: so I do not know at this stage who is likely to become a member. I know the composition of this House: so I do not think that the Boundaries Commission can well afford to be without some sort of expert or some expert assistance in the carrying out of this job. I am speaking quite impersonally on this matter; it does not matter to me who suffers even if I happen to be one to suffer as a result of this. I do wish that the Boundaries Commission will be in no way hampered in the execution of what has been entrusted to it to do.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph caught my eye first.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to the hon. member to give way on the plea which I made earlier today. There are two other matters which we have to consider today. It is obvious that the discussion on this Bill is going to take some more time and I therefore beg to move at this stage.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister cannot make a motion because the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is on his feet. If he is prepared to give way, well then.....

Mr. COWARD: All right, Sir, I will give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I said, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph caught my eye first and it will be all right so long as he is prepared to start when we resume the discussion on this.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that further consideration of this matter be postponed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION re COMPULSORY ACQUISITION
OF LAND FOR PURPOSE OF HIGHWAY
IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the parcels of land described in the Schedule thereto for the purpose of Highway Improvements for the use and benefit of the public.

The Hon. Minister is not in his place.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask leave to deal with this Resolution, standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Social Services is asking leave of this House to deal with Order No. 5 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael. If there is no objection, leave is granted the hon. member. *(A pause).*

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. Minister.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, hon. members have inspected plans for widening the road near the Indian Ground Social Centre and in order to carry out this development, it is imperative that certain portions of land in that area owned by Mr. R. T. Harewood, Mrs. B. L. Murrell and Mr. R. Herbert would have to be used for the development of the road in that area.

According to the Schedule to the Resolution, it is clearly seen that Mr. R. T. Harewood is not willing to sell his land there and therefore in order to widen the highway along there it would be necessary to acquire that land compulsorily.

7.35 p.m.

As to the question of Mr. Herbert's land, it is noted that Mr. Herbert does not have an indefeasible title for the land and that necessitates the implementation of the Compulsory Land Acquisition Act. I think that everything has been clearly outlined in the First and Second Schedules to the Resolution as well as in the Addendum. I therefore take great pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member which of the lands which he is referring to?

He refers to the land of Mr. Herbert and would he tell me which portion of land is vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee? I am quite in agreement with this Resolution because I appreciate the Government's decision as to the widening of the roads. I was following the hon. member quite closely while he was speaking and he mentioned land which is vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee; however, I must plead ignorance of this land.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. senior member for the City, the portion of land which is vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee is a portion of 2,036 square feet which forms part of a portion of land acquired from Mr. J. C. Cheeseman in March, 1958.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member.

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

PUBLIC HEALTH (REPEAL) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: To move the second reading of a Bill to repeal the Public Health Act, 1908, and the Public Health (Amendment) Act, 1945 (Act 1945-29).

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Public Health Act of 1954 places the responsibility for the administration of the Public Health services on the Director of Medical Services and replaces the General Board of Health as an Advisory Body on public health policy or administration by Public Health Advisory Committees. It was, however, necessary by the Public Health (Amendment) Act of 1959 to keep the General Board of Health alive mainly and primarily for the purpose of looking after the sub-division and sale of land. This has necessitated an additional burden placed on the Department of Medical Services and also the rubber-stamping of appraisements and so forth done by the General Board of Health. The Board serves, at this stage, with the introduction of Town and Country Planning Legislation in this island, no useful purpose. As a matter of fact, it tends to delay action in the purchase or sale of land and therefore I hardly think it is necessary to continue with this Board of Health any longer. As a matter of fact, as the position stands now, if anyone is willing to acquire or sell or divide a portion of land, he has got to have the approval of two bodies. In this day of grace and in this age, we feel that there should be no longer any delay in developing our country because we have got to approach two bodies for permission to sell and divide our land.

As a matter of fact, in many cases, applications, although they are approved by the Town and Country Planning Office, are held up for a month or two by the General Board of Health. There is provision in the Interim Control Act for the Town and Country Planning Officer to approach certain Governmental Departments when an application is put forward for any sort of development or for the construction of a building or the purchase of land and so on. Under the provisions of this Act, the Town and Country Planning Officer can ask the opinion of the Director of Medical Services who will be able to advise on the health or the sanitary situation whether it is a question of the purchase of property or the sub-division or sale of land. The Director of Medical Services will be able to advise where such matters are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to make the point that the various applications are just becoming a nuisance in the office of the Department of Medical Services. I hardly think that any hon. member of this House would object to the proposal to abolish this General Board of Health and transfer the powers of the General Board of Health to the Town and Country Planning Officer. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member desire to speak on this Bill?

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the object of this Bill is to transfer to the Town and Country Development Planning Office the functions which are now performed by the General Board of Health under the Public Health Act, 1908 in relation to the sub-division and sale of land. In this particular case, I think that for the last three years we have been dealing with this type of business in the Bridgetown City Council.
7.45 p.m.

I can assure you, Sir, that the Board of Health has been doing its job, but in my opinion the Town and Country Planning Officer has been given too much latitude, and on several occasions we have had to come to the rescue of the poor people. To give him more power, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we would be looking for more trouble, because we would be putting the cart before the horse. I am saying, Sir, that this Bill should be postponed.

You will be surprised to know, Sir, that just a couple of days ago the Town and Country Planning Officer gave Esso permission to make a by-pass on the main road on either side of Fontabelle for their service station, but refused to give a gentleman entrance for his car on the same street. I should also like to bring to your attention that at the corner of Milk Market he refused to give Mr. Rollock permission to carry his building four storeys high, but allowed the Goddards to carry theirs five storeys high. We of the Public Health Board in the Bridgetown City Council are the persons who have to assist him, and we tell him to give everybody permission or none. I think this matter would take very serious discussion, and I do not think it should be forced through today. You will notice too, Sir, that a lot of people today are prevented from erecting houses on certain lands throughout the Island, and yet they have allowed the Y.M.P.C. to erect a galvanised paling right on the road. I should like to know if the law is for certain people and not for others.

Mr. Speaker, in Carrington Village, there are lovely spots that are wasted, and to give the Town and Country Planning Department more power would be to make things worse. People who have to deal with this matter would like to speak on it, and I do not think this Bill should be rushed through today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member sits, is he moving that further consideration of this Bill be postponed?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will do that, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to listen to me carefully, and I am very glad that the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing has entered the House. I am one who has been observing law and authority. I believe when the Bill was passed here at the time vesting power in the hands of one man without giving the people of this country the right to appeal to a disinterested non-political body such as the Judiciary, that I said you were taking away the rights of the people of this country. I was criticised, my suggestions were laughed at and scorned, and the Bill went through. Today I want to make my position abundantly clear. Out of courtesy, the Town and Country Planning Officer must send to a Committee to the various Councils — and there are three Councils in the Island — if there is a disagreement, to hear their views, and at times there is no disagreement. I believe, Sir, that at least in the municipal area we have served some useful purpose in trying to point out the hardships which are being caused to a number of individuals.

Now I think it is universally known in this Island that the Government employs the minority of people and private enterprise employs the great majority. By private enterprise I do not speak of big businesses, but of the small people who employ people other than the Government. Quite recently, Sir, there were some 90 applications on the desk of the Town and Country Planning Officer awaiting decisions. You will quite appreciate that in a country with unemployment — and this Government should appreciate it more than anybody else — when there are 90 applications for people to repair, remodel or build houses lying on the

desk of this Officer, that that would be keeping hundreds of people out of work. I think of people like artisans and those who would be able to do such work. Now I am not going to accuse either one of these Officers of being partial, but what I would like to say is that there is a lack of knowledge of the country that at times seems to make them allow things to happen in one area, and in the same breath not allow it in the same area. What the hon. senior member for St. Michael has said is true. We have seen an application from a man on the Harbour access road definitely signed by the Officer refusing him entrance on that road for his car; but on the same road we have seen an application from the Esso Service people granting them permission to have this facility on the same road. We made it clear that they might have a Government behind them, but the Government does not control me, that I have the right to say what I want to say, and we are not going to stand for that.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore call upon the Minister to investigate this because it is dishonest. You cannot have any officer in that Department turning down an application from a Barbadian for entrance on that road, and allowing foreign people to come in and have an entrance. I call on the Minister to investigate that, and if it is a lie, the hon. senior member for St. Michael and I will resign our seats. The next thing we want to draw to your attention is that this Bill, as the Minister says, will prevent this delay which seems to be occasioned by having the Board of Health in an advisory capacity, because as the law now stands, before you can apply to the Town and Country Planning Officer you must get the permission of the Board of Health to cut up or divide land. In the Act, there are such phrases as "no person shall divide" and "no person shall build".
7.55 p.m.

It goes further — I can tell you that because it is part of my living, I have to look after it. A man cannot build a wall on his land unless it goes six feet from his boundary.

I want the Minister to answer me this question. You will pardon me if I refer to him personally. From the time I can remember myself, doctors at the Lunatic Asylum lived in that house in Deacons Road which had some shrubs around it and, as far as I know, they lived there quite comfortably. Apparently today, you have an officer who is living there who thinks that there are too many Negro people near to him and I notice without your going back six feet from the road, you are building a six foot wall right on the boundary. I want to ask the Hon. Minister why is he taking all this money to build a six feet wall around that property when in the same breath you are saying that you should take the money which will build a guard wall and build a house. I have not found Mr. Stevens to be dishonest but I have found him to be over zealous in doing his job. I have found the other man whom you have in that office frightfully ignorant about his job. I refer to the man who has Geography as one of the certificates of his qualification.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to report progress.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, no; the hon. member cannot stop me on this. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that if any hon. member owns a piece of land and he wanted to build a house on it, he would be told by the Hon. Minister that he has to go back six feet from his boundary line and the boundary line of his neighbour. I need not remind you that during the time of the last Government the Town and Country Planning Office advised the Government not to erect a market in Bay Street but they went ahead and erected it there. If you want the majesty of the law to be respected, then Government must set the first example; you should not expect the people who bought Jones Land to respect your decisions when they see that the Government is prepared to build a six foot wall around its property just because a doctor may say that he does not like to see Negro people too near around. That is not right in principle. If any member wants to have friends in that way, that is not the attitude to adopt. I will not adopt that attitude. People think I am making a lot of sport but I am not making any sport. I call on the Minister to find out by whose au-

thority you build a wall six feet high around that land. Dr. Goddard lived there at one time, I have asked the Hon. Minister about that already. Why? What has gone wrong? Is it because you have poor people around there? I know the Hon. Minister will go and investigate.

Sir, I will have nothing against, let us say, an amendment to this Act which would say that you should apply straight to the Town and Country Planning Officer and that you should send your plans to him, but it will surprise you to know what you are doing here in this country. A man came to me the other morning and told me that he made an application to the Town and Country Planning Officer to put up a sign in front of his place. He received a letter in reply. He told me that it cost him \$120 because they wrote and told him that he would have to submit a drawing to show the whole outline. He would have to get a surveyor or draftsman to submit a plan to show how near it would be to the other people's premises. He only wanted to put up a sign to show that he was selling films for development. Is that not outrageous? Either that person who is doing that is a convulsed ass or does not know what he is doing. I am just saying that hon. members of the Government are sitting down and do not know what they are doing.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. For the information of the hon. senior member for the City, the discretionary powers of the Town and Country Planning Officer are practically unlimited in this Island and very soon we will be coming to the Legislature to amend that Act completely. At present, applicants have got the right to appeal and there are several cases of appeal outstanding now. As I have said, in a very short time we will be coming here to amend that legislation. I am sure that this Government will do nothing whatsoever to create unemployment or hardship on the people in the Island of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Hon. Minister is now making a speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am so happy that the Hon. Minister has got up and said that. If there is any Minister whom I have faith in, it is that hon. member. What you have here in this Bill is dishonest. Go to that office and you will see that there is an application which has been on that officer's desk and that officer has refused to consider it. This Bill is made retrospective so that when the time comes he will be able to turn down that application. Some officers from the Bridgetown City Council can give you chapter and verse on this matter.

