

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 31st July, 1962.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P. and Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that the Minutes of several past meetings are yet in the Printer's hands.

LETTER FROM CLERK

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Clerk intimating this day his absence from the House.

It reads as follows:-

"Sir,

Owing to indisposition I am unable to attend the House today. I ask to be excused from my duties for today accordingly."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move that the Clerk be given leave of absence from today's sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

DEPUTY CLERK TO ACT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be appointed to act as Clerk for today's meeting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. G. W. ALLEN TO ACT AS DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. G. W. Allen be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today's meeting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a report from Messrs. FitzPatrick Graham and Company, Chartered Accountants for the information of this House in connection with the operation of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the period ended 30th June, 1962.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay on behalf of the Hon. Premier, Message No. 6/1962 from His Excellency the Governor regarding his absence from the Island.

The Message reads as follows:-

MESSAGE NO. 6/1962

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that he proposes to visit Jamaica as the special guest of the Jamaica Government on the 3rd of August to attend the Jamaica Independence Celebrations and to proceed thence on the 8th August to the United Kingdom on short vacation leave, returning to Barbados on 2nd of September.

2. During His Excellency's absence from the Island the Honourable Sir Kenneth Stoby, Chief Justice, will assume the administration of the Government in accordance with Article XXI of the Letters Patent and the Honourable F. E. Field will be appointed to act as Chief Justice.

J. M. STOW
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados,
30th July, 1962.
(M.P. - L. 29)

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Secondly, on behalf of the Honourable Premier, I am commanded to lay the Report on the Training Scheme Fund for the financial year 1961-62.

PETITIONS

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the humble petition of Mr. Edward Parker Edghill of the Golf Club Road in the parish of Christ Church in this Island in respect of the construction of a groyne with or without sea walls opposite his property known as "Rostrevor".

The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the humble petition of the Right Reverend Edward Lewis Evans, Lord Bishop of the Island of Barbados and the Reverend Cyril Mallalieu, Rector of the parish of St. George in the Island of Barbados respecting the division and sale of a parcel of land in the parish of St. George.

The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

NOTICE OF BILLS

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to authorise Edward Parker Edghill to construct a groyne with or without sea walls near or attached to a property called "Rostrevor" in the St. Lawrence Gap in the Island of Barbados.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to authorise the Bishop of Barbados and the Rector of the parish of St. George to divide and sell in lots a parcel of land containing two acres, three roods, 28 6/10th perches part and parcel of a larger area of land containing 62 acres, two roods and some perches together with dwelling house known as the St. George Rectory.
2.45 p.m.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will Government initiate an additional mobile library service for children in the country districts by obtaining a special van or vans to contain the said books and to transport same to the various districts from the Public Library, with a view to relieving the said children of having to travel to the City to obtain same?

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of dissatisfaction existing among Government Pensioners due to the high cost of living and their inability to eat two good meals a day out of the pensions paid to them?

2. If the answer to the above query is in the affirmative, will Government consider setting up a committee to recommend a scale of increases for all Government Pensioners?

Mr. COWARD: To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:-

Is Government aware of the poor condition of the road known as "White-wood Walk Road" in the parish of St. Joseph?

2. Will Government consider the advisability of repairing this road, and extending it to Cane Garden at the earliest opportunity?

3. If the answer is in the negative, will Government state why?

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the road junction from Barbados General Hospital, Jemmotts Lane, crossing to the highway, Bay Street, is very dangerous to Doctors, Nurses, and other persons who cross this road from east to west?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government immediately take steps to have same remedied, particularly as the meals, etc., for the inmates of the Eye Wards are also endangered because of this hazardous crossing?

3. Will Government either place signs marked "Pedestrians please cross", or provide a lane for such crossing as the vehicular traffic is very heavy in the said area?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to authorise Edward Parker Edghill to construct a groyne with or without a sea wall or sea walls opposite his property known as "Rostrevor" situated at St. Lawrence Gap, Christ Church, be now read a first time.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the City rose, but I did not hear his voice.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Which hon. member for the City?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City. He rose but I did not hear his voice.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is because of the microphone.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that the hon. member does not have to depend on the microphone.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that motion.

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

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to authorise the Bishop of Barbados and the Rector of St. George to divide and sell in lots a parcel of land containing two acres, three roods twenty-eight and six-tenths perches be now read a first time.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 16 and 18 be suspended for today's sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any answers laid to questions? (After a Pause) I take it that there are no answers to questions ready.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Consequent upon the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 16 and 18, I understand that the Hon. Acting Leader of the House proposes to deal with Government Business.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: 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.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$2,254 and I am asking leave to deal with it in the absence of the Hon. Premier in whose name it stands.

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

2.55 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1962-63 No. 14

Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$1,500 be voted under Item 112A which is a new Item - Expenses of Sugar Factory Smoke Control Board.

As hon. members will remember, the Sugar Factory Smoke Control Board was set up under the Sugar Factories Smoke Control Act which was passed last year, and in order to meet certain essential expenses to carry on, it is necessary for the Board to secure a loan from the Government which the Government has agreed to do, in order to meet such expenses until the Board shall collect registration and other fees which will see after the working expenses of the Board.

As the Addendum sets out, the sum of \$1,500 is required to enable an advance to be made to the Sugar Factory Smoke Control Board under Section 17 of the Registered Sugar Factories Smoke Control Act, 1961-39 to meet the expenses of the Board during the calendar year 1962. The advance will be interest free and repayable, within two years from the date of issue, from the fees received from the Board in respect of the registration of sugar factories, as I have just explained. The Board has just been set up, and at this early stage it is still too early to give a full report as to its working. Hon. members will remember that we in the Opposition gave any amount of opposition to the passing of this Bill during the last Session, but Government has decided to give this Act a trial and to allow the Board to prove its worth for a temporary period; so that within the next two years the Government may probably have to review its entire policy in this respect.

I beg to move that the sum of \$1,500 stand part.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$754 under Item 20 - Apprentices - be voted.

As the Addendum sets out, Sir, consequent on the revision of salaries to Government employees, the rates paid to apprentices at the Government Printing Office have been revised with effect from 1st April, 1961. The provision in the current Estimates has been calculated at the old rates and is therefore inadequate, and supplementary provision of \$754 is now required in order to give the employees there an increase, and to adjust the deficit. It really amounts to that.

I beg to move that the sum of \$754 stand part.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$2,254 do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 6 as the second Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Acting Leader of the House is craving its leave to proceed with Order No. 6 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Co-operative Societies Act, 1949. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. Apparently there is no objection. Accordingly, leave is granted the Hon. Minister.

THE CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, since 1949, this is really the first time that any major amendments are being made to the Co-operative Societies Act, 1949, and I think that at this stage, Sir, it may be an appropriate time to give a brief resumé of the history of the Co-operative Movement to this Honourable Chamber, and to give some of the background in order that hon. members may be fully apprised of what is happening in the Co-operative Movement.

Now the Co-operative Movement in Barbados is just over twelve years old. The Co-operative Societies Act was passed in the year 1949, as I have just mentioned, and the first Society was registered in 1952. Since then the Movement has grown quietly under the old set-up, but as from 1958 the Movement has grown very rapidly under the present set-up, and when I say that, I refer to the change-over since we have had a Registrar of Co-operative Societies and Friendly Societies.

3.05 p.m.

There are now fifty-one registered societies which are made up as follows: 15 Saving Societies, 1 Thrift Society, 16 Credit Union Societies, seven Fishing Societies, eight Marketing Co-operatives, two Consumer Societies, one Irrigation Society and one Secondary Society.

These 51 societies have a membership of 2,381 and a share capital and savings of \$90,919.01.

In so far as the Savings Societies are concerned, they have a membership of 360 and savings of \$2,156.32.

The 17 Credit Unions have a membership of 1,325 and share capital of \$71,318. For the year ending 31st March, 1962, the sum of \$6,500 was the Loan Balance.

So far as Fishing Societies are concerned, there are 216 fishermen in the seven Fishing Societies and a savings of \$1,631.91.

Six Primary Societies were recently formed into a Secondary Society which would be responsible among other things for organising an insurance scheme for fishermen and boat owners, and through this same body the marketing of fish and the purchasing of fishing equipment for all members of the organisation will be arranged. Two of these societies are supplying fuel to members' boats and up to 31st March, 1962, the sum of \$4,364 in fuel has been supplied to the vessels of members.

Then, there are eight Marketing Societies and of these, five societies market their canes co-operatively and thus receive the benefit of the additional price under the Domestic Sugar Agreement. The others market their canes individually. The five societies marketed a total of 4,688 tons

of canes and have already received a sum of \$65,632 and are awaiting the additional price and preference.

There is one Consumer Society with a membership of 90 persons and a share capital of \$1,312.90 and a turnover of \$2,000.

Sir, that gives hon. members briefly the progress of the co-operative movement. I can give fuller details but I think that is hardly necessary unless members request further details.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had many experts here to assist in the educational programme. We have had a visit from Mr. A. A. Bailey of the Credit Union National Association who has given considerable assistance to the Credit Union movement in this island. He had conducted training courses, and, through his initiative, arrangements were made for the Co-operative Officer to participate in observation courses in Canada and in the U.S.A. in 1960. For six weeks in April and May 1962 a series of lecture courses were conducted by Mr. Reginald K. Harper, who is a co-operative expert, through the good offices of the U.N.O. Technical Assistance Board and of the International Labour Organisation.

Many people took advantage of these courses which were conducted by Mr. Harper, and those who attended the courses are expected to form the nucleus of the team to preach the gospel of co-operation and to spearhead the educational programme. We have also seen to the setting up of a Standing Co-ordinating Committee for Co-operative Education and that committee held its first meeting on Tuesday, 10th July, 1962; and they have drawn up a policy and a programme in order to carry through the educational policy of the co-operative movement.

As far as Government's policy is concerned, Government does not believe in the formation of Co-operative Societies merely for the purpose of doing so. We believe that co-operatives should only be formed if the individual can see quite clearly that by joint action his individual position is better off than if he had continued to act individually. Their survival does not seem hardly possible otherwise. The Government firmly believes that co-operative action can achieve a higher degree of economic well-being and of social satisfaction not only for the individual but for the community and the country as a whole. We feel that co-operatives, as one writer puts it, can achieve the goal of making men — men in the sense of both individual and joint responsibility — so that they may rise individually to a full personal life and collectively to a full social life.

Mr. Speaker, you will see in our Three-Year Development Plan that the policy of the Co-operative Movement is set out briefly as follows:—

- (a) to improve the economic viability of the fishing industry and of agricultural small holdings and to stimulate a change in the pattern of agricultural production through the operation of farms on a co-operative basis;
- (b) to reduce the cost of living through the operation of consumer co-operative societies;
- (c) to encourage thrift and to utilise the savings of its members to greater economic advantage.

It is planned to achieve these objectives by intensifying the present promotional campaign, including a programme of Co-operative education at all levels, including schools, through the agency of a Standing Co-operative Educational Committee. The Barbados Marketing Corporation has been specially charged by law with the duty of assisting agriculture and fishing co-operatives to market their produce.

I think that should give hon. members some little idea of what the co-operative movement is trying to achieve, and I can now proceed with the objects and reasons of these proposed amendments which are set out quite clearly in the Objects and Reasons of the Bill.

If I may give the proposed amendments *seriatim*, I think I should better do so at this stage. The Objects of the amendments are:—

- (1) to request societies to forward three copies of their bye-laws with their applications for registration instead of two as required by subsection (3) of Section 6 of the Act;
- (2) to reduce the qualifying age for membership of registered Co-operative Societies from 18 years as provided in Section 22 of the Act to 16 years and to provide for the introduction of co-operatives in schools among organised youth groups approved by the Registrar;
- (3) to enable the Registrar in his discretion to enquire into the conduct of members of the society when the misapplication of funds is suspected, instead of requiring the Registrar to act as provided by Section 47 of the Act, only on the application of a liquidator or of any creditor or of any contributor to the society;
- (4) to provide that any order of the Registrar under Section 47 of the Act for repayment of money or for the restoration of a property or for contribution to the assets of the society by way of compensation to be in writing;
- (5) to make provision for the amalgamation of two or more registered societies by special Resolution of those Societies;
- (6) to enable companies registered under the Companies Act, 1910, or an Industrial or Provident Society registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act 1888, or Friendly Societies registered under the Friendly Societies Act, 1905, by special Resolution, to convert themselves into registered Co-operative Societies.

In other words, it would not be necessary in the case of a Friendly Society which is going out of business or of a Provident Society or company registered under the Companies Act, first to be dissolved and then to seek admission into the Co-operative Movement. It would be possible to do that by way of special Resolution, so that any Friendly Society of its own free will, can become a Co-operative Society and can do so by this simple process. We are providing the facilities whereby a limited liability company or an Industrial or Provident Society can, by special Resolution, become a Co-operative Society if it so desires.

To continue the objects of these amendments:—

- (7) to enable a registered Co-operative Society to make provision under its bye-laws for imposing fines and other penalties on its members for infringement of its bye-laws or breaches of any contract entered into by the society in accordance with the provisions of the Act; the guilty party to be required to pay all costs, expenses and fines in case any action in respect of such breach is brought by the registered society.
- (8) to provide for the remedies of injunction or specific performance in the event of a breach or threatened breach by a member of any company registered under the provisions of this Act of any contract made in accordance with the provisions of the Act. Upon *ex parte* application to a court having jurisdiction in the matter, the registered society to be entitled to enter an injunction restraining such breach or threatened breach pending adjudication of any action brought by such society.
- (9) to provide for appeals from the decisions of the Registrar to be made to the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries instead of to the Governor-in-Executive Committee as follows:—

- (1) against the refusal by the Registrar to register a society. (Section 7 (2) of the Act).
- (2) against the refusal by the Registrar to register an amendment to any by-law (Section 10 (4) of the Act)
- (3) against an Order made by the Registrar for the winding up of a registered Society (Section 39 (4) of the Act).
- (4) by a person aggrieved against an Order of the Registrar surcharging officers of a registered Society (Section 49 of the Act).
- (10) to delete the provisions under Section 3 of the Act for conferring special powers upon the Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies and include general provision for the appointment of persons to assist the Registrar.
- (11) To change the references to the Peasants' Loan Bank and Peasants' Loan Bank Act, 1936, occurring in Section 15 of the Act to Agricultural Credit Bank and Agricultural Credit Bank Act, 1961.
- (12) to amend the reference to the Police Magistrate of District "A" and Court of Common Pleas occurring in Sections 38 (5), 50 (4) and (5) and 51 of the Act to agree with the re-organization of the Judiciary by the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956, and the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956.

Those are the amendments which are contained in this amending Bill. The Objects and Reasons of the Bill have been all set out stating exactly in which section of the Act the proposed amendments are to take place. The amendments will do no harm or injustice to any society and they will be a means of giving more power to the Registrar of Societies to enable him to carry on his programme in getting the Co-operative Movement on a sound and lasting footing.

I hardly think that it is necessary for me to read through the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill, because hon. members have the "Objects and Reasons" before them. I have given a resume of the points which this amending Bill seeks to effect; I have done that when I touched on the points from one to twelve in connection with this Bill in which we are asking this House to concur. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad indeed that the Government has come around to be looking at the co-operatives in Barbados. I have to put to the Minister some of my views on this matter. Before I begin to do so, however, I should say that tomorrow or on the next day the Hon. Minister will receive a letter from the Barbados Workers' Union inviting him to discuss matters which impinge upon this matter which he is now introducing. I would say that the co-operative idea and ideals are things which we should encourage at this stage, in view of our own peculiar economic position and in order to stimulate a new type of economic growth in this island. There is, however, a point which I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister. It is proposed in this Bill to give encouragement to young persons in some organizations to come together and in paragraph 6 (b) of the "Objects and Reasons" this is what is stated:-

"as regards conversion, the Bill seeks to make provisions whereby companies registered under the Companies Act, 1910, or societies registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1888, or the Friendly Societies Act, 1905, may by special Resolution, determine to convert themselves into registered societies in keeping with the provisions of the Bill;"

I have no objection to that paragraph; but I would like to point out from my own study of the co-operative movement — and it is an early study which I made — I know the co-operative movement within the context of the Barba-

dian society, and you have to look at an established organization which has the co-operative concept already prevailing and try to encourage it as much as possible. I take no credit for it, but if you are making a provision, and we hope this movement will get groups to come together, I propose to say this.
3.25 p.m.

The impact of the Trade Union Movement on modern industrial society is greater than any of these other things with the exception of the Companies, and within Barbados itself the Trade Union Movement has a bigger combined membership than all the Co-operative Societies put together, and it also has a higher income content than all of them put together — about \$90,000. I say that for this reason: I have just come back from Washington, and there are possibilities for entering into a big co-operative scheme which is something vital to the social and economic life of this country, namely, housing, which is going to be very important, and the Trade Union can have available to it sums of money for the development of co-operative housing within this Island. I am going to have discussions with the Minister on that, and he has been written to that effect. Now that we are passing a Bill, one of the conditions in the Alliance for Progress and Projects to Trade Unions is to have them registered, or have the scheme so piloted that it works through a Co-operative Organisation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in Barbados I doubt very much that the Co-operative Societies here are able at this stage to have this type of assistance that we are talking about, and as I have said already, I feel that the Trade Union Act as it stands in Barbados is outmoded. That was passed in 1875 as the first major Act in the United Kingdom, and you can very well realise that we are nearly 100 years away from 1875, and the conditions which existed in Great Britain in 1875 have absolutely no application to the situation in Barbados today. For that reason, we feel that the Trade Union Act should be so modelled as to suit the peculiar economic circumstances prevailing in this island. With an Organisation that can have 10,000 or 15,000 members, with higher potential, you will realise that it represents about 60,000 which in terms of percentage is nearly 25% of the gross population of Barbados. You cannot ignore an Association with such a content.

Now, I pay credit to the Friendly Societies; but again the Friendly Societies within the context of our growing system can only touch the fringe of the social and economic matter with which we have to deal. They cannot grapple with the vast economic situation, because they were never intended to be organizations to deal with these matters. They serve their purpose within the context of modern thinking, but Friendly Societies have to be remodelled to suit the particular needs. There is no point in looking at Friendly Societies in the same light that you looked upon them in the early 19th Century. The economic position of Barbados through the same Workers' Organization in the Trade Union has outstripped the \$4.00 a year concept as the reward people are looking for as a Christmas bonus to go and buy something, because the price alone has outstripped that, and a man no longer gets an ordinary pair of cheap shoes; so you can understand what the situation is. They have served their purpose in the incidence of medicine, and medical science has reached a stage that a society acts as assistance; but the true concept in the community is that medical services, social services and health services must be so geared to meet the needs of the population.

I am suggesting to the Hon. Minister that within this section I would like to see provision made whereby Trade Unions should have the same benefits. I encourage Co-operative Societies and I would like to see them grow, because within our own Union there are certain sections and members that are co-operators in various Co-operative Societies; but as I have pointed out to the Co-operative officials and authorities here, an organization as big as ours is already a co-operative, and there is no point in telling us we must go through the red tape methods in order to create Co-operative Societies, because a man who has been a Trade Unionist for the last 15 or 20 years has been practising co-operative ideas in a real manner. For

that reason, I would like to see the provisions in this Bill and the protection that this Co-operative Bill is going to give extended to the Trade Union, because it would save the organizations from the unnecessary legal expense, and unnecessary worry with a lot of red tape, but would give the right that you can convert one into the other, so that the rules that apply to a Co-operative Society, would also apply to the Co-operative Society which is registered in the name of the Trade Union.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the Barbados Workers' Union, or any Trade Union for that matter, being able to register as a Co-operative Society as such and have the Co-operative Society rules apply to them, in the same way, Mr. Speaker, that in the early days the Trade Union was registered under the Friendly Societies Act in the United Kingdom, though it was not a Friendly Society, but the purpose and intentions and objects and reasons were similar to those of a Friendly Society, and the Friendly Societies Act applied in many instances to the Trade Union. You will understand, Mr. Speaker, that in order to give the Trade Union some movement and in order to have the same way of getting over the hurdles of the early Acts which prevented them from forming in 1799, it was agreed to have them come under the Friendly Societies Act without breaking the law, until strikes and disputes brought them afoul of the law and they had to have a special Act for them.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time is moot that with the Budget Proposals which I have read but which debate I have not participated in, the trend in under-developed or developing territories in the world today makes it incumbent upon the Government to be, and I will say that the Minister has been, a great friend to the Co-operative Movement and to the Trade Union Movement; but now that it falls within his jurisdiction and power, he can see that they can be merged without any of these technical infringements that would be involved. It is true that we in the Trade Union Movement are broader and more liberal in our concept of doing things than some of the smaller organizations, because they think that the bigger one wants to come in and swallow up the small man. It is not our intention to enter into the Co-operative field *per se* to take away any credit from the Co-operative Organizations, but it is our view that the Trade Union is as much a Co-operative Organization, and if it is registered, I would like it to be made clear so that I can underline all I have said that we do not want our finances being pushed into what we regard as risk capital, because if there is a strike or if something breaks down in one field, or for instance if you have a Co-operative Housing Scheme which in itself would be a scheme that would take its own way in life to deal with other matters, we would not like somebody to call a strike in the Barbados Workers' Union and you can take the funds out of the Co-operative Organization which are to be used for housing, and use them to back up a strike. It should be able to register with all the restrictions that are called for appertaining to the protection of funds, because, Mr. Speaker, I am a believer that when you have public funds - and I regard the Trade Union as a public organization just as I regard Friendly Societies as public organizations because we appeal to a wide area without discrimination - those funds should be protected and well guarded by public scrutiny.

3.35 p.m.

I hope that the Hon. Minister will look at this matter in this light. As I have said earlier, I feel that the Friendly Societies have done a good job in Barbados; but you very well see now that the time has come when there should be a searching investigation into the operation of Friendly Societies, I understand, and I believe I am right, that the Registrar of Friendly Societies is the same person as the Registrar of Co-operatives. The time has come when there should be a searching investigation into the operation of Friendly Societies and it does not matter if you crush anybody's corns in doing so. As a matter of fact, it is good to crush somebody's corns sometimes because it makes that person get rid of them. Some people believe that it is a natural corollary of civilisation to have corns. For that reason some of the social and economic corns should be removed, and I am suggesting that the Minister carry out a searching investigation into these Friendly Societies because some of the societies operating are not operating

as they should be. Moreover, there is money locked up in the banks as a result of the operation of some of these societies, and I do not believe that this small island with its limited capital can afford to have lots of money locked up in the banks especially when you bear in mind that it is the result of small people putting up their sixpences into these societies that has caused this money to be lying in the banks and no use can be made of it.

I personally know of one of these societies and for some unknown reason nobody seems to know how it functions. You cannot have this sort of thing operating in a country. You have the peculiar situation in which the President of one was the former Prime Minister of the West Indies, but how this society works, we do not know; and we have the problem - I mean the Barbados Workers' Trade Union - where we had to expand on somebody's building and up to now we cannot get any conveyance for that building and we have a long and drawn out period of going through the Courts in order to get possession of the necessary conveyance and papers. We know that we can possess the land, but there is the question of who has the conveyance and who has the papers. I am the kind of person who, if I know that if I have the right of ownership, I am going in and possess the land, I would like the Minister to carry out an investigation into this matter - and not only this: but all those societies which were closed for the last three or four years you should have an investigation into them.

Why I say that is because we cannot in this age have somebody sitting down at a table with a little kerosene lamp somewhere down Bawdens or Indian Ground, and then somebody turn up the next morning saying that he was a very nice old fellow, but the place burned down last night and they cannot find the money. The time has come when we should seek to put a stop to this kind of nonsense. We should also make the people understand that the day has come when Friendly Societies in many instances should be amalgamated into some sort of Provident Society; we should amend the law so as to give them power to produce a lot of other things which are needful. It would take a lot of ingenuity for the people to profit much from twenty-six shillings per annum which they throw up in these societies. There is not very much that this amount can provide by way of a social need. I say that because out of this subscription per annum many of these societies only get seventy-five cents per member as a surplus, and that is not taking into consideration payment for the management of the society; so you can very well see that many of these societies are not profit-making organizations, but are benevolent organisations. We should give approval to societies which can provide benevolence of a better nature than what is provided by these Friendly Societies - benevolence which is in keeping with modern times.

Sir, I have no objection to the passing of this Bill. It is a bit unfortunate that when this Bill was being drafted the Trade Union Organisation did not have the opportunity of expressing its views on it. However, it may not be too late; an amending Bill can come with that in it. I am sure when I carry out investigations with the Minister in charge that he would agree that we should legislate for these things, and for the future we should have our laws so constructed to provide for these things in a modern way.

Sir, although I do know that we happen to be living in a British territory, yet I do not feel that everything done in Great Britain needs to be repeated here. With our growing change and our economic circumstances, the background to our political and social circumstances - they are circumstances which demand special treatment; and for that reason I feel that our laws should be constructed for the things of the community and the community should not be constructed to suit the law. For that reason I ask the Hon. Minister to give thought and consideration to what I have to put before him in this Committee. Any organisation which would have the same objects and ideas as the Co-operative Movement, they should see that it should have the same privilege which the Co-operative Movement can enjoy without any infringement of the law.

Sir, as it now stands, it is extremely difficult for organisations like the Co-operative Movement to venture

into some things for the benefit of their members. You can buy property; but there are very worthwhile ventures otherwise which members are in need of, but they are hamstrung by the law. I wish to see the time come when the law would be modernised and liberalised to meet the needs of the people of these times.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that as a result of this amendment, as Government anticipates, throughout this Island there would be such societies formed. I notice that by virtue of this amendment much power is being given to the Minister who will be in charge, as well as the Registrar. I want to make it clear that I am in full support of this Bill, but that what most persons would be watching will be the administration. Like most organisations, an Act or Bill may be passed by which they should operate; but what would be very lacking, as is the case in this Island, is the administration. You have the Agricultural Loan Bank, the Housing Loan and all those schemes, and they are intended for the good and welfare of the Island; but what is lacking is the administration. It will be no longer enough for the Minister — and when I say the Minister, it does not mean the particular Minister today because these things go on — or the person in charge to expect that whoever is Registrar, he would carry on and nobody else knows anything. This is a time which calls for vigilance and I say this as a warning. With the experience gained from many organisations, we should pay particular attention to those who serve in the administration of these societies, because as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has just mentioned, it is a question of dealing with public funds.

3.45 p.m.

It is well known in this island what has been the experience of public funds being used. I have mentioned the Housing Authority, the Agricultural Bank and the Peasants' Loan Bank and I am just saying that that experience must be used to see that this administration is well taken care of.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I must very candidly admit that I have not scanned this Bill. It arrived over the weekend and I have not been able to read it as carefully as I should have read it. I have listened to the Hon. Minister and, unfortunately, I was only able to be in the House for what was the last part of his presentation of the Bill. However, I notice in the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill that Clause 3 says this:—

"Clause four of the Bill is designed to encourage the introduction of co-operatives in schools and among organized groups of young people."

I do not know if the Minister has given any explanation as to how it is proposed that co-operatives in schools would be carried on; it would be very interesting to learn of the way in which co-operatives would be run in schools. There was a time during this century when organizations known as four-H Clubs started in Jamaica and they, in some way, resemble co-operatives. That, of course, dealt with individual schools. I have no criticism to make of the idea of co-operatives in schools, but I would like to hear something of what it is proposed to do in this direction.

When we come to paragraph 6, subparagraph (b) of the "Objects and Reasons", this is what is stated:—

"As regards conversion, the Bill seeks to make provision whereby companies registered under the Companies Act, 1910, or societies registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1888, or the Friendly Societies Act, 1905, may by special Resolution determine to convert themselves into registered societies in keeping with the provisions of the Bill;"

That sort of conversion would be worthwhile. We are very slow indeed to catch up with the idea of co-operatives. Some people say that Barbadians are too individualistic and they do not tend to co-operate or work together in groups. I know of two co-operatives in St. James, but I do not know of any in my constituency; I believe that if some

of the small co-operatives could combine, probably that would be a new shot in the arm, and they would continue to thrive. I was trying to find the Section in the Bill which deals with co-operatives in schools, but I have not succeeded in finding it. However, when the House goes into Committee, I may be able to elicit some information on the matter from the Minister who introduced the Bill. This Bill is not a controversial one and I am not surprised to see that there is not much debate on it. Where it seeks to widen the compass of things as such I think the House should give this Bill its blessing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member wish to speak before the Hon. Minister replies?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: In reply to the queries which have been raised by hon. members, I will first endeavour to answer the last hon. member who spoke, that is, the hon. junior member for St. Peter. He touched on the question of the training of school children and he wanted to hear something further of this proposal. The purpose of training school children in co-operatives is to provide a basic understanding of the meaning of co-operatives which would encourage these young people to participate actively in the Co-operative Movement at a later stage. The Co-operative Division has, on a few occasions, addressed pupils at selected schools. The training of teachers at Erdiston College is to provide suitable trainees for carrying out work in the schools. It is recommended that (a) the Ministry of Education be asked to encourage the formation of co-operatives in schools and that the Registrar, Co-operative Officers and certain selected persons carry out a series of practical training courses for the pupils and members of Old Scholars Associations; (b) that the Ministry of Education be asked to include co-operatives in the curriculum of the schools as part of a social studies course. The hon. member also touched on the question of converting Limited Liability Companies and Friendly Societies into Co-operative Societies; that is done at the free will of the company or the Friendly Society, and is merely a facility which will be rendered the Friendly Societies or companies; but there will be no coercion or compulsion if the company wants to remain as a Limited Liability company. In the same way, if a Friendly Society wants to remain as a Friendly Society, it will remain in that way. However, a company could pass a Resolution to become a co-operative without having to go through the formalities of winding up the company and all of that procedure.

The hon. senior member for St. James has expressed a certain amount of fear as to the administration of these Co-operative Societies and Friendly Societies, and he has said that a great amount of power is being vested in the Minister and in the Registrar. That is true.

3.55 p.m.

It is for that reason that the power is being vested in the Minister and the Registrar to have a firmer grip on the entire matter. You will see that under the proposed amendments the Registrar has wide powers of calling for audits without any delay, and having investigations without any formalities attached; so the Registrar will be seized of greater powers and shall be in a position to tighten up on the running of these Friendly Societies and Co-operative Societies under these proposed amendments.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Trade Union Leader, expressed approval of the proposed amendment, but intimated that he feels that the Trade Union Movement should be granted the opportunity just as limited liability companies and Friendly Societies of being registered as a co-operative, and of being entitled to the facilities and privileges which are enjoyed by Co-operative Societies. Well, I can assure the hon. member that if such facilities would be beneficial to his Trade Union Movement, I have little or no doubt that the necessary amendment would be made after due consideration is given to the proposals. I think those are all the pertinent questions which were raised. As far as the Friendly Societies are concerned, investigations are proceeding at present, and the whole matter is under consideration by the Government.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called. It reads as follows:—

3. Section three of the principal Act is amended as follows:—

- (a) by renumbering the section as subsection (1) thereof;
- (b) by deleting the words "and an Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies shall exercise such powers and functions of the Registrar as may be conferred or imposed on him by general or special order made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee";
- (c) by adding the following as subsection (2) of the section —

"(2) The Governor may appoint persons to assist the Registrar, and the Minister may, by general or special order published in the Official Gazette, confer on such persons all or any of the powers of a Registrar under this Act.";
- (d) by deleting the words "Assistant Registrar" in the marginal note to the section and substituting therefor the words "persons assisting the Registrar".

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, Section 3 (2) says that the Governor may appoint persons to assist the Registrar, and the Minister may, by general or special order published in the Official Gazette, confer on such persons all or any of the powers of a Registrar under this Act. The Hon. Minister has just assured us that they are going through all of these Friendly Societies, and I am only drawing to his attention that I hope they will go through thoroughly the dissolution of the St. Elizabeth's Friendly Society, because up to not long ago nothing has happened. Something went wrong with one of those persons who had to do with the Friendly Societies which caused the people to lose money. After the Society was dissolved, one of the officers called on people to bring the money to him as a man. These people did not know and drew the money from the Bank and took it to him, and since then everything went overboard. I do not want to be clear on the point now, but I hope the Minister will go into it and see that this money is refunded to these people, because they are not able to lose it, and it is Government's responsibility because it is a Government servant who has taken this money from these people. I hope the Minister will take note of it and let me know what really is the true position relative to the repayment of this money.

Mr. Chairman, whenever you are dealing with Societies of this sort, you are dealing with the very poorest class of people who can barely put their pennies and cents there, and the most you can hear them say is that they are meeting their Society to give them a little milk when they are sick or to give them a proper turn-out when they die. They are not meeting it to build a big amount and become rich, and it is not fair for one or two servants of Government to cause these people to lose this amount of money. I hope the Minister will go into it and let us know something about it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I think the query raised by the last hon. member deserves some reply. Now

on the question of monies which are paid over by trustees of certain Societies, before the appointment of the present Registrar of Co-operatives, that money was paid over to the last Inspector of Friendly Societies for distribution to members after the dissolution of the Societies. The last Government dealt with this question of reimbursing the Societies in respect of this money which was paid over to the late Inspector of Friendly Societies, and, as far as I know, decided against it. This happened last year and I am not blaming the last Government, but I am simply drawing to the attention of the hon. member that the incident took place last year before this Government came into office, and the last Government in office actually considered the matter and decided against it. I think the hon. member is referring to the six Societies which paid over money to the late Inspector of Friendly Societies.

4.05 p.m.

I think the hon. member is referring to these Societies: the Elementary Teachers' Association, the Good Samaritan Society of St. Michael, the Nugget Brotherly Society of St. Joseph, the Prerogative Society of St. George, the St. Matthias Combined Society of Christ Church and the Sweet Home Society of St. Peter. All this happened between the years 1959 and 1961 and the present Government is now considering this matter. Because of that, I cannot give any definite statement as to what the decision of the Government will be as regards the reimbursement of these Friendly Societies. The last Government dealt with the question of reimbursement to Societies of monies paid over to the late Inspector of Friendly Societies and, as far as I am informed, decided against it.

Mr. SMITH: I am very glad to hear the reply coming from the hon. senior member for Christ Church, but I am a bit surprised and shocked to hear that the last Government decided against a thing of this sort. I say that because I am not a legal man, but I know that I am responsible for my servant: and I know that if my servant goes and does anything wrong, I would be responsible for him. Therefore, the matter would be the responsibility of the Government, and the Government should hold themselves responsible for the losses and they should not let these people lose their money.

I sincerely hope that the present Government would be considerate and go into the matter on the question of realising that it is the people and not the society who would be losing it. I hope this Government would be considerate and do something by way of reimbursing these people.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, this is a Bill which deals with Friendly Societies and what I have to say is a bit pertinent; therefore, I would like the Hon. Minister to give an ear to what I have to say. I think the Hon. Minister gave the impression that this is a matter of Government doing something towards the refunding of money owed to members of the several societies which he named. I am not a lawyer, but I was of the opinion that the winding up of a Friendly Society and the distribution of the remaining assets of that society was a matter which concerned the ordinary processes of law. I did not know that it would depend upon the good graces of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to act in this matter; in other words, to say "yes" or "no", "we will refund" or "we will not refund" that part of the remaining assets of the particular society. I thought the ordinary processes of the law took good care of that.

I would like the Hon. Minister who is knowledgeable in the processes of the law to make a statement. I would not feel satisfied if it is left to the good graces of a Government that members of societies which are no longer functioning or can no longer function should ask that their assets be wound up, if there are any assets remaining, and that it is left to the good graces of Government. I do not think they should depend on that. I do not think the Act in front of me says that, but owing to the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the information given by the Minister in charge of this Bill I do not like the tenor of things.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I would not like the Hon. Minister to get into this. He knows the hon. junior member for

St. Joseph, and, as the hon. senior member for St. Andrew said some time ago, he can get off the right latitude so often and get a whole debate muddled up. We are dealing with a Bill which affects the amalgamation of the Friendly Societies Act.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has suddenly become very knowledgeable on all matters which I am very pleased to see. The hon. member has asked the question and the Hon. Minister in charge who was very polite answered him dealing with the money which has been handed over.

Now, Sir, this is not a question of the dissolution of a Friendly Society. Unfortunately, the Friendly Societies Act in Barbados was so stupidly drafted that nobody can dissolve a Friendly Society. Under the present statute, you pay up your contributions to the society, and the management puts the money in the Bank; and if so many members do not call on the Registrar to dissolve the society, the Registrar cannot dissolve it. It is not so with the Trade Union. Under the Trade Union Act, the Registrar of Trade Unions can go and say that such-and-such a Trade Union is not a functioning organisation and, therefore, it is going to be struck off the register. Under the Friendly Societies Act, you put money in the bank and it stays there and nobody can do anything about it. As a matter of fact, some members of these societies have gone to Panama, and on some of them the people have put the name of some little children as members, and the children never knew that they were members.

Some years ago it was put up that you should do something about it, and that the Act should be amended retrospectively so as to deal with some of these societies which have gone out of operation and so that the Registrar can wind up certain organisations, and that the division of the assets can be done by legal processes through the Courts.

I would say this. Unless it is a matter which we are going to discuss today, as regards the past Inspector of Friendly Societies holding money for someone — a matter which has to be investigated — I do not think we should enter on that matter in dealing with this Bill. The least you should say is that if there is an investigation so that any money can be distributed to persons belonging to societies and which that officer had in hand, it would be a question of what you would get from that officer. The Hon. Minister of Societies should know that the Government has assets for any public officer because any pensionable officer, whether he dies intestate or not, has money accruing to him; therefore if anything is wrong, if any money is owed by him, that can be a charge against his estate. I repeat, we should not allow the debate to proceed along those lines. As I have said, a Registrar of Friendly Societies can only do something within the province of the Act, and if the members of a society do not act, a Registrar is hopeless. That is one of the reasons why they wanted to amend the Act and they wanted to give him the authority which this Act is giving to him now.

What the hon. junior member for St. Joseph does not know is that this money cannot be given back to anybody at all. It is not money which belongs to any person in that way. For anything to happen, the members of a society would have to come together to say that they want the particular society dissolved. Unless the society is dissolved no money can be given. I know that many of these societies have not been dissolved legally, but they have stopped functioning; and I also know that some of the members, particularly of the management, have got into hot water because some of them thought that when the rules stated that it should be dissolved with two-thirds of the membership, it meant two-thirds of the Committee of Management.

4.15 p.m.

You can see what has happened in the early days. In the early days they had two-thirds of the membership so as to make it difficult for the societies to be dissolved. Many of them have not got two-thirds of the members to dissolve the money. You will find that in the Savings Bank there is money on behalf of some societies for the last twenty years. I raised the matter from the point of view

of investigating the business of the society. There is the Barbados Progressive League Friendly Society which is next door to me; it was a political society and it was closed down. People have asked me for the Society's money and I say that I know nothing about it. The officers paraded as the great benefactors of the nation and therefore you have these circumstances. These people ran the Government for the last fifteen years and did nothing about the matter. It is unfortunate that the hon. member had to tell the hon. junior member for St. Joseph something about the facts of life.

Mr. SMITH: I do not think that the hon. senior member for St. Peter was in here when I began to speak. I did not raise this question on the second reading of the Bill at all; it was only after the Minister gave us the assurance that the Government was investigating these things that I simply drew to his attention what happened to this particular society. I never told the hon. member that I do not know anything about Friendly Societies; he knows better than that. This particular society, as far as I can remember, was called upon to be dissolved. After the membership was reduced to such a small number it would not pay to carry on that society. With a society having 50 or 60 members, what can that do? It cannot pay the funeral benefits, it cannot even pay two or three dollars a week when one is sick; and what is the profit of allowing people to put money there when they can put their money in a bigger society and get the benefit? This particular society was dissolved by law and the money was put into the Bank. These people were told: "Draw the money and bring it to me." (*Laughter*). I do not mean bring it to me personally. But, of course, the hon. senior member for St. Peter must throw something at the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I can say that I know more about Friendly Societies than the hon. member because I am president of one. I do not think I would know more about being General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union than the hon. senior member for St. Peter. However, I would not have raised this question under this Bill because this is not the place to raise it; I raised it on the reply which came from the Hon. Minister. It is not fair that these people should lose their money when they are able to place the money in the Bank.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 4 to 11 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) BILL

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 4 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:— To move the second reading of a Bill further to amend the Pensions Act, 1947.

4.25 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a relatively short measure. There are several amendments to the Pensions Act, 1947, and I may take this opportunity to inform hon. members that a similar provision will be coming down shortly in relation to secondary school teachers, because I believe some 13 or 14 years ago the Executive Com-

mittee made a decision that secondary school teachers should enjoy the same pension rights as members of the public service of this Island. The secondary school teachers are now employees of the Statutory Boards which run the secondary schools. The reason why I mention this, Sir, is because I know that in the course of this debate some hon. members may ask, if a decision was made some 13 years ago to place secondary school teachers on the same footing as public service employees, why nothing has been done. The wheels of legislative process appear to grind exceedingly slow in this respect, but the teachers who retired since 1947 will not be prejudiced in any way, because they will enjoy all the rights and privileges even if they retired in 1948 as if the Bill had come into effect, except that payment will not be backdated for 15 years, but from the date of the coming into operation of the Act.

If I may get down to the instant Bill, Sir, the purpose of the Bill in the amendments which we have brought forward is to bring the local pensions legislation in line with that of other territories in the Commonwealth. It is true we have reciprocal agreement. Clause 2 provides for inclusion in the definition of "public service" in section 2 of the Act of 1947 references to the East African Common Services Organization, and this has become necessary because the East African High Commission has been replaced by the East African Common Services Organization, and the East African Court of Appeal has been re-established; and on this re-establishment these officers have ceased to be regarded as being eligible for pensions under the Service of the Government of Kenya. This of course is not an impelling consideration, but similar provisions have been suggested in the other territories of the Caribbean. Other provisions in the Bill are set out in the Objects and Reasons, and I need not go into them in detail except that when we come to Clause 4, there is no provision in the Pensions Act for an officer who has died in the actual discharge of his duties if he dies as a result of damage to any aircraft or vessel in the time of war while travelling by a route approved by the Governor to or from the Island at the beginning or at the termination of his period of service or period of leave, or if he dies as a result of injuries received while travelling by air. Clause 5, Sir, is pursuant to another recommendation of the Secretary of State that we substitute the words "service under the Government of this Island" for the expressions "service in this Island" and "the service of this Island". "Service under the Government of this Island" is the appropriate phrase which will be used, because expressions like "service in this Island" and "service of this Island" have given rise to difficulties in the application of the Act and the Regulations to cases where service with certain authorities has been deemed to be public service by the Secretary of State. If I may give an illustration, it may be felt that someone who is employed, let us say, by a Board or in a school or somewhere like that is in the service of the Island, but I want to make it clear since this is a Public Service Pensions Act, that it should be "service under the Government of this Island".

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this Bill in a general way to object to, but in a specified way I must raise a point which I raise each time the Pensions Act of 1947 comes to be amended. You can see that this Act has been amended as many times maybe as the years in the 20th Century. I am sure there are over 50 amendments to this 1947 Act, and the time has come when the people in the administration must get down to working for their living. There must be a comprehensive consolidated Pensions Act passed in this Island. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we are running into a lot of difficulties in this Island because no one knows the Pensions Act thoroughly with all the amendments. When one Establishment Officer or Personnel Officer goes, another officer must acquaint himself thoroughly. It is amazing the number of occasions on which the Crown Law Department sent down an amendment to the 1947 Act, and before the ink dries on that, there had to be an amendment to the amendment which they sent down, which shows that there should be some consolidation of the 1947

Pensions Act to bring it up to date, so that people could read and see what the Act relates to, because if you look at the laws of 1947, you will see that so many changes have been made.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see it consolidated, because every pensionable officer in this Island should come under the 1947 Amendment Act, whether he is in the parochial service or in the Government Service, so that you would have a consolidated Act which would apply with all the legal terms to them; and if it is a question that the local authorities have to pay a pension, they would be paying a pension in accordance with the 1947 Pensions Act, and that would simplify a lot of our pensionable difficulties, because people working with local authorities are asking how are they to get a pension. My view, Mr. Speaker, is that Barbados is small enough that there should be one big consolidated Pensions Act.

The second point I would raise - and I raise it on the financial side - is that I think the Pensions Act should be so remodelled that its computation for giving pensions should be on an escalator basis, and as I said before, persons retiring from any given post or salary, without acting on the whims and wishes of a Government from day to day, should enjoy the pensionable amount appropriate to the scale that is in existence in their life time, and you would not have a system which we had some years ago of coming with this business of a Pensions Act making it some mathematical jig-saw puzzle for people not to understand what it really means.

4.55 p.m.

A man retires at £1,000 per annum and he is getting a pension calculated at £1,000 per annum; but if you carry the post to £1,500 the pension emoluments should follow that rise because the person occupying that post would get that if he retires. I would just say in passing that since I left the Island the former Chief Justice, the late Sir Allan Collymore, has gone to the Great Beyond.

The only person who would ever draw the pension comparable to that salary of \$1,500 is the present incumbent if he retires. What it does, if you were to amend the law along those lines, would be to make it easier for the Government or for any Government because they would not have to work it out any more.

I know of a pensionable officer who has been living 24 years after he retired. You, Sir, can imagine what was his salary when he retired. You cannot go into the reverse. Whatever position you were holding, you are expected to live up to that position.

I think it is a sound idea and there is nothing original in making that statement. It is done elsewhere and it is a thing which Barbados should follow. You should bring down an amendment to the Pensions Act to have pensions computed on the basis of the salary of the post, that is to say, in a case of a cantonnier, let us say, if a man who was a cantonnier retired when he was getting a wage of 28 cents an hour, and the rate per hour of that position is now 48 cents an hour, you should give the man who has retired a pension computed at the rate of 48 cents an hour. In so doing, you will not have to say that you are going to give him 10% more. When you change the salary structure in the Civil Service, automatically you have increased the salaries of the officers because the cost of living has gone up and because of that, it must have an impact on those who are pensioners. I do not think it is illogical to give to pensioners a pension comparable to the salary of the incumbent of the present post.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Peter has raised two very interesting points on this Bill. The first point was as regards the consolidation. The question of multiplicity of amendments to statutes is not only dealing with the Pension Act at all; it is found all over the place on all sorts of subjects and all sorts of heads. The question of consolidation of the Pension Act is a matter to be done with the revision and amendments of the Laws of Barbados.

I am glad to say that we expect to have that matter dealt with soon. After many false starts, a sum of money was voted by the Legislature for the revision of the statute laws, and one jurist who was a member of the Other Place made a start on the revision and after spending some time on it he had to retire from his efforts.

During my visit to the United Kingdom earlier this year, I had the privilege of discussing this matter with a contemporary of mine, a Professor of Law at Sheffield University. I should say the Hon. Minister of Education and myself and at least three of the Permanent Secretaries had the distinction of talking to this gentleman and therefore we know something of his capabilities. The Nuffield Foundation has given him and two other West Indians the task of looking at all the laws of the West Indian Islands and in the course of doing this he expressed his anxiety over the present state of the law in Barbados and it was fortunate in this discussion that I got the idea from him that if the Government of Barbados was so disposed that he would be pleased to carry out this job along with his team of workers who have been working on the West Indian laws.

In addition to that, there is another young West Indian who has had experience in other West Indian Islands in similar capacities and I think Your Honour will be aware of his identity. He will be assuming duties in London shortly and he has promised to give assistance.

Law revision is not merely a question of using a scissors and a bottle of paste. It is an extremely technical job and it calls for vigour and enthusiasm. Most of the law revisions or so-called law revisions have broken ground because of the misconception of the Governments of those territories that the more senior a person, the easier the law revision would be because Government felt that that person would bring to bear his long years of experience on the revision. It is now considered the most technical art of the legal profession, and that is the reason why we allow people who are specialists in that field to revise the laws of Barbados.

In the process of time, recommendations have been made to this Chamber for law reform and actual consolidation of the various statutes would be taken care of in the process of the law revision. We are not compiling the statutes of this Island and the rules and the regulations. We are not merely cutting a piece of paper out of one book and pasting it into another book. I would like to assure the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the consolidations of the Pensions Act will be taken care of.

There are other aspects of the law which would have to be tackled as a matter of urgency, and one is the consolidation of the Labour Code, or having a Labour Code at all; because labour legislation is found scattered all over the place. We will be departing from the long recognised practice of publishing laws by their chronological order. We will be publishing laws according to their subject matter. The Jamaica laws are published in the same form as Halsbury's Statutes, but I am not quite sure whether we intend to follow that practice.

The second question raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter is the question of bringing pensions up-to-date. That is a very complicated question. I have received several letters from the time I came into office as Minister of Finance pointing out the plight of Government Pensioners, a plight which I am not totally or partially unconscious of, because you will find in the programme or policy of the Party of which I have the honour to be Chairman, the necessity to revise at an early date, as soon as practicable, the pensions being paid to former Government employees who retired before salaries had come into line with reality. 4.45 p.m.

This is a matter which weekly I have under active consideration. I would hate to enter a debate on this matter now, but I do not think that one could say right off the reel that a person's pension should be automatically adjusted to what he would have received if he had now retired from a

post, whatever the income of the person holding the post may be. Let us say that a person retires on a pension of \$100 a month. A person who is now holding the office from which his predecessor retired would be getting \$600 a month and for the same service that person would have been getting \$400 a month as pension. You can see the implications of that. If I understand the hon. senior member for St. Peter correctly, a man who retired 20 years ago and is drawing a pension of \$100 a month, would automatically have his pension adjusted so that he would be drawing \$400 a month today. I believe that there are places in the world where that kind of adjustment obtains. I am not quite sure, but there is some provision in British Guiana where, if you did not get exactly the same pension, you got some kind of adjustment. I know that there are hard cases. I know a person who was the headmistress of a school for over 40 years, and if she were doing that job today she would be getting probably \$400 a month. It was one of the largest schools in the island and I do not think her pension ever exceeded \$60 a month, although a person who is resigning from a similar school today would be getting \$200 a month. There are people who made their investments in property and they brought up their children, but there is a category of pensioner of more recent vintage. The cost of living index had not started to rise in the fashion as it did ten years after the War, when the cost of living went up by something like 300%. These people are suffering hardship; I cannot say, at this stage, that the Government is prepared to introduce legislation whereby pensions will be equated to the salaries which the posts would offer or from which Government servants would have retired before the coming into being of such legislation. I cannot give that assurance; as a matter of fact, it would be difficult for me to give that assurance now.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter will be pleased to know that the Cabinet has been discussing the composition of a Committee to go into this whole question of pensions. I cannot now remember whether the Committee has actually been appointed. Some of my colleagues would be in a position to say whether that is so or not, but I know that the members of the Cabinet have been discussing the question of the appointment of a Committee to go into the whole question of Government pensions. I understand that the personnel of the Committee has not been designated, but that the Committee has been appointed and the matter is under the aegis of the Ministry of Social Services. The Hon. Minister of Social Services is not now in his place to assist me in this matter, but these things do take a little time to be dealt with.

I hope that the assurance which I have given answers the question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Of course, the members of the Legislature will have the opportunity of discussing the recommendations of the Committee before the necessary legislation comes before this House. I hope that if the hon. member has any supplementary questions to ask, he will reserve them for the Committee stage of the Bill. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that I mentioned that there was another Pension Bill — the Secondary School Teachers Bill — which will come before the Legislature soon. I forgot to mention that, in dealing with that Bill, we discovered that in the provisions which we were making to that Bill, although we were not neglecting the rights of people in other parts of the Commonwealth from which we recruit people, it was in advance of the 1947 Act as amended. It was in dealing with the Secondary School Teachers Bill that it was discovered that we should bring this one up-to-date. We hope that within a very short time the whole Pension Act of 1947 will be consolidated in the law revision which we are now contemplating.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

4.55 p.m.

Clause 3 was called. It reads as follows:

3. Section three of the principal Act is amended as follows —

(a) by substituting the words "and published in the Official Gazette" for the words "for their approval" appearing at the end of subsection (2) of the section;

(b) by inserting immediately after subsection (2) the following new subsection —

"(2A). Whenever the Governor is satisfied that it is equitable that any regulation made under this section should have retrospective effect in order to confer a benefit on or remove a disability attaching to any person, that regulation may be given retrospective effect for that purpose; but no such regulation shall have retrospective effect unless, before being made, it has been approved by a resolution of each House of the Legislature.";

(c) by deleting from subsection (3) the words "and approved".

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this is not to oppose Clause 3, but to take the opportunity of thanking the Hon. Premier for his explanation to the points I raised in the second reading. So far as the point which I made about the methods of computation is concerned, that would always be a matter of opinion, but I would say that the Hon. Premier need not have any fear, because the same problem is likely to arise on an *ad hoc* basis. If the Government is called upon at any time to increase pensions to all pensionable people, they have to do it by some amount of money which is going to last as long as the persons are there. You know that everybody who comes to receive a pension has a life span, and I am pleased to hear that this Committee has been set up so that you will get some idea of the average age of persons retiring in Barbados and what you have to pay them; and if there are three increases, the most they can look forward to is about two. What I would like to point out to the Hon. Minister is that the jump is not what a man was getting twenty years ago if you are going to give him a pension computed on what he was paid, because the number of 'twenty-year-ago' people still living in Barbados — and I am dealing more so with men — and the statistics from the Statistical Department show that men die in Barbados after 50 years faster than women anyhow, and the majority employed in the service are men, and therefore you have to work out what you are going to do with this majority. You will find, therefore, that you will be able to count people on your fingers who are over twenty, and people in the higher posts live longer than people in the lower posts. So the problem of finance is no worry, though the principle may look a bit complex and confusing.

The Hon. Premier talked about people writing to him. Nobody writes to you to say they should get a pension, because it is already stated and computed. What you get people writing on are the issues that should be settled on a certain basis of principle, because if you compute an officer's pension, he never comes back and tells you he does not want the pension; he knows what it is going to be before he starts to work. What I feel, Mr. Chairman, is that a Legislature like ours has many exercises of dealing with issues that can be settled by certain broad principles, but the House of Assembly is forced to deal with them, because there is no other medium for people to get justice. I should never have to discuss the question that pensioners are not

getting an increase, and people saying "who are going to see after the poor pensioners". That should never be a situation; and that is why I say it should be complementary to your salary, because that is what a pension is; and if the pensioner lives for any length of time, his pensionable emoluments should be on that basis, so that there should be no confusion as to what the position should be. If a man retires today and you amend the salary to his post tomorrow, he is entitled to the amended pension, and that is what I would like the Committee to study. At some stage of our life we have to face as a fact that if you change from one system to another, it is going to cost money. If you change from a 48-hour week to a 44-hour week, the change-over is going to cost more money because you have reduced the hours; these are consequential prices which you have to pay.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that when you examine this, you will find that it is sound and logical, and I would say that it is a system which any person, whether private or public, should be willing to adopt, because it has sound points in it. From what the Government has said, I do not think that salaries in the Public Service are going to be revised on this basis, very quickly, and I am a subscriber to the fact that public salaries which form a different character where you have increments and certain things should be worked on a different basis. I say that because the Hon. Premier said that nobody's salary in Barbados will be increased in his time because the salaries of the Government are geared on a common plane in which you have the Chief Justice's salary, the Attorney General's salary and the salary of higher officers of the Government coming within the Civil Service structure in which you also have a cantonnier, a man driving a lorry and a man riding a road roller, and I do not see how I can be dogmatic and say that because you are not going to change the Chief Justice's salary in the next three or four years, you are therefore going to freeze the salary of the cantonnier, the road-roller driver and the people at the bottom. That is why I say on this side that I have to be able to come back subsequently and say that on 31st July I agreed not to increase salaries and now I am pressing Government to do it. In respect of the Establishment and people in the other groups, I cannot in my own conscience say that I would freeze salaries at the bottom of \$18 or \$20 a week for the same period that I would freeze salaries at \$800 a month. I would have to be going stark, staring mad, and I am not going so yet.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 4 and 5 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

5.05 p.m.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE COMMISSIONS OF ENQUIRY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day — Order No. 5 — stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill further to amend the Commissions of Enquiry Act, 1908.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the present Commissions of Enquiry Act, 1908, enables the Governor-in-Executive Committee to issue Commissions of Enquiry into the conduct of officers in the Public Service as well as into the conduct and management of Departments of the Public Service and Parochial or Local Government Bodies. The Governor-in-Executive Committee is also empowered by the present Act to issue Commissions to enquire into the conduct and management of public or local institutions or bodies that are in receipt of or entrusted

with public funds and into which an enquiry would, in the opinion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, be for the public welfare.

I mentioned that because hon. members may be asking why should we have a new Commission of Enquiry Act when we have one which has been serving this Island usefully from 1908.

It is considered that it is necessary, especially for Commissions of Enquiry, not only to enquire into the expenditure of public funds, but also into other questions where public funds may not be directly involved but where in the opinion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee such an enquiry would be in the public interest and for the public welfare.

I personally would not like to go into cases or illustrations at this moment, because it may give the impression to the public that the kind of cases which we have in mind are cases where we are out to victimise a person or group of persons. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has always been saying that we should have in Barbados the equivalent of the Senate Investigating Committee and, as the hon. member knows, that Committee has very wide powers. He has always voiced the opinion that a lot of people who are now at liberty would be behind bars if we had such an Investigating Committee.

I think that I should make it clear that this is not a Bill which is aimed at a particular individual or a particular organisation. The time has come when, although public money may not be involved, you should have a Commission into a set of circumstances emanating from a private person's conduct. For instance, just now we had a Bill introduced by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture which gave rise to some questionable Friendly Societies. As far as I know — and I am speaking subject to correction even by Your Honour or any other persons — a Friendly Society is a friendly society. We have an Act to enquire into the funds. But let us take the question of a 'meeting turn'. That is an agreement among a set of people who contribute as much as \$20 a week in some meeting turns: and if you had eighteen members subscribing to a meeting turn where you were contributing \$20 a week, the Treasurer may wake up one morning and say to himself that the amount of money which you get out of that per week may be just sufficient to pay his passage on the "Surriento" and as the saying is, the money of the other people has gone through the eddoes, and as it is, you cannot ask the Treasurer to come back. The Government has no power to conduct an enquiry into the occurrence. In Trinidad they call such meeting turns a "Sou-sou". You will find some West Indians are buying houses out of such meeting turns. You can very well see that such a Treasurer is not the sort of person whom you should entrust money with and by making it possible to have a Commission into that sort of thing, we will be able to bring it to the attention of the public, and West Indians in London will get to know, if that individual tries to organise such a sort of thing in London, that he is a person who should be avoided at all costs.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we will be introducing a lot of measures in the process of time to tighten up on the collection of private funds in Barbados, because we are trying to create an atmosphere in which people must have confidence not only in the Government, but in the business community: so that when people come from abroad they can walk into any institution and subscribe money knowing that Barbados is going to protect them. One of the ways we are going to protect them is by the Bill which we have now before us.

Another way is by legislation dealing with Insurance companies. Insurance companies are conducting their affairs in a manner which suits them. Of course, very many of them are conducting their affairs in a highly legitimate and legal manner, but the law as regards them is certainly inefficient. I cannot, as Minister of Finance, sit and see Insurance Companies come here and collect premiums and take those premiums and send them out of the country and invest them in Canada. They pay income tax: but there is a

special rate for Insurance Companies and it is a better rate than that given to investors' companies. We intend to do something about it. I have never understood the reason why Insurance Companies pay less income tax because they invest very little of the money which they collect by way of premiums into the Island. It is true that some of them have taken up Government debentures, but they have done so under pressure — almost blackmail. That had to be done in order to get them invest some of the money in the Island. 5.15 p.m.

One of the reasons why insurance companies may have been allowed this concession of 7% from previous Governments is that they probably computed that the premium rates would have much higher if the Government did not confer a special rate for insurance profits; but the profits should have been computed in a way where all the profits are calculated as having been earned in Barbados. I have already informed the insurance companies — as a matter of fact we have sent out documents from time to time setting out the new approach to insurance. We have received some very scathing replies to what we have sent out to them, but I say that insurance is a business which Barbadians can run for themselves. If the foreign companies do not want to co-operate with the Government, but want to regard our economy or the economy of Barbados as a happy hunting-ground for those who believe in a rubber industry, then we will deal with them. Apart from our local insurance companies like the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Company, which is an Institution established for over 100 years, there are these mushroom organizations which are coming in here without any capital and hawking insurance for people who are working in cane fields and giving them prospectuses which contain illusory benefits. We have to deal with these organizations. All of these things have been going on in this island and they are creating a shortage of investment capital.

This Government does not intend to allow that state of affairs to continue for very long. We can tell these insurance companies which are operating in Barbados that they can go to hell if they do not want to co-operate. What I say about insurance companies I will say to the companies which go in for motor car insurance and Third Party insurance. I have the figures as to the amount of money collected on Third Party insurance. As to Workmen's Compensation, the premium rates are very low. We intend to increase the amount as to Workmen's Compensation very shortly and I believe we have consulted with the organization of the hon. senior member for St. Peter who, I think, is well aware of the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Bill which has for its object the increase of the benefits from \$1,850 to \$10,000. We can do that much because the rates which the employers pay are on a maximum of about \$2.69 to \$3.00. We can say that that is being done without any great hardship on the employers. Your Honour will remember that as far back as seven years ago I introduced a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act on the floor of this House relative to the increase of benefits and it was not acceptable to the members of the Barbados Labour Party. I suppose that when I reintroduce this Bill I will get as much satisfaction as Mr. Ernest Bevin got in 1946 when he repealed the Trade Union Act of 1927. I suppose that when I introduce this Bill to increase the amount payable in respect of fatal accidents, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will say that it should not be \$10,000 but \$25,000. I hope he will satisfy us that a jump from \$1,850 to \$25,000 will be a jump which the Island will be able to support. I will withdraw my Bill when the hon. member comes down with these figures but without the supporting facts.

I do not think that hon. members will have any objection to the present Bill which is an improvement on the 1908 Act and which makes provision for the appointment of a Commission of Enquiry concerning any matter which the Governor-in-Executive Committee considers to be in the interest of the public welfare. I think that I ought to give the assurance that as long as this Government is in office the provisions of this Bill will not be used as a measure of oppression or to pry into a person's private affairs, but only where it is in the interest of the public welfare. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not know of all the reasons why the Premier has introduced this Bill. The Hon. Premier has quoted me as being a believer in a Senate Investigation Committee, but he will agree with me that that is a different thing from a Commission of Enquiry. That is a Committee which investigates public affairs when the House discusses them and decides that the issues involved are subject to a Committee and they set up a Committee to investigate these matters. A Commission of Enquiry is something which the Government decides to set up. As the hon. member has said, what I do not like about Commissions of Enquiry is that if the Government does not feel that they should set up a Committee to investigate something, they do not set it up, and they will hold back. I have asked this House to set up a Commission of Enquiry into the working of the Labour Exchange and a Commission of Enquiry into the working of the sugar industry and they waited until it all broke down. You do not pass legislation for Jones and Harry; I believe that all of us have aspects of embarrassment in our lives. You want to investigate my friend but I do not want to preside over my friend's investigation and therefore I will wash my hands of it like Pilate. 5.25 p.m.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are human, and those are some of the human frailties from which we suffer. I doubt there is any member of this House who would look upon his closest friend and say: "Send him to the guillotine". He would say he did not know what happened to his friend which caused him to do what he did, that he saw him the day before and if he had only mentioned the matter, he would have done everything to avoid it. We would be looking for an excuse, because we would not want to come down on somebody we like, and that is what I am afraid of. In dealing with a Committee like the House, you do not have to worry because members of the House have opponents in the House, and that is why I am in favour of the Government having the powers stated there, because I know they wanted more powers. There was a Bill passed in 1908 which aimed primarily at public officers and public institutions and organisations that spent public money, but we have gone a little further in this Bill.

I would like hon. members to be very careful and see that this amendment says "any matter in which an enquiry would, in the opinion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, be for the public welfare". I want to know from the Premier why is it he wants to have a Commission of Enquiry to investigate any matter. Sometimes you can have a Committee. For example, a Commission of Enquiry is stamped and sealed and has all the evidence that you use in Court after setting up a Committee to investigate the matter, and as the Hon. Premier has said, he does not want to interfere with the rights of the individual. I would say to him that all lawyers are like that. Lawyers protect the fundamental rights of the individual, because their profession is basically a profession of the individual; but what I am afraid of is that lawyers would protect the individual, but kill an organisation, even if it is an organisation that has money to spend.

I am not Minister of Finance, but I will caution the Premier that living in a small place like this, people are likely to misinterpret what he says, and I do not go in for too many re-explanations or explaining what I said, because this country has had a very bad reputation from one of its former leaders in these explanations and saying that he did not really mean it that way. With all due respect to you, Mr. Speaker, because you belong to that profession, there seems to be a tendency among lawyers to explain what they have explained already, and they believe that the population is a population of jurymen, and if they explain something again and again, they would get the verdict they want. In politics, we are not jurymen; we are politicians and are going to listen to you and pin you down to what you have said. I do not want the Premier in dealing with this Commission of Enquiry to go off the beaten track and deal with people who should not be dealt with. The hon. member talked about an enquiry into Insurance Companies: and when he talked about premiums, I believe he meant

benefits, though premiums might have been stated inadvertently. I believe that Workmen's Compensation can provide some of the benefits he has mentioned, if it necessitates that everybody who is working should pay for these things.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are certain aspects of public life that require a Commission of Enquiry. There are certain aspects of life that deal with public welfare that will require a Committee to investigate, because you are setting up a small Committee to go into the details; so you do not want the heavy-weight machinery of a Commission of Enquiry; it is just like a Royal Commission dealing with something. I am sure that the Premier is aware that there are many ways of investigating; but the reason why I am cautious on that, and the Premier is aware of it, is that the Government now proposes to set up a Commission of Enquiry into the Sugar Industry on a basis with which the Union does not agree, because we do not agree with the terms of reference. You can set up a Commission of Enquiry which does not investigate private people's affairs, but you can set up a Commission of Enquiry with such terms of reference that it does investigate into private affairs, to find out whom you were walking with last night....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I do not think the hon. member is quite accurate. The Cabinet proposes as promised to the electorate to set up a Commission of Enquiry to examine certain things carefully before we can implement our proposals for matters like a guaranteed week and certain social security measures for agricultural workers, amongst other things. In the process of examining the composition of such an enquiry and the setting up of an enquiry at all, the matter has been referred to the Workers' Union that the Government intends to do something. We set out broadly certain items which we consider should be investigated to the mutual benefit of all agricultural workers; they are the people with whom we are concerned. The Workers' Union has written back and said that they are satisfied about certain aspects of the Sugar Industry; but it is not the intention of Government to force a Commission of Enquiry into matters which the workers themselves or their representatives are satisfied with; so I will ask the hon. member to leave that out altogether, because we have not decided to do something against the wishes of the workers' organisation. It is true it is our intention to set up a Commission of Enquiry by setting out terms of reference before approaching them directly; but having done so, we then send back to the workers' organisation. The matter is still under consideration, and in order not to prejudice the negotiations which are in process, I would ask the hon. member to appreciate that everything they have submitted will be taken into consideration, and that the purpose of this Bill, although it will include such a thing as a Commission of Enquiry into the Sugar Industry, is not devised for the occasion of a Sugar Industry enquiry.

The hon. member will also appreciate that one of the reasons why we have to introduce this Bill — and I am not strictly on my point of order, but you will probably give me a little latitude because the hon. member will certainly reply and this will save him the necessity of raising the point — is this: let us take an enquiry into the Sugar Industry; you can have an enquiry into a trade dispute if there is a trade dispute, but if you want to examine rationally and in the cold light of reason the position of the Sugar Industry of this Island, you have no power to compel any employer or organisation to produce their books and to show what the true economic position is. But under this Act, we would consider it in the public welfare, provided we reach the necessary terms of agreement with the workers' and employers' organisations as to terms of reference and so on of the enquiry; but we would consider it absolutely necessary that, let us say, a factory owner should not come before people we have brought here or people of eminence within the Island and tell them that he cannot tell them that, and it is a matter for him and his shareholders.

Mr. Speaker, we must have provision in the Commission of Enquiry Bill which we are now debating to compel people to attend and give evidence and produce their books. But I would like the hon. member to know that we are not introducing this for a Sugar Industry enquiry at all. As a

matter of fact, today I had discussions with one of the representatives of the Sugar Producers' Association on another matter, and he said he was working under pressure. I told him not to work under pressure too much, because there were several important things which the House had to do which we would expect him to back up the Government and the workers on.
5.35 p.m.

I told him that we are still discussing this matter with the Barbados Workers' Trade Union; the General Secretary has just come back over the last few days and, therefore, not to have high blood pressure about a sugar enquiry. The same assurance I gave to the representative I now give to the representative of the workers in the industry.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Premier had a long point of order, Mr. Speaker, and as you have seen I did not even raise the point which he anticipated. We tell him that we are in general agreement with him, but we have to be very careful that everything and all the details are set out clearly, or else we will run into very bad waters. To avoid that, I am taking this opportunity to make it quite clear. If I were in disagreement with him, I would have said so. However, I would say this. I agree that you should have these powers in order to have a Commission of Enquiry into these matters, but we want you to make it clear so that you do not scare people. This is not like a Senate Investigating Committee. A Senate Investigating Committee has first to get the approbation of the people to feel that something wrong is going on. With this Bill, it is a question of whether the Government thinks it fit, and then you urge that a Commission of Enquiry should be set up and you know very well that a Commission of Enquiry is going to be set up.

I am not saying that the Hon. Premier is going to do it. But, as you know, the Hon. Premier took ill when he went to London. Periods of illness come along. You go out at night and take a few drinks and you wake up the next morning not feeling too well. That has been the experience of many of us; so the Hon. Premier must realise that when you are passing legislation like this, you have to be very careful and I like to be very careful.

This Government is a young Government and some people do not like any opposition or anything that looks like an opposition. By this Bill we will be able to set up a Commission of Enquiry into those matters and, as you know, the Government usually can get a Commission set up when the intentions are well known to make a report of what it wants. I believe if this Bill was on the Statute Book already, the Government would have set up a Commission of Enquiry into Local Government with a view to abolishing it. They would have set up a Commission of Enquiry with such terms of reference as to abolish Local Government. Mr. Speaker, you know as I do that it is the terms of reference of a Commission of Enquiry that carry the sting.

The Hon. Premier had asked me not to go too far into this question of the sugar industry, but I would like to let him know that I can go far. I have made it known that when we reach a point of no return, it means no work. You say that you are not paying any more; you say that you have reached the limit of what you can pay and we say no more work; you may get somebody else. I can tell this House that we were locked in discussion for the last ten or twelve weeks over that matter. When it was stated that a Commission of Enquiry was going to be set up to investigate the matter, I did not object to it, but I said that I was not going to give any evidence behind closed doors. If I want to meet the Sugar Industry, everybody can hear what I have to say. We objected to giving any evidence on the basis that we were not giving evidence behind closed doors. You have something to enquire into. You say that you are not paying any more money and that you are not willing to do that. We are going to give you long enough notice. We are going to tell you: "Well, boys, we are going to tighten our belts because we will not be working after a certain date". As a matter of fact, employers know my attitude so well. They know that I give them notice when I am going on strike.

Sir, I say this to the Hon. Premier because he is not responsible for everything done. I did not mention this question about the ministerial system earlier, but I wish to say that you have to be very careful with Ministerial Government for which a Minister is responsible for his portfolio, and as can be seen in the last Bill, for administrative matters. You have to see to it that you do not allow the Civil Servants who are acting on your behalf to do things and then the Minister is not prepared to pay the final price. Sir, you know what is the final price. I say that because this Government has not yet come into power for a year and I have seen some administrative decisions which have come to me with wrong Cabinet decisions but I have not made any row about them. They are not big enough for me to make a row about. They were not legislative matters to come here. I say this to the Hon. Premier and I will not say, like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph or the hon. senior member for the City, that I am not a lawyer. I can read and I study what I read.

Now, Sir, this is the beginning of a letter which was sent to me and I can read it because it is not confidential. It says: "I am directed by the Minister to inform you that subject to legislative approval the Government proposes to set up a Commission of Enquiry." I am not going any further, but after that, it spells out all the things. Now, this is not anything which I had any prior discussion about. I say, go and look at the Wages Councils Act. Before you set up a Commission of Enquiry you have to determine whether you should set up a Wages Council because even in circumstances where you want to set up a Wages Council to go into wages and conditions of employment in certain employment where there is no Trade Union or any other organisation or where there are no facilities for dealing with the matter existing, you have to determine that. I say that because you should not get the idea that the Workers' Union or I would be in a position to say that you should not have an investigation in the Sugar Industry. As a matter of fact, I have asked for an investigation into the Sugar Industry to determine what it costs to produce a ton of sugar.

So far as industrial matters are concerned, I have become mum. I do not beg for compromises.
5.45 p.m.

I am going to read it in one way and you will read it in another way. We want a jurist to come and say whether it should be retrospective or not. A Commission of Enquiry will give the Union a piece and it will give everybody half and half. I am in the Trade Union movement and I say: "You will sit down here until you agree." I say to the Premier that the Government may want to investigate the sugar industry, but as to the terms of reference we said that we did not agree with them. I am a bit worried about "any matter in which the enquiry would, in the opinion of the Minister, be for the public welfare". That is a question of opinion. All it would mean, as the Premier has said, is that you do not want people to be hunted down unnecessarily by setting up a Commission of Enquiry. I may say that I see the hon. senior member for the City is travelling too late at night on certain roads; and we will set up an enquiry to say how often motor cars with number plates marked "M" go too far south of the border. I have called the names of people who were willing to go before the Court and say what happened at the Labour Exchange and a Minister told me that they were satisfied that there is nothing wrong taking place at the Department. We have heard complaints of people coming from the United States of America who were told by the United States Authorities that certain people should not go back to America. That was because of certain things which were going on behind the scenes. When people come forward and say that they will give evidence, we do not work on that.

Fundamentally, I am in agreement with any aspect of legislation which gives the Government authority to carry out investigations, but you should do what is done in the United Kingdom; you should consider each case you have and the type of investigation which you want to carry out. There is a tendency in the modern world, in developing territories, that wherever the Trade Union movement is

powerful the Government believes that the Trade Union is short of this or that and that they are to do the Trade Union job. That is where you will get Commissions of Enquiry set up to go into anything which is in the public welfare. Conditions of employment and wages are things which are in the public welfare. Politicians will say: "The Trade Union is not doing sufficient for you and therefore we will do it for you by legislation." I have been in politics long enough to know the machinations and manoeuvres of politicians. I am not a theoretical politician; I am a practising politician. I know what are the intentions of this move from the intentions of that move; I know when you want a Commission of Enquiry and when you want a Committee. There are those who have not been paid their money at Sandy Lane since 1958 and no Professor from anywhere can tell me what we want. We are not idiots; we do not have to ask anybody what to write for. We know what we are doing. We have wages comparable with any in the West Indies. (ASIDES) I hear the hon. senior member for St. Andrew say that while the grass is growing the horse is starving. When these men are waiting, how are we going to satisfy people who have been waiting for four years? You can set up a Committee to give me more, but I want what is mine now.

The Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is not now here, but I am not making any excuse for saying that since this Government has come into power, there are certain things which should have been implemented. I will not stop one step at any stage. You have a Provident Fund to be implemented; I do not want anybody to come from anywhere to tell me how to implement a Provident Fund Scheme. I know more about that than anybody who is coming here from anywhere. They have to go to the textbooks just as if you have a lawyer who has to go and look up all his textbooks when it comes to certain cases. You bring a Commission before you make a decision. I am saying that the Government can be its own Commission of Enquiry. If this is a proposal for which the Barbados Government is fundamentally responsible we ask: can you start now? We have had Professor Richardson and he has gone home. We have had Mr. Stockman and he has gone. We want to have a Boundaries Commission. I am in favour of having an investigation into any aspect of public life, whether it be the sugar industry, the rum industry, Banks, anything whatsoever; Cricket Clubs, even Kensington Oval.

5.55 p.m.

You can have an enquiry into Pickwick Club, Rovers or any other Club if it is in the public interest to have an investigation, but you should decide what type of investigation you would have and not use a sledge-hammer to crack a nut, thus utilising these things to the best of your ability. I raise the question of the Sugar Industry because I know more about that than can come out here; but sometimes, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to know whether the Premier is speaking for the Government or whether as Minister he is speaking for his Department. I say that for this reason: you have a Ministerial system, this is a young Government in a growing country, and power has a peculiar reflection on people's minds.

Some people have the idea that the Trade Union is too powerful. I heard some of the Premier's satellites taking me to task as if they put me in the Trade Union, and advising people what to do about forming a Trade Union. Anybody can form a Union; any seven members can form a Union, but some of his satellites may be so drunk with new power that they believe he can take over everybody's life, toenails and boots, that he can put up a big gate and everybody who goes through will be given a stamp. They have come into new power as his supporters, but I have been in politics long enough to know that they will soon tell him that the other people used to give their supporters jobs and ask where he is going to put them; so the second phase would be finding jobs for his satellites, because they say the Labour Party used to find jobs for their fellows, and Mottley put people in certain positions.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, to whom is the hon. member referring as "Mottley"?

Mr. SPEAKER: Nobody in this Chamber; he would not dare do it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am surprised that the hon. member rose on a point of order, because I would never refer to him in a manner other than "the hon. senior member for the City". But I am sure he has heard this remark being used in Barbados, even if by accident it happened to be his name. Those of us who do not run a State sometimes have to use our judgment and discretion, because the ones who run the State have the ultimate responsibility for good public order and conduct and no one wants to challenge them. It is a heavy responsibility. I say that because I know what is the early temptation of power. There are those who would stand behind you and urge you on to be very indiscreet in your ambitions, and to persons they do not like they would like you to use vengeance on them by all the processes of legislation. All of us have political foes, but I am sure when we get into power we do not want to utilise our power for destructive or what we regard as negative measures; we want to use our power for positive and constructive measures and not be like our erstwhile friends who today are looking for mistakes. I have just come back here: and from what I have seen, I would like to warn the Premier that when a person is looking for mistakes, he must be an examiner. You have put him to work in an examination room, and he is looking for mistakes. You must realise that the greatest feat of any person looking for mistakes is trying to destroy; he has no positive thinking at all.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to give grist to anybody's mill in matters such as these, especially the mill of those who are not even deserving of any assistance whatsoever. My criticism therefore of this is not a criticism of its content; my criticism will be a criticism of its application, because this is a bit of legislation that is worthwhile. But as it is worded it says "any matter in which an enquiry would, in the opinion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, be for the public welfare". I am a Barbadian and have lived among Barbadians, and I know that some of them are extremely spiteful, whether they are politicians or Civil Servants, and wherever they can put the knife in someone, they put it as far as they can get it; so I do not want to see legislation being misused or used to such an extent that it becomes spiteful. I will say to the Hon. Premier that I have been fighting the sugar barons in this country for the last seventeen years, and my fight will continue with them because I do not think that on fundamental issues we stand on the same ground. They stand on the ground for making as much profit as they possibly can. I do not deny them the right to make profits, because as we live in a capitalist society, if they do not have profits, they would not have money for further investment or for running their business thoroughly; but I am also thinking of a fair and equitable distribution of the wealth of the industry for the workers. I cannot therefore be against any investigation or enquiry into any aspect of the Sugar Industry.

Mr. Speaker, what I have said is in a general way, but the Premier is aware of the specific objections which I have made and I have given reasons for them. We feel that the objectives of the Premier or of his Government can be met by other methods. As I said earlier, I have to discuss matters with the Minister of Agriculture on the question of co-operatives, and I have to discuss matters with the Minister of Communications relating to the Port; so the Trade Union does not have the attitude that it happens to be a law unto itself and does not value the processes of negotiations. Our whole life comprises discussions and negotiations, and that is why in Barbados industrial peace has been what it is, because we believe in the processes of putting people on the other side around a table. Sometimes we start off miles apart, but we finish up at the meeting "firing" a drink, shaking hands, and you believe that we are blood brothers until we start again at the other stage; but it shows a question of industrial maturity, and our minds are so emancipated that all sides who have opposing views can meet, if they feel like taking away their money and I feel like taking away my labour. In politics, you do not get so close, and for that reason a Commission of Enquiry is set up; but I should like to say

that it should be set up with all consideration given to all the Departments.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member spoke about Insurance Companies, but I would not like to see him set up a Commission of Enquiry into Insurance Companies until he is prepared to let them know that he proposes to set up a Commission of Enquiry with such terms of reference, not that the final decision is not the Government's.....
6.05 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member will give me the opportunity I just want to say that I never said that we were setting up a Commission of Enquiry into Insurance Companies. What I said was that this is the first of a series of legislative enactments which we intend to introduce to straighten out certain deficiencies in the body politic and I went on to say that among the matters which would be dealt with by legislation in a very short time is that to regulate the practice of Insurance Companies - not by Commissions of Enquiry, but by legislation dealing with Insurance Companies. I knew before the hon. member spoke that members of the Press were quite capable of saying that we are going to have a Commission of Enquiry into the Insurance Companies. I am not going to say the occasions, but it is a fact that you get mushroom Insurance Companies coming in.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I did not say that the Hon. Premier said that he was going to set up a Commission of Enquiry into Insurance Companies. I said, suppose you were going to set up a Commission of Enquiry into Insurance Companies, I am a frank man. I like to say what I mean. I have strong views about Insurance Companies, and as a matter of fact, I think I have stronger views than any hon. member in this Chamber. For instance, I do not believe in a two-Chamber Legislature. I do not believe in many things which the British people practise. I do not think that our economic growth is tied to the pattern of two or three hundred years of British rule.

Sir, when it comes to Insurance Companies, I am a believer that every Insurance Company should be under strict legislation. I have said many years ago, why should we give up Workmen's Compensation to Insurance Companies when that is the one insurance which we should carry? I am sure that with the same rates of premium you can have large amounts of money for that purpose. Why should not everybody be called upon to pay so much per annum? I am satisfied that you can carry this insurance. I realise that all Insurance Companies throughout the world hold powerful hands over the Governments. That can be said of other countries too. When you go down to Washington and you talk about President Kennedy and all of that, behind all of that, your Insurance Companies - I.D.A., C.D.A., and all those companies which have large investment capital are the things which hold sway. We know that. That is why the situation in Venezuela was what it was. It was because many of the American Industrialists had their money invested there.

Sir, I am not putting words in the Hon. Premier's mouth. What I would advise him is this. Do not be too hard on the newspapers. Do not be too hard on the newspaper reporters. They are only human. Do not think that all can hear as well as you would like them and you must also bear in mind that the acoustics of this Chamber are not the best. You must also bear in mind that nowadays most of these newspapers think of putting a headline to which the bottom of the article has no bearing. That is not the fault of the newspaper man. That is not only so in Barbados. Newspaper companies realise that the people are too busy; so they give you everything at short notice on a big headline. I do not think as Minister of Finance, the Hon. Premier can be as open as I am in making these statements. When he makes such statements he would send up a psychological fear in the people's minds. You are bound to get them scared.

What the Hon. Premier has got to realise is that the investment of Insurance Companies here is a concept which

is based on a small community; therefore the whole concept of investments has been regulated along a very narrow channel and that is why we have to break away from the past and introduce other avenues. Another thing is that the climate and atmosphere for which the people who have the investments to make should be one in which we have the control over them. Nigeria has stricter laws than we have. For instance, nobody can go there and own land, even though they are setting up a company. However, a man does not want to own the land to set up a business. He wants to operate on such a basis that he can make a profit. If you give a man a piece of land at a 999 year lease and after that the lease can be renewed, what is wrong with that? What difference does that make from owning the land?

Sir, as I was saying, we do not want to create a climate here for which people can come and invest and we do not have any control. At the same time we do not want to create an atmosphere where people will get afraid of us or think that we have something up our sleeves which we have not told them. The Hon. Premier should know as well as I know that Barbados being a small place it gives room for a lot of gossip. You do not have a wide area to deal with and in this narrow path they radiate around this place. They talk among themselves and build up fears in their minds; and if it comes from a source which is responsible, they feel that it is something which they should resist. For that reason, Sir, I would not like this amended Bill to create in anybody's mind the feeling that you will be doing something which can be interpreted very widely, and that it would challenge some of the foundations in our society which you need to honour, just as if you are going to carry out an enquiry into something which you consider important, whether it is the sugar industry or any other industry or even if it is going to lead into the operation of banks. Why I say that is this. I feel the Minister has a right to say that you should have a banking system in keeping with our ideals. The Minister of Finance has a right to call all the managers of the banks to his office and tell them what he proposes to do. If it is something which you have in mind as regards Insurance Companies, call the directors of those companies in and tell them that you are not satisfied with how they are conducting things and in your opinion you feel that you should carry out some investigations because you cannot ask those who are involved any questions; you have to ask somebody else.

Sir, I agree with the Hon. Minister that you cannot set up a committee to deal with all aspects because some people will not give you the information unless you set up a Commission of Enquiry. It is only for you to process the information and utilise it; therefore, you must put a body of people who can give you a report on the information.
6.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the Premier to know that so far as our views in these matters are concerned, I am in favour of an investigation into any matter. I do not hold back; all I ask is that in any investigation which you make, always give the parties concerned the right or privilege of coming and airing their views in connection with the investigation, and nobody will have any objection to that. Anything which is in the public interest, the public is in favour of. It is not that we could not set up a system like what obtains in the United States of America, and therefore I agree with the method that you will have to give powers to the Governor for setting up these Commissions of Enquiry. The Premier will understand, when we come to industrial matters, that under the Trade Disputes Act you have to use a certain process with trade disputes. If there is no dispute, we do not have to use the Act. Where the industrial relations process deals with a matter, you may call upon people to do something and you say that you will call a Commission of Enquiry to investigate the matter and nobody can be annoyed with you. I quite agree with the Hon. Premier that you must have legislation to deal with the matters which are in the interest of the public welfare. There is no question of principle about this; it is a question of application. When we agree on matters of principle, it is important that we agree on details so that we do not leave out anything in the future or that there will not be any misunderstanding. I have no objec-

tion to the Bill as it is, but I think it is necessary for me to draw these things to the attention of the House before the Bill is passed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is just one change in this Bill from the original Bill which gives the Governor the power to have an enquiry in what would be in his opinion, in the public interest. I agree in part with what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said. I think we will agree with the principle of the Bill. Nobody will disagree that some authority should have the power to bring a matter to a head, to put it right; but, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, it is a question of application. I did not hear the Premier's speech on the matter; whether he has said that this should be used as a basis for Insurance Companies or not, I do not know; but in the last 20 months a lot of people came to me about Insurance Companies, and if you had a sound investigation or enquiry carried out I am absolutely sure that somebody would go to jail. I have certain things in my desk now. Despite what the lawyers say, I do not see any Barbadian jury letting some people go and not convicting them for obtaining money by means of false pretences. I am glad to think that I have not been singing this solo. These Insurance Companies have been coming here without giving any securities to people. It is pathetic to think of how various people will come in here and go to every plantation yard during the crop time and collect \$1.20 or \$1.25 from people and tell them what they will get if they put up \$500. Sometimes I smile at things; there have been many attempts made to hold enquiries over me in Local Government, but there were still those who were wise enough to know that the holding of public enquiries seldom do people harm. However, we are doing good for people.

This Bill broadens the powers which are given to the Governor to deal with matters of public welfare. I will say this now; I agree with this Bill because there was a time when the Trade Union was headed not by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and they did not make returns for nine years. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not now in his seat. You can call upon the Attorney General to see that a newspaper can say that it is a Trade Union paper when it is not, and the Government does nothing about it. I am speaking of legally trained men who accept registration of papers, who know they did wrong; and people have had no opportunity although they are libelled left and right. Of course you want a Bill of this nature.

It has been said that you can only use the Commission of Enquiry Act where one was entrusted with public funds. Here you have the interest of the public welfare and I hope that public welfare will be taken in the right perspective. This Bill does not interfere with the individual. I will tell you something which the hon. member may have forgotten.
6.25 p.m.

In the United States, if you have a dance for charity like my colleague, the hon. junior member for the City who had a dance the other night in aid of the Olympic Games — you must make returns to the District Attorney showing how you spent the money. You cannot say you had something for charity and then decide that charity begins at home though there is nothing wrong with that. I am sure my colleague will not take offence at that because his dance did not make any money. A lot of people have done these things and got away with murder, and I can instance case after case, but I am only going to instance one. A few years ago an Insurance Company came here and opened up in Swan Street, and within eighteen months it had robbed a tremendous lot of people and left this country. If the hon. member doubts me, I will ask him to receive me and I will bring papers to his office and show him the number of people who have been robbed by certain companies in this country by taking away a few shillings from people weekly and telling them that in five years they could draw back this money. One woman who had paid in \$400 came to me and told me that she understood it was a five-year policy, then she was told

it was a twenty-year policy and the most they could lend her was \$40.

I would say to the Hon. Premier that the institution of this amendment will give such authority as to bring some of these people to their senses. No insurance company should be allowed to run in this country without certain security being put down.

On the question of Workmen's Compensation, the hon. member who is a Trade Unionist knows how I feel about that, because in my twenty odd years' experience in dealing with people, I realise how they have suffered. I have had to send people to lawyers to fight to get something for these people. You get a man maimed for life and they talk about \$1,800. These things should be put right; therefore I am going to support the Bill with the strict understanding that it gives the right to enquire into any matter of public welfare, and would not be misused to interfere with the life of a private individual. I heard somebody refer to what is known as a sou-sou or meeting turn. If somebody had a meeting turn and ran off with the money, that is public welfare; so why should there not be an enquiry into it? As a matter of fact, I am going to put it as strongly as this: if the hon. member looks at the Acts of this country, he will see one special Act which passed through this House of Assembly giving one individual the right to operate a Friendly Society outside of the Friendly Societies Act, and nobody had any right to ask him any questions — a man not of this country. Under this Bill you can have an investigation into this, because it is public welfare since you are taking money from thousands and thousands of people all over this Island, to see what are the benefits, what the Government is getting out of it and what taxes are paid.

I can throw a lot of light on this, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to support it because I am convinced that it is the right thing and does not interfere with the rights of the individual. The late Mr. T. T. Lewis always said that any person who raises money for charity should make a public statement to show how it was spent. You will notice that there are certain people in this country who as soon as they raise money for charity make a public statement showing how the money was spent. That is the correct thing to do, because in the United States you have to do it. As a matter of fact, you must be registered as a charitable organisation of some sort and show what you do with the money you receive.

I therefore have much pleasure in supporting this Bill, which will be used in the interest of public welfare, and if I am not mistaken, if there is any attempt to misuse it, I believe there is still a stop-gap in it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, just very briefly I would like to re-assure hon. members that invariably a Commission of Enquiry must spend money, whether it is for stationery or paying a Secretary or Shorthand Reporter, and that in every case where we have to institute a Commission of Enquiry, as there is no provision in the Estimates for it, except of course under the Trade Disputes Act and so on, we would have to come to the House with a Resolution; and if hon. members do not approve of the terms of reference of the Commission of Enquiry, they have the right to criticise and in the last analysis withhold granting funds for the carrying out of the purposes of the Commission of Enquiry; so I do not think hon. members need have any fear that the Executive Committee would get in a corner and set up a Commission of Enquiry purely to investigate an individual's private affairs out of a sense of vindictiveness or anything like that.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:-

2. Section two of the Commissions of Enquiry Act, 1908, is repealed and replaced by the following:-

2. (1) The Governor-in-Executive Committee may, whenever he deems it advisable, issue a Commission appointing one or more Commissioners and authorising such Commissioners or any quorum of them therein mentioned to enquire into -

(a) the conduct of any officer in the public service of the Island or of any person in the service of a local government council in the Island; or

(b) the conduct or management or any -

(i) department of the public service of the Island,

(ii) local government council in the Island,

(iii) central or local government institution or body which is in receipt of or entrusted with public funds whether provided by the Treasury or otherwise by any local government council of the Island or from Imperial funds; or

(c) any matter in which an enquiry would, in the opinion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, be for the public welfare.

(2) A Commission issued under this section shall specify the subject of enquiry, and may, in the discretion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, if there is more than one Commissioner direct which Commissioner shall be Chairman, and direct where and when such enquiry shall be made and the report thereof rendered and prescribe how such Commission shall be executed, and may direct whether the enquiry shall or shall not be held in public.

(3) In the absence of a direction to the contrary, an enquiry under this Act shall be held in public, but the Commissioners shall nevertheless be entitled to exclude from such enquiry any particular person or persons for the preservation of order, or for the due conduct of the enquiry, or for any other reason."

Hon. J.C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I just want to draw to the attention of the Committee the need for a verbal amendment in Clause 2 (b) which reads in this Bill as follows:-

"the conduct or management or any -"

It should obviously be "the conduct or management of any", and I therefore am asking leave to substitute the word "of" for the word "or" after the word "management", and beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION re REPORT OF THE EAST CARIBBEAN FEDERATION CONFERENCE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 2 be taken as the next order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day.

Apparently, there is no objection and therefore, leave is granted the hon. member.

Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education: to resume debate on a Resolution relative to the report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference, 1962.

On the previous occasion when this Resolution was debated the hon. and learned senior member for St. John moved the passing of the Resolution which was seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. A motion was made by the hon. senior member for the City, seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, that the debate be postponed. If the hon. senior member for the City is disposed to resume he may speak at this stage.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago when the Hon. Premier moved the passing of the Resolution that this Report be accepted, members of this House became very apprehensive as to whether time enough had been given, and rightly so, and the House agreed with my motion for the postponement of the debate after the hon. senior member for St. Peter had spoken, owing to the fact that he had business out of the Island and wanted to take part in the debate, having feared that it may come up for discussion during his absence. It falls my lot to add my contribution as Leader of the Opposition now.

Before I attempt to discuss the White Paper or what is called the Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference of 1962, I would just like to make this position abundantly clear. To some people it appears that as soon as I accepted the office of Leader of the Opposition it was my duty to come on the floor of this House and oppose everything that came into this Chamber. After seventeen years in here, Sir, I have not done that; and, as far as I am concerned, the office of Leader of Opposition, with whatever remuneration it carried, can go the way of all flesh; I shall never change my policy on the floor of the House. A thing is either right or wrong; and if my greatest detractors or my greatest opponents bring in something and it is right I am going to say that it is right. For some reason or the other, certain members of this House and certain ex-members of this House think that they can vilify me in the eyes of the public because I choose not to oppose for the sake of opposing. If Your Honour will recall, I made it abundantly clear that it was not going to be my policy to oppose for the sake of opposing. You, Sir, who have been here much longer than I have, and from whom I have learnt a lot, will recall that on several occasions during the regime of the last Government, throughout its fifteen years in office, I have on several occasions together with my colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the then hon. junior member for St. James, Mr. Wilkinson, paid tribute to the now Ex-Prime Minister of the West Indies when he delivered his Budget Speech, and I have fearlessly criticised him when we did not agree. The time has not come when I can launch my attack on the present Premier; but when it comes I would have no qualms about it. I would deliver the same attack on him as I delivered against the other Ministers.

Sir, you will recall that I offered my criticisms here on the last Budget Speech despite what some people think.

The general public knows that because they have heard the things which I said about it, I gave praise for the speech and the enlightenment which the Hon. Premier gave to the Island as a whole.

Now, it comes my lot to speak on the Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference, and I want to say this. Nothing has given me in this country more concern, nothing in my entire career in this House has caused me more sleepless nights, nothing has caused me to do more research and looking up things than this Report. I have been studying Barbados, its financial position and its commitments with anxiety for its social reform. I have got from various sources statistics about the Windward and Leeward Islands. I want to say at the outset that more people apparently are interested about the Federation of the "Small Eight", as they are called, than were interested in the West Indies Federation when it included Jamaica and Trinidad. I do not say this because I happened to be on that committee which was selected to go to England; I say that because the breaking up of the last Federation was the result of people becoming so very little interested in it.

6.45 p.m.

I say that because, with the breaking up of the last Federation, people became so interested, with Trinidad and Jamaica pulling out, that they began to think of Federation not merely in the terms of the populace in Barbados which as you know, would be to say that Federation means that there is trouble or that there is a fight down there. Enlightened public opinion became interested in Federation and then people began to think of Federation as the coming together of a group of islands for the purpose of reducing the cost of administration. Let me repeat that: I say that enlightened public opinion in Barbados, as far as I can ascertain, began to think of Federation, not in the sense in which our forefathers thought of it, or even as some of the people in Barbados thought of it, that is just a noise or a quarrel down there; but they began to think of it as the coming together of a group of islands, namely the Leeward and Windward islands together with Barbados which has the largest population, for the purpose of reducing overhead or administrative expenditure. In other words, people began to think in the same terms as I say the plantocracy or the Colonial office thought in 1876 when Pope Hennessy, as the Governor of Barbados, was given a mandate to bring about a form of Federation. The whole idea was to reduce overhead administration or administrative costs.

Now, Sir, at the first meeting in Barbados of the Leeward and Windward islands and Barbados, the Government took a very wide view and not only elected a representative of my Party but also invited a representative of the Barbados Labour Party in the person of the hon. junior member for St. George and also an independent member of this House, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, to attend this meeting. That is something which had not been done in Barbados during the last Federation. It could be said therefore that all views were represented at this first Conference; but then the time came when we had to have a Conference in England and it was my fortune to be selected to attend that Conference. I want it to be understood that, at this Conference which was held at Marlborough House in London, this document was not an instrument signed by the delegates of the Leeward and Windward Islands and Barbados; it is a summary of the views which were put forward and which have been accepted by the majority. I repeat that this document is not a document or instrument signed by the delegates of the Leeward and Windward Islands and Barbados; it is a summary of the views of the majority of delegates from the Leeward and Windward Islands and Barbados put forward. May I be permitted to say this? The means by which those votes were taken - it is only the Chief Ministers who recorded their votes. Those of us who were delegates to the Conference were given the opportunity of expressing our views, but only the votes of the Chief Ministers were taken.

When the Premier of Barbados moved the passing of this Resolution for the purpose of accepting this document as the Report, I am afraid that, lest people think that I

should have gone to England as a delegate and sat with the Premier and the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour and then come back to Barbados, having agreed with them on something and then disagree, I say that that is not so. This White Paper is merely a summary condensed by the Secretary General of the Commission, Mr. A. M. Mackintosh at Marlborough House. There are a tremendous lot of things in this Report with which I do not agree. I myself spoke against them, but, as I said, only the views or the votes of the Chief Ministers were taken, when arriving at a decision to present a report as a guide. Nevertheless, I must say at the outset that I have gained a great deal of experience by attending this Conference. I have, as a result of attending the Conference here, been afforded the opportunity of seeing all of the files. I have been afforded the opportunity of seeing what I would call one of the best guides for us, that is, the views of Professor Arthur Lewis, the Principal of the University College of the West Indies, in his Report, and I must say that the West Indies owe Professor Arthur Lewis a great debt of gratitude. Immediately as it could be seen that the old Federation was on its death-bed just waiting to be moved away by the undertakers, Professor Arthur Lewis did a wonderful job by coming to these islands, Barbados included, in order to obtain the feelings of the leading Ministers so as to find out if there could be brought about a bond between these eight units or if there could be brought about some sort of Federation.

The big question which one must face today is whether we are to be or not to be in a Federation with the terms or with the majority of the terms as set out in this White Paper; but, as I said, the votes which were taken were the votes of the Chief Ministers. The question is: are we to be or can we afford not to be in a Federation with these terms or with such modified and amended terms as would bring about a Federation more viable and with a stronger centre?

6.55 p.m.

I have read and re-read the Report of the Conference and Professor Arthur Lewis' Report, and I am not prepared this evening to say what in my opinion caused the other Federation to break up, because it is common knowledge, and I believe all the leading political personalities in the West Indies and indeed outside of the West Indies who are interested, are more than conscious of some of the reasons that caused the disintegration of the last Federation. After sitting and listening to the United Kingdom delegation and to the delegations from the Windward and Leeward Islands and also the Barbados delegation, I am going to make a statement which I hope every Barbadian listening to me tonight will appreciate. I am not going to be unduly critical of the English Government, and I have made it abundantly clear that as far as I am concerned no one should think that because I have been preferred for some birthday honour or anything of the sort I am now saying this. I have said from the time I have been in politics that I have greater faith in the British and its administration of the Colonies than I have ever had in any other nation. I do not say that they are perfect; indeed, I say none of us can be; but I have always said that they are certainly the best of a bad lot, and are certainly the ones to whom you can look for a greater sense of the administration of justice than any other nation in the world. That has always been my feeling even when I lived in the United States, and I proclaimed it from the housetops wherever I have lived.

I should like every Barbadian to know, and not be fooled by the leaders in politics or anybody else, that it is really the desire of the British Government not to have us as Colonies any longer. Some people seem to think that it is the idea of politicians in the West Indies to have Federation. I have spoken to a number of very knowledgeable people in this community who have stupidly said to me that this is only a racket by politicians who want to get power and get into a Federation and have these big jobs and so on. It took me only three days, Mr. Speaker, to discover what I have always been suspicious of and what no one can bring home to me as a fact, and it is that the British Government no longer wants to have

the trouble with the Colonies, and the West Indies are included. From the financial point of view and from the political point of view they do not want to have to answer the United Nations and do not want to continue to give support. I am one of the firm believers in what Sir Alexander Bustamante said during the formation of the last Federation when he asked for some astronomical figure in pounds, but a lot of people started to laugh at and ridicule him. If you go back and even take what Sir Winston Churchill himself said, you will realise that although it sounded like a lot of money to us, over a period of 300 years it really did not mean so much compared with what they had got out of us during past years.

From the Conference, Sir, you could see that the British Government would like to get rid of us. If you take the Report paragraph by paragraph and get the gist of it, you will see that I am only dealing with one or two of the matters appearing in the Report. I am among those who believe that you must have a strong centre; and by a strong centre, I mean you must have a strong Federation and a strong Cabinet, and enough power must be given to the Federation; but I am also among those West Indians who can understand better possibly than any Englishman that we have one thing in common from Jamaica right back up, if we may include British Guiana, and that is poverty. It is true that Trinidad has been fortunate to have what is needed in the modern world, and that is oil. There were times when Barbados had what the world needed — sugar, but today sugar is grown all over the world, in Russia and in Germany; so the big thing which must matter in this country is the question of economics. Barbados, with nearly a quarter of a million people, is the largest of the eight Islands with Jamaica and Trinidad going out.

While I am on this point, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Hon. Premier is not in his place, but I should like to say that it is unfortunate that this Government cannot see the wisdom, despite the fact that we are somewhat annoyed at the pulling out of Trinidad and Jamaica, in living above that and selecting a representative from Barbados to represent this Island at the Independence of Trinidad and of Jamaica. Only a few days ago I was talking to quite a number of people some of whom had been living in Trinidad for many years, and it is estimated that there are around 26,000 to 30,000 Barbadians living in Trinidad; so it would be unfortunate for us to adopt the attitude that because they pulled out, we should appear so small as to turn down their invitation to send a representative to their Independence.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just intervene to let the hon. member know this: the invitation which we have received from the Government of Trinidad to attend their Independence celebrations is now currently under consideration and no decision has been taken on that yet.

With respect to Jamaica, we have replied in very courteous terms that it is not convenient for us to attend, but we have sent the best wishes of the Government and people of Barbados to the people of Jamaica on the occasion of their own Independence celebrations, and I have no doubt that next week when we meet in the House, a formal letter of congratulations to the people of Jamaica will be moved.
7.05 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I must thank the Hon. Minister for intervening and drawing that to my attention. I quite appreciate what is being done about Trinidad, but I would like to draw to his attention that quite recently at the meeting in connection with essential services it was pointed out that the U.C.W.I. should be retained and at that University there are Barbadians; and I do not think that they would feel very happy and well if Barbados is not represented at the Jamaica Independence celebrations. After all, we are all West Indians. Despite whatever name they may apply here, from a geographical point of view, we are all West Indians, and however you think about it, we have one thing in common and that is, we were brought to these parts and we have one

thing in common and that is poverty. I hope that the Government would reconsider the situation in Jamaica. Let Barbados live up to its reputation as being a country of real big people and people who are big in mind, and not small.

As I have said, Sir, from the point of view of the Conference in London, it can truly be said that it was a success. I must here pay tribute to the skill of the Hon. Minister of Trade during the absence of the Premier — I think I paid tribute already to him personally — for his ability for adopting the role, without so being appointed, of Leader of the delegation or the head spokesman as such and keeping members of the delegation together at the Conference. Indeed, my first experience showed me that although we were considered West Indians, at a Conference like that it appeared as if we were eight foreign countries with the exception of two things which came out at the Conference. One is that they all agreed who should be the Governor-General and the second is that they all agreed that Barbados should be the capital. There was no argument, not one dissentient voice, but the skill with which the Hon. Premier and the Minister of Trade were able to get compromises from delegates from St. Kitts back to St. Vincent was something which was beyond comprehension when you are dealing with all West Indians.

If you were to read this report carefully, you will see that it took days and days; and even though the Hon. Premier was sick in hospital during the time, there were those of us who took advantage then of going to him — and I mean not only those of us from Barbados — for advice on matters.

Sir, you will notice this statement in Appendix B of the Report. In consequence of the foregoing, the present services will be transferred to the Federal Government. Customs — I notice here "and Excise" — I do not believe that I am so dull as not to recall what has happened at the Conference, but I have been searching my papers and my memory and I cannot really remember that Excise was agreed upon. I remember that there was a tremendous argument about it. However, it is in this Report and I am not going to pit my memory against the memory of all the others, but I do not remember that Excise was one of the items agreed upon. It goes on to say 'income tax, judicial services' — which means not only judges and magistrates but administration also — and 'police, postal services, public relations, pensions' and so on. Then it says 'broadcasting, television and telephone services.'

Well, Sir, if you take the islands of Anguilla and Nevis — of which we usually made fun and called them the unitary states of St. Kitts — Montserrat, Antigua, Grenada and the others, you will find that after discussing from every possible angle these things, there are different methods of taxation and different rates of taxes in all of these Islands, and that is why I say it took a tremendous lot of skill to handle these Ministers and to convince them what the position is. We in Barbados have boasted that for centuries we have never been grant-aided. The people in the other territories dislike very much being called the 'Little Eight'. They are grant-aided territories.

This is what I would like to put before hon. members of this House. In the Report you will find that for a given period — I think five years — certain recommendations which were made by Professor Authur Lewis have been adopted. There are certain economists who disagree with him, but we in the West Indies have a lot of implicit faith in his recommendations. Although the other territories are grant-aided, the most important things, in my opinion, as to the coming together of these islands is: will these Islands be able to carry themselves? I know my hon. friend, the senior member for St. Peter, dislikes the phrase 'economic viability' and he has said that this is one of the phrases used today. However, although Barbados is not a grant-aided territory, there is such a thing called the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement which, although it is not given to us to balance our budget or for paying our Civil Servants and administering the affairs of the Island, yet we cannot do without it. I understand that without the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement it would possibly cost us £10

per ton of sugar more than we actually get for it in the open market; so you can see that although we are not grant-aided, in many respects we are dependent upon Great Britain.

Speaking on this, I do not pretend to be any economist; I am speaking with mere commonsense. I repeat, although the seven other Islands are given grants-in-aid for the purpose of running their affairs, while Barbados has not to be given any grant-in-aid, and it is a fact that Barbados existed without it before there was any such agreement in respect to the sugar which it produced — and Your Honour knows the results from not having such an agreement before — yet we are still in a way dependent on Great Britain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I sat at this Conference and listened to the others, I too did make a little contribution. I made it clear that it would never be right for me to go on the Barbados delegation and have an open row at the Conference table with the Leader of our delegation, but make no mistake about it, in the matters which I disagreed with him, I made known to him that I disagreed, but I did not think it would be proper to enter the Conference room and let people see that I disagreed with him on a matter. 7.15 p.m.

Now, Sir, on the question of taxation, I think it will be universally agreed that Barbadians have been taxed to the hilt. Just a few days ago we heard of the criticisms which were levelled at the Government for their policy of taxation, and, as I said, I made it clear that it was a matter of indifference, from an economic point of view, who took the Government in hand. Whoever took the Government in hand would have had to find \$3 million more this year than they would have had to find last year, because there was the question of being committed to doing so. I am not arguing on that now, but I am trying to put the point that we must get what we need. Only a few nights ago, the ex-Prime Minister of the West Indies referred to the fact that we cannot make promises unless we know where the money is coming from. That is wonderful advice coming from an elder statesman, but it is a pity that he did not know that when he was much younger, when he had the destiny of the Federation in his hand. If he had known that when he was younger, possibly they would not have foundered on the rocks on which they have foundered. There was no knowing what was going to happen in 1959. In other words, everybody in Barbados must know that while St. Vincent, Grenada, St. Lucia and other islands receive money to pay their Civil Servants, Barbados could not have existed without the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement; and I will say here that Great Britain pays us more for our sugar than she would pay for it in the other markets. What ever you call it, it is money given to us; and Great Britain did not have to give us this money because she could get her sugar in the open market.

The question now is: must we go into Federation or should we not? This is something which we should not pass in this House hurriedly; that is why I agreed that the hon. senior member for St. Peter should be given the opportunity to make his speech. I am hoping that the Government will agree that that was the best way of dealing with the matter; not only must a man buy his rice, but he must buy his vest, his pumps and his shirt, and if you go into Federation it will cost more money. I challenge anyone to say different from that. Section 26 of this White Paper deals with the question of income tax. I believe it says that all the money from our Customs duties will go to the Federation and that is what I do not think — I understand that our money which amounts to \$12 million must go to the Federation, but it shows you what they will be responsible for in the eight territories. That money from all the islands will go into the Federation. There are many things which I could say here, but this speech is going through the islands. You cannot say things on the floor of the House which might disrupt the harmony of the other countries when we are trying to bind ourselves in a Federation. A form of Federation, I submit, would be the best thing for the eight territories now that Trinidad and Jamaica are out.

When we come to Section 32 of this White Paper, what do you find? Barbados has had to increase its taxation to the displeasure of many of its inhabitants, but you cannot enjoy social reform or social respect unless you pay for it. Hence Barbados must give up something to some of these impoverished islands like Montserrat and some of the other islands. I have with me the Government's Manifesto and I have said publicly that I do not see how a Government could find a hot meal for every child in school. It is not that I am opposed to that, because in Local Government I myself have tried to do what I could down there; therefore I know what it means. I gave the Minister my experience and I said that it would have been more important to find funds to assist such children who would be in need of a hot meal than to find funds to carry St. Vincent and St. Lucia. That is my opinion and I expressed my opinion for Barbadians to know.

I challenge anybody, whether it be the Secretary of States for the Colonies or anybody else, to say that that is not true. The policy of the British Government is that they do not want to have the trouble of running these colonies. I believe that it is for financial plus political reasons that there has been such a metamorphosis in the countries of the world; they can no longer come before the United Nations and defend themselves rightly and be trustees for other people.

In paragraph 32 of this White Paper — this is what is worrying me. I will read it. There was a delegation from all the territories in the United Kingdom but the United Kingdom delegation was a very strong one. This is what this paragraph states:

"The United Kingdom Delegation stated that the United Kingdom Government recognised that a Federation of Barbados and the Leeward and Windward Islands would stand in need of external assistance for a period after it was established, both on capital and on budgetary account....." 7.25 p.m.

"The United Kingdom Government would be willing to help within the limits of the resources which they were able to make available, but the amount and the nature of such help would require further consideration."

I would like people to underline that, carry it home, and sleep on it. Whether you would like to believe it or not, impoverished countries are encouraged to federate, but the amount of help must wait for further consideration. The Report goes on to read as follows:-

"In this connection the United Kingdom Government had noted with interest proposals put forward by Dr. Arthur Lewis, Under these, budgetary assistance would be continued for a limited period after the establishment of the Federation, but on a tapering basis from its present level. At the same time Dr. Lewis proposed that United Kingdom capital assistance should be fixed at a given annual level for an initial period of five years" — five years in the life of a nation is like yesterday — "after the setting up of the Federation. This approach merited further study in the light of a more detailed survey of the economic needs and potential development of the area which the United Kingdom Government proposed to put in train."

Now it is abundantly clear on the advice of Professor Arthur Lewis and using his figures that for five years after the setting up of the Federation, we will need help, but they cannot say what help they would give. At present they are giving help to the seven countries, and at present whether or not we like it, they are giving Barbados help by paying us under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement £10 more for sugar than they would normally get it in the open market, and as I said, sugar is no longer something which is grown in Barbados, the Dutch West Indies and the like. In Canada today huge sugar factories are going up to process beet sugar, and this is also true of the Southern States of America and Germany.

While I was in England, Mr. Speaker, we were invited one Saturday morning to hear a specialist speak, and he

spoke for four hours on the European Common Market. After the talk, some very pointing questions were asked, but I do not want to take credit for asking them; I will give credit where credit is due, because although we listened very carefully, few of us understood much of what it was — and I make no apology for that, because the lecturer's flow of English was so mellifluous and so sweet — and the Minister of Education would appreciate what I mean — that we could only listen. One was charmed by the way he was putting it over, and when he had finished, you only knew that here was a fine English speaker. The Minister of Trade, however, asked the very simple question as to what is going to be the position if and when we are federated and become independent and Britain joins the European Common Market. I remember the Professor saying distinctly that Britain would never shirk her responsibility. Aren't they lovely words? The Minister of Trade and the Minister from St. Kitts further asked what is going to be the position, with Trinidad and Jamaica becoming independent, if cement was manufactured in Montserrat which would be a member of the Eight and whether we could put up a tariff if we became an associate member with the United Kingdom in the European Common Market. We wanted to know whether we would be able to put on a tariff and say to Trinidad that we were manufacturing cement in Montserrat or St. Vincent to supply the 750,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, you must remember that these things are being studied, not by book economists, but by practical businessmen. However, we were told that they did not think so, and that if Trinidad is also a member of the European Common Market as well as the Federation of the Eight, we would have to put the tariff up against all countries. The Minister of Education will be able later to contradict me if I am wrong or explain to the public what I am saying. Right away it struck me that with Trinidad's Emigration Laws we could not find work there, and without "firing" a shot Trinidad would have won a war, because her emigration laws do not apply merely to the West Indies alone but to all the people in the European Common Market. If you therefore look into this again carefully, you will see that it is the British Government's intention to set up and have a fiscal survey before anything is done. In other words, they would have experts independent of Professor Arthur Lewis to make recommendations from Anguilla right back up to Barbados. I am therefore of the opinion that while I say that it would have been the policy of my Party — and I believe I represent, if not numerically the greatest number, a body of opinion that must be counted with — to join in a Federation of the West Indies, just as the British Government says in paragraph 32 here that they would be willing to help within limits of their resources, it would need further consideration. We cannot therefore rush madly into it.
7.35 p.m.

I repeat, this is nothing which I have signed and am going back on. There is nothing signed in this Report by any delegate attending the Conference. Some hon. member made a *sotto voce* remark that I have not signed anything. That is true. This report is signed by Mr. R. Maudling, who was the Chairman and Mr. A. H. Mackintosh, the Secretary General. This is a working paper to put before the various territories, and in this paper it has been made abundantly clear by the Chairman of the United Kingdom delegation that it was considered essential to allow a reasonable time for public discussion in the units of the Conference, proposals for the new federation. The Secretary of State in particular considered it necessary, before making final proposals to Parliament, to be satisfied that there was a reasonably wide measure of support for the Conference proposals throughout the territories concerned, signified finally by the approval of the Legislatures.

Not only has he said that you must meet and approve of it, but you must be satisfied that members of the public have discussed it. It should not happen like the last time, because you will agree with me, Sir, that in this country less than 25% of the voters came out to vote for members of the Federal Parliament although the polling day was made a public holiday. That was a day on which nobody could employ you; else they would be fined; and therefore every living soul could come out and vote.

I must say, however, that on this occasion more people understand what it is all about. When we were in London, we got this Island's newspapers the next day after they were published and you could not help being interested in the way the "Advocate" and "Rediffusion" carried every day something about what we were doing. In such a way people must become interested.

The position therefore is simply this. The position with Barbados is an economic one. Do not be afraid of people moving in and your going out. The Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Trade will forgive me for saying this. With the capital coming here to Barbados and the money which would be put in circulation in Barbados, it would more than compensate. I anticipate that the Hon. Minister of Education will be speaking next. I am saying that the capital coming here with all its employment would more than compensate to Barbadians for what they are going to look for. Let me repeat this. You had to look for \$3 million more to finance your budget. You did not raise your hands to high heaven. I made it clear that I did not agree with certain things which you taxed, but I also made it clear that if I had won the Government that there was no use my going down on the Reef and scraping this money up and that you must have further taxation in order to get what you wanted.

Some hon. members said that you should put it on income tax and wickedly said that that was not done because there was an alliance between the Government and my Party. That was the most wicked and tortuous attempt at haranguing a Government that I have ever seen. People who understand anything of economics know this. If you in one breath say that you should put it on by way of trade and income tax, it works out to 52 cents in the dollar and if that is the case, how are you going to attract people to come here? The people who come here to Barbados do not want to really know from the Minister of Trade what the position is. The people in Germany will talk to the Minister of Trade, and the people of Jamaica will talk to the Minister of Education, but let there be no mistake about it. I heard somebody down there mention it. Industrialists who want to come here and set up an industry, the first set of people whom they are going to discuss the matter with is the bankers of the country. Every banker of the country asks for every law in this country. He has them there right at his head office because representation is made either in Canada, or in New York.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. member that he get back to what was done at Marlborough House?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Marlborough House was so very much enlarged that I am prepared to retrace my remarks, subject to your approval. I can quite appreciate the latitude which you have given me. The point which I was making was about the question of economy of these Islands.

The question which the Hon. Minister of Education should answer and tell this House and the public of Barbados is going to be the question of having the capital here. With the capital coming here, it would compensate possibly for what you are going to tax. In this memorandum it says this, and I pay tribute to the Hon. Premier for this. It was hinted that after spending what you want out of your \$12 million or the money which you got from your customs that the balance should be returned to the various territories. But, Sir, you know what happens with a Government, a people, a wife, a man or anybody who has money to spend and it is done that way. You know very well that seldom there is much to be returned.

I think, Sir, that what I have said tonight is sufficient to give the people of this Island an insight of what is going to happen. No Minister can tell the public of Barbados that federation is not going to cost us more. Great Britain has said that she is going to help us for a period. While we would be helped for a given period, the thing which must worry the people of Barbados and it must worry everybody is that when Britain goes into the European Economic Common Market, the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement goes.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage I am going to move that this debate be further postponed.

I now formally move that this debate be further postponed.

Mr. SEALEY: I beg to second that.

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

7.45 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That concludes Government Business for the day.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed:

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 7th August, 1962, at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 7th August, 1962, at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.47 p.m.