

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 4th June, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Communications, Works and Housing); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. N. W. BOXILL and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Social Services).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that several Minutes of meetings of this House are now in the hands of the printers and every attempt is being made to have them printed and circulated.

ILLNESS OF THE CLERK

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Medical Certificate from the General Hospital to the effect that the Clerk of this House is ill there and that the probable duration of his illness will be one month. I am certain that hon. members will be sorry to hear of Mr. Cumberbatch's illness and will hope that he will be well soon again.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR THE CLERK

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Clerk be granted one month's leave of absence from his duties as from today.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should like to state that during that month it may be necessary to have someone to assist with the duties of the House, but this notice is rather short and there was no time to make such an arrangement.

The question that the Clerk be granted one month's leave of absence from his duties as from today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Messrs. E. D. MOTTLEY, F. L. WALCOTT, L. A. LYNCH and J. W. CORBIN entered the House and took their seats.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CLERK

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be appointed to act as Clerk for one month as from today.

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

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

STATEMENT re EMPLOYMENT OF BARBADIAN SEAMEN ON S. S. "CATALINA"

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement in reply to the Resolution passed by the House of Assembly on the 4th December, 1962, on the motion of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas regarding the employment of Barbadian Seamen on the S. S. "Catalina".

The Statement is as follows:-

"On the 4th December, 1962, the House of Assembly passed the following Resolution:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to investigate the circumstances surrounding the employment, conditions of work, incidence of pay and discharge of the Barbadian Seamen who joined the S. S. "Catalina" at New Orleans, Louisiana, U.S.A. on 10th December, 1961, and who were discharged at the Bahamas Islands approximately three months afterwards."

2. On 8th December, 1961, eighteen Barbadian Seamen were recruited by the Lincoln Chartering and Shipping Company, through that Company's Local Agents Messrs. J. N. Harriman and Company Limited.

3. The men, who left Barbados by Air on 10th December, 1961, were engaged on terms and conditions not less favourable than those laid down by the National Maritime Board and similar to those prevailing on vessels of the Harrison Line. The men were signed on the appropriate form of agreement to join S. S. "Bahama Pearl" or any other ship owned or chartered by the same Company at New Orleans, U.S.A. (It subsequently transpired that the men actually joined the S. S. Catalina at New Orleans and that this vessel was to have been renamed the "Bahama Pearl" on arrival at Nassau, Bahamas).

4. Consequently upon a report made to the Port Department by a seaman, who returned from employment on another vessel operated by the same line, and the receipt of information by the Port Department that the seamen were not receiving proper treatment, a cable was despatched by the Port Department to the British Consul at Miami asking him to investigate these complaints. A reply was received from him stating that conditions aboard the vessel were satisfactory. The Port Director, Nassau, was asked to investigate the complaints and he reported that the Registrar of Shipping was enquiring into the matter. In all, a total of nine cables were exchanged as follows:-

Date	From	To
6.3.62	Governor, Barbados	Governor, Bahamas
6.3.62	Governor, Bahamas	Governor, Barbados
8.3.62	Governor, Barbados	Governor, Bahamas

8.3.62	Governor, Bahamas	Governor, Barbados
10.3.62	Registrar, Shipping, Bahamas	Harbour Master, Barbados
12.3.62	Governor, Bahamas	Governor, Barbados
16.3.62	Harbour Master, Barbados	Registrar, Shipping, Bahamas
7.6.62	Permanent Sec. Ministry of Communications Works and Housing	Registrar, Shipping, Bahamas
8.6.62	Registrar, Shipping, Bahamas	Permanent Sec., Ministry of Communications, Works & Housing.

12.25 p.m.

"5. While the vessel was at Nassau, fifteen seamen alleged improper treatment and requested to be discharged and repatriated to Barbados. The Registrar of Shipping was apparently not satisfied that the conditions complained of were sufficient to warrant termination of the agreement at Nassau, and since the final Port of discharge was noted in the agreement as Bridgetown, he agreed to arrange their repatriation only on condition that the men signed an affidavit admitting that they were deserters. This procedure is in accordance with the "Instructions to Officers", issued by the Ministry of Transport in the United Kingdom.