I agree with the hon. member when he suggests that this ought to be postponed. I came in here with the intention of talking this out until 9.00 o'clock. There are plans in this man's office in which we disagree with what he has said and we told the people to appeal but their appeals have never been sent on to the Minister.
8.05 p.m.

You can bring in whom you like. I am not asking for any job. If a thing is wrong, then it is wrong. Stevens said one thing and West said another. You have Mr. Hoyos at the Housing Authority who got in at the backdoor. Because I expressed my view in relation to the people who support me in the Bay Land — because I defended the people who support me up there — I understand that because there are a few doctors and lawyers and a few negro men who do not know themselves yet — they are a lot of social climbers. I am void of social climbing. I was going to say I have heard that that boy Hoyos at the Y.M.P.C. said that the Presidency will be changed and he is a personal friend of the Minister and he wonders what Mottley would say. I am not mincing any matters about that.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the policy of this Government in connection with the erection of fences or barriers around playing fields which are property of the Government or Statutory Boards is not to erect these fences or barriers, and therefore the necessary instructions are given to implement the policy of this Government in all of these matters. Where any play-

ing field or property of the Government has been fenced around, that action is against the policy of this Government. We are taking every possible step to ensure that any property which belongs to the Government must be left open so that everybody can have the use of it just as Queen's Park or any other place in Barbados is left open for the use of the people.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear that. I have in mind the doctor who said: "It may be all right, but when the Sunday morning comes all of these little children are playing on the pasture." I want to say that if I had my way Spartan Club would have had to look for somewhere to go ever since.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is more than obvious from the volume of the speech of the hon. member that he has had his supper and what not, but I am suggesting that the Staff of the House has been working here without interruption since 12 o'clock (Noon). I am therefore suggesting to the hon. member that he should make a motion for the postponement of the debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Very well, Mr. Speaker, at this stage I beg to move that the further consideration of this Bill or that the further debate on this Bill be postponed.

Mr. MILLER: I beg to second that motion. In the meantime, before the adjournment is taken I would like to know what will be the position be with regard to the debate on the White Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us deal with one thing at a time. The question is that further debate on this Bill be postponed. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. Further debate on this Bill is accordingly postponed.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT TO THE PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn, there is a Bill which has been returned from the Other Place with one amendment. That Bill is the Pensions (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill. This Bill has been passed by the Other Place with a slight amendment which appears in Clause 5, sub-clause (1) and in the first line of that sub-clause. The word "amendment" has been amended to appear in its plural form. In other words, we are merely adding an "s" to the word "amendment". With those remarks, Sir, I am asking leave that this amendment be dealt with forthwith.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to deal with this amendment forthwith and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister. (After a pause) There being no objection, leave is accordingly granted.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I have already pointed out, the Other Place has changed the word "amendment" occurring in Clause 5 sub-clause (1) line 1 of this Bill to the word "amendments". I beg to move that this amendment be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.
The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the amendment was read a second time and agreed to.

8.15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the House will have to deal next Tuesday with the Local Government Bill of which notice is

given today. I presume the Clerk will have it circulated as soon as possible, but we have to get it through because the rates of the municipality have been held up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust the Minister of Trade will see that the Government gives its full and unstinted co-operation in getting it printed and circulated not later than Saturday.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: With regard to the question of the hon. junior member for St. George about the White Paper, this is really not under our control. For instance today, we have just not been able to get to it. Hon. members have had their allotted time for Private Members' Business, two and a half hours or whatever it was, we have been here from 12 o'clock, and we are adjourning after 8 o'clock, with only a short break for lunch and a short attendance at the Other Place. We just could not get to it.

Mr. MILLER: I want to know more than that. Today you decided that you would curtail further debate on the White Paper and instructed the operator from Rediffusion to leave the building. I want to be told definitely when we will be given an opportunity to debate the White Paper.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, we did nothing of the kind today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually, the hon. junior member for St. George has accused me, because he said "you".

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I do not know who instructed the Clerk, but I am told that the Clerk did dismiss the operator from Rediffusion. I want to be told by the Leader of the House exactly when will time be made available for the members of the Opposition, because I have got something to say on the matter.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are certain important measures like the one to which I referred just now which have to be finalised before the House goes into summer recess. If finalisation of these matters can be effected in time next Tuesday for debate on the White Paper to continue, by all means; but these other matters must have priority. May I be permitted to say that for the entire day the equipment of Rediffusion was here, and it is only about an hour ago when it became more than obvious that we could not get to the White Paper tonight that the Rediffusion man was allowed to go? He was there the entire day and evening until 7 o'clock.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I want a firm undertaking from the Leader of the House, no matter how he talks around it, as to what is going to be the fate of the debate on the White Paper before we break for the summer recess.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the Hon. Leader of the House anything to add to what he said before?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have no control over the duration of the contributions made by hon. members on matters when they come up. I am informed that the Rediffusion equipment is still here, because we presumed that there would have been some time today to deal with the Federation issue, but it just was not possible. The hon. junior member for St. George has, I think, had more time on the floor today than anybody else, and everything depends on how voluble he and his colleagues are next Tuesday and on whether the matters on which the Government is asking for priority can be dealt with in time to leave here before midnight. It is a very short Order Paper.....

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, if it looks difficult or even impossible to complete, would the Leader of the House give us some sort of assurance that on Tuesday, if for any reason the debate is prolonged until Wednesday, we will have the opportunity to speak? It is true that we could have had a break earlier for the staff to get some supper, but I want to know if you are going to adjourn until Wednesday so that opportunity will be given for members to speak on this vital and important matter in the country's history. The Hon. Premier has spoken on it and the Minis-

ter of Education has spoken for two days and a half on it, and for some reason or other we fear we will not be given an opportunity to speak on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no motion before the House now. The hon. junior member for St. George rose on a point of order, and again on another point of order, but there is no motion before the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 28th August, 1962 at 12 noon.

I am suggesting that in view of the importance which the hon. member appears to attach to the continuance of the debate on Federation, if it appears that the Government Business is taking up, or rather if the debates of the Government Orders through the prolixity of the speakers take up as much time as they did today, we may suggest that Private Members' Time be allocated for discussion on the White Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Instead of 'prolixity', I would suggest 'the comprehensive nature of members' contributions.'

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That involves no reflection on Your Honour.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second the motion for adjournment.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Leader of the House and Deputy Premier looks at the Order Paper, he will realise that we have just completed Item No. 5 under Government Business, but Item No. 2 is the White Paper on the Federation. It is a question of whether or not you want to take the Items as they appear on the Order Paper. Why should he suggest that I am paying more importance to the White Paper than I would normally to Government Business? Why should it take second place to any other matter? I am simply asking to be given the assurance if we cannot complete it on Tuesday that we go on until Wednesday. I am willing to agree to the break for the summer recess, but you should certainly not deny members of the Opposition an opportunity to speak on this. This is the fifth time for the evening that I have been asking him to give us that undertaking. We must feel the same responsibility to somebody as the Leader of the House, because we are all elected here. Why should there be this kind of behaviour? We are only asking for that opportunity, and you are going to waltz and dance and sing?

Mr. SPEAKER: Whom do you mean by 'you'?

Mr. MILLER: You know that I can only be addressing you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Exactly so.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member is shilly-shallying and dancing all around the question which I have asked four or five times. All I am asking him to say is whether the debate will be continued on Wednesday if it is not completed on Tuesday. I am not asking him to say like the Premier, but to say something. I have a right to ask this, and like the Leader of the House, I am an elected member. 8.25 p.m.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, you may recall that I seconded the motion of the hon. senior member for the City. I had to give way to the Hon. Premier but with the undertaking that I would have carried on with the debate today. I would like to know whether at the next sitting of this House No. 2 on the Order Paper would be made Order No. 1.

Mr. SPEAKER: As to the opportunity to speak, I told the hon. senior member for St. Michael last Tuesday that so long as he was present and showed the least indication of intending to speak, he would catch my eye before anybody else because he had risen to speak and he gave way to the Hon. Premier.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday of next week at 12 o'clock (noon) was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 8.30 p.m.