6. The fifteen seamen signed the affidavit and returned to Barbados between the 21st and 23rd March, 1962. Copies of their accounts of wages and the affidavit referred to were received by the Port Department.

7. It was ascertained by reference to the Registrar of Shipping, Nassau, that the men had engaged the services of a lawyer, Mr. L. O. Pindling, to represent their interest, in a claim as the vessel had been seized for debt. On 4th March, 1963, Mr. Pindling forwarded cheques for the balance of wages due to thirteen of the seamen.

8. No balances were received in respect of two men whom it is understood did not retain the services of Mr. Pindling. On 20th March, 1963, the Shipping Master, Nassau, was asked for a report on the position regarding wages due these two seamen but no reply has been received to date, although a reminder has been sent.

9. The three seamen who remained with the vessel returned to Barbados subsequently and the balance of wages due them has been paid in full.

10. Having regard to all the circumstances, the Government considers that everything possible has been done to assist these seamen, and is still being done in respect of the two of them, who have not yet received their wages."

QUESTIONS

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the playing field situated at Bagatelle, St. Thomas, is in a very bad condition?

2. Will the Minister investigate the matter with a view to having the said playing field made usable in order that the pupils at Welches School, St. Thomas, as well as the people in the area may be able to have the use of the said playing field?

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Questions.

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

Will the Minister please use his good offices and have erected or placed immediately one letter box at Prout Village on Highway F in the parish of St. Thomas, so as to

facilitate the many residents of that area who have been going without this dire necessity for over too long?

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

Is the Minister aware that due to a faulty gutter at Clifton Hill on Highway F in the parish of St. Thomas the residents in that area are in an unhappy state, owing to the stench from stale water that lodges in the gutter?

Will the Minister please use his good offices to have this state of affairs rectified immediately?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House to resume debate on the Resolution to sanction an Agreement made on 19th of October, 1962, between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Barbados Union Oil Company Limited.

Last Tuesday at the moment of interruption, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

RESOLUTION re AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVERNOR-IN-EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE BARBADOS UNION OIL COMPANY LIMITED

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I intend to draw to the attention of the House today more information to show that the Clause which I spoke about is not only stupid and obnoxious, but is against the very Acts of our own Island. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will remember that on the last occasion when I made mention of this matter, I pointed out that in so far as this Clause is concerned, it gives the Company the right to determine wages, and I should like to point out that if we pass this, — some members of the House do not pay as much attention to this as they should — it is not a fair wages Clause. I was at pains to read it to members, and I will read it again. It reads as follows:-

"The Company shall give preference to Barbadians in the staffing of the refining operation to the extent that persons are available who, in the Company's judgment...."

You as a lawyer, Sir, would know that if it is within the Company's judgment to do these things, nobody else can go and interfere with them. Who is going to decide that? This is nothing to do with a fair wages Clause; so when anybody talks about this being a fair wages Clause, he does not know what he is talking about. Then it goes on:

".....have the qualifications and skills necessary to perform efficiently the duties and discharge the responsibilities of the positions involved and shall undertake to pay to such employees, and shall require its agents and assigns to pay to these regularly engaged in service and business under this Agreement, wages commensurate with prevailing wages paid by other employers of Barbadian labour for like job requirements such prevailing wages to be determined by The Company."

Now let us see where this is stupid and false. 12.35 p.m.

Barbados passed a law in 1952 known as the Labour Clauses (Public Contract) Act. It comes from an I.L.O. convention and the I.L.O. convention of the Labour Clauses (Public Contract) Act lays down certain specific duties which you have to do in labour contracts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will have to forgive me if I have to draw this to your attention and to hon. members of this House so that you will have some insight into the background of labour laws. This was a recommendation of the Labour Clauses (Public Contract) Act, 1952 and it is now a convention. The Government of Barbados passed this convention.

I should just briefly read this in order for Your Honour to see that this Clause which the Government has now al-

lowed to come before the House is an affront to the legislation which we have passed. In the Labour Clauses (Public Contract) Act, this section deals with where you give a person a contract and this is what it says:-

"The contractor shall pay rates of wages and observe hours and conditions of labour not less favourable than those established in the trade or industry in the district where the work is carried out, by agreement, machinery or negotiation or arbitration to which the parties are organisations of employers and trade unions representative respectively of substantial proportions of the employers and workers engaged in the trade or industry in the district (hereinafter referred to as "established rates and conditions") or failing such established rates and conditions in the trade or industry in the district, established rates and conditions in other districts where the trade or industry is carried on under similar general circumstances."

There is nothing in the Labour Clauses which give any company the right to do this by agreement, negotiations or by any other means.

It goes on to state:-

"In the absence of any established rates and conditions as defined in paragraph 1, the Labour Commissioner shall, after consultation with representatives of employers and workers prepare and furnish a schedule setting forth fair and reasonable rates and conditions to be observed in the execution of the contract, having regard to established rates and conditions in respect of persons employed in a capacity and in general circumstances similar to those of the persons engaged on the contract or failing such rates and conditions, any fair standards or rates and conditions commonly recognised in respect of persons employed in a similar capacity and in similar general circumstances."

Now, Sir, having this law, you get the Government coming down with a clause which completely nullified the law. Someone says that this is a protection and a fair wage clause. They do not know what they are talking about.

Moreover, under the I.L.O. conventions, speaking about Labour Clauses, in the Conventions of 1949 this is stated:-

"This Section applies to contracts which fulfil the following conditions:"

"(a) that one at least of the parties to the contract is a public authority; and

(b) that the execution of the contract involved -

(i) the expenditure of funds by a public authority; and

(ii) the employment of workers by the other party to the contract;

(c) that the contract is a contract for -

(i) the construction, alteration, repair or demolition of public works;

(ii) the manufacture, assembly, handling or shipment of materials, supplies or equipment; or

(iii) the performance or supply of services; and

(d) that the contract is awarded by a central authority of a Member of the International Labour Organisation to which this Section applies.

2. The competent authority shall determine the extent to which and the manner in which this Section shall be applied to contracts awarded by authorities other than central authorities.

3. This Section applies to work carried out by subcontractors or assignees of contracts; appropriate measures shall be taken by the competent authority to ensure such application."

Now, Sir, I will read from page 153 of the International Labour Code, 1959, Volume 1, article 119. It reads as follows:-

"1. In cases where private employers are granted subsidies or are licenced to operate a public utility, provisions substantially similar to those of the labour clauses in public contracts should be applied."

This is not a contract. This Company is not doing anything for the Government. But if you are writing in any labour clauses, the labour clause should be the same as that you passed here. Where else in the world would you have this obnoxious situation that a Government which is professedly a Socialist Government allows this obnoxious Clause to come in here giving a company the right to determine wages which is contrary to the very laws of Barbados which you have passed. You pass a law which is statute law which says what is the situation. The Government is bringing in an Agreement with a Clause in it which in this year of grace gives the employer the right to determine wages and that employer is the Barbados Union Oil Company.

Now, Sir, the company wanted me to accept from them a letter. You cannot take a letter as law. The Union does not want any letter. We are going to pass this Agreement with this Clause in it but even in the Middle East you do not get this sort of Clause written in an Agreement. The Company must have put this in for the Government. If the Minister in charge had been paying any attention to this matter, surely, he could not agree with it. You say here in this Agreement that the Company shall undertake to pay to such employees, and shall require its agents and assigns to pay to those readily engaged in service and business under this Agreement wages commensurate with prevailing wages paid by other employers of Barbadian labour for like job requirements, such prevailing wages to be determined by the company. You go on to say that the Company will make actual surveys of the labour market from time to time.

The Company is going to carry out surveys and after carrying out surveys it can come back and say that these are the wages which we are going to pay.

Another strange thing is that the Barbados Union Oil Company has an Agreement with a Trade Union. The law here says that not even the Labour Commissioner can determine wages by himself. What is an Agreement? This is an Agreement between a Company and somebody else. What is arbitration? This is what the clause says:

"If any dispute shall arise with respect to the interpretation of any clause of this Agreement between the Government and The Company which cannot otherwise be resolved to the satisfaction of the parties, such dispute shall be submitted to arbitration."

I have not written it in. Somebody has said that this is a fair wages clause. I would not mind if it were. They say that this is in accordance with the fair wages clause. As I have pointed out; "in the absence of any established rates and conditions as defined in paragraph 1, the Labour Commissioner shall, after consultation with representatives of employers and workers prepare and furnish a schedule setting forth fair and reasonable rates and conditions to be observed in the execution of the contract."

That is what the Labour Commissioner has to do after you come in an area where nobody is working in this thing and you put down a new company.

Now, I have heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition say that he is not accusing anybody of anything improper in this matter.
12.45 p.m.

He feels that it has been done above-board. I would like to feel so, but when you see a persistent resistance against something which is so blatant and improper as this, you can only conclude that all is not well. Has somebody been paid out to write in a Clause or to agree to a Clause like this? The resistance you get to a fair wages

contract in the case of something like this is as if somebody has been paid out to write that in a Clause. There is no justification for giving any company the right to determine wages when on the Statute Book you say that wages can only be determined after consultation.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said that when you see resistance like this in respect of a Clause giving a company the right to fix wages, all is not well. First and foremost I want to ask the hon. member what resistance he is talking about, because, so far as I know, nobody has replied to the speeches made by hon. members. Where is the resistance? And I strongly object Mr. Deputy Speaker, to any implication or direct accusation that because the hon. member or anybody else disagrees with any of the provisions of this Resolution that somebody has been paid out. I do not think that Your Honour is entitled to sit there and allow the hon. member to impute any dishonest motives to any hon. member of this House. The hon. member has to wait until the Government replies to say what he is saying because there has not been any resistance at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have heard both hon. members and I will speak now. I am going to make it quite clear and I hope that hon. members will appreciate what are points of order and how they must be taken. I heard the Hon. Leader of the House say that he does not think that I should stay here. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sit there.) I know when an improper motive has been imputed. I have been listening to the hon. senior member for St. Peter very carefully and I am not aware, from what he has said, on the surface of it, that he has been imputing improper motives to anybody, I will hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not a man who is given to saying what I do not believe. I do not talk with my tongue in my cheek. The Hon. Leader of the House has been famous for rising on a point of order — in fact, it has become endemic in his nature to rise on a point of order and proceed either to lecture to the Chair or to make a speech in reply and say what he intends to say; but he does not deal with the point of order which has arisen. It is true that the hon. member has not yet replied but I would remind him, if he is not aware of it, that I have drawn a matter to Your Honour's attention and I have also asked that words be taken down, which were stated in reply to this same matter on a point of order (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: By whom?) By the Hon. Leader of the Government of Barbados when he stated that I agreed in principle with this Clause in connection with which I had the deliberate intention of misleading the House and the public. I took objection to this Clause because of the question of protection for the workers and the Hon. Leader of the Government told me something about reading Clause 7. When the hon. member talks about my speaking of resistance to this Resolution and nobody has spoken, it all shows how much attention he is giving to his Parliamentary duties; because these statements were made in the House and the hon. member was present at the time. I say that resistance has been given because when I was making my speech on this Clause, the Hon. Premier got up and made a statement in reply to what I was saying. The hon. member is going to say that the Hon. Premier is not a member of the Government because when he made his speech he was not making his speech as a member of the Government. If the hon. member thinks that I am accommodating anybody when I speak, then he is making a mistake.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am a member of this Chamber and whenever there is any matter before the Chamber which I feel is not in the best interest of good legislation, I will speak on it. As to hon. members on that side of the House, when it comes to the question of making imputations he is fantastic for doing this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should like to inform the hon. member that I have already settled that point.

Mr. WALCOTT: Any resistance which is against the laws of your country will mean that all is not well. Why do

you resist something which the law does not permit you to do. The law says what a fair wages clause should be. Here you are writing a wages Clause in the Agreement. I am not a legal draughtsman and therefore I do not even attempt to tell legal men how they should do their drafting; but I have been to school and I have been reading long enough to know that in this Clause you try to write up a lot of things which have nothing to do with a labour contract and fair wages. This is what the Clause says:-

"The Company shall give preference to Barbadians in the staffing or of the refining operation to the extent that persons are available who, in the Company's judgement, have the qualifications and skills necessary to perform efficiently the duties and discharge the responsibilities of the positions involved and shall undertake to pay to such employees,....."

I am submitting that that is nothing to do with a fair wages clause. I agree, if you write it in, that you should make the company employ Barbadians, but when you say that "the company shall give preference to Barbadians... to the extent that persons are available who, in the Company's judgement, have the qualifications," who is going to negotiate with the company or determine that this or that Barbadian has not got the qualifications? Why is it not going to be the judgment of the Labour Commissioner or that of somebody else? This is Barbados. You want to employ somebody at the rum refinery and do you leave it to the company's judgment to do this? Why do you have to do that?

12.55 p.m.

The ordinary employer has a common law right to employ people in his own judgment; so you do not have to write in a contract that I must employ people in my own judgment. I employ a man whether I like his face or not. There is no particular statute law giving any of us the right to employ people in our own judgement. *Ipsa facto* that is there. What is now very important is that you are leaving it to the judgment of the Company which is likely to employ people other than Barbadians. Where would the Government or anybody else stand after this Clause is written in? If a man comes along and employs somebody from Timbucktu, Wales or Norway, and somebody raises a shindy and says this person should not be employed, what is the statute you have passed saying that he cannot be employed. In the Company's judgment, they have decided that he is the best man to employ, and there will be a lot of companies who would think they have not done anything illegal; so if you want to put Barbadians on all fours with these people, you would have to take out this Clause. I agree that if you are giving rights for Barbadians to have a preference; naturally everyone would like Barbadians to have that preference; but that is not important. What is important is that the Company shall undertake to pay to such employees, and shall require its agents and assigns to pay those regularly engaged in service and business under this Agreement wages commensurate with prevailing wages paid by other employers of Barbadian labour for like job requirements, such prevailing wages to be determined by the Company. Now how could you do that? Who is going to determine these job requirements? The Company is going to say that it wants a labourer at the Union Oil Company to dig post holes, but the Telephone Company or somebody else says so much and they will look around. The Union says "oh no", you cannot pay these wages, because you are an oil refining company and we are going to treat you on the ability to pay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those of us whose duty it is to negotiate wages, more so in a poor community, do not negotiate wages with private companies on the basis of what is happening all around, because in some instances what is happening all around is on negotiated wages. The workers have no choice and have to accept what they get. Our experience here now is that we have been negotiating wages with a Company in Barbados that is not purely a local company, and the rate of the economic growth of this company has risen something like nearly five times the amount over a period of about ten or fifteen years. Do you expect me to go and sit down with a company whose rate of growth has been five times the amount of any similar company or group

of companies or people employing persons under like rates and ask them to pay their employees no more wages or wages commensurate with what is prevailing here? Now a fair wages Clause is put down to be a floor. Somebody wrote in a newspaper that this is meant to be a floor for negotiations. This would happen where there was no union existing, but in a fair wages Clause and even in a contract you call upon a person to pay wages by agreement. The only machinery I know for negotiations is between the company and the Union. Before this Agreement is passed, you should cut out that Clause in accordance with the Labour Wages Contract, because wages should be determined by the Company and the workers' organisation under a unilateral agreement, but in your very statute which speaks about negotiations, you are now going to write in a contradiction in this Clause to give the Company certain rights which a man who is drawing stones for the Government, Mr. Farnum or whoever he is, a tailor who gets a contract or any man who gets a contract, cannot write in his contract. Before you give a man a contract, under this Labour Clause, there is no agreement that a man has to pay wages determined by the Labour Commissioner and the Labour Commissioner can determine them alone. He has to call in the Union in that particular business to find out what is regarded as a fair wage.

Moreover, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Barbados Union Oil Company could not request the Government to sign an Agreement like this for them to operate. They could not come along and claim that if you did not give them the right to determine wages in Barbados that they were not coming, because you could tell them if they did not want to come under these terms and conditions, do not come. It means, therefore, by writing this in a contract that the man at the saw mill can decide to come in and have nothing to do with stevedore labour, but will get some small sloops, charter a ship to come to Barbados, and then go in the country and bring down some stone cutters who do not work for \$8.00 a day and put them aboard the ship to work. Soon you may find elected Ministers unloading these ships or have a situation like that existing in British Guiana, because you are writing in a clause that a company shall determine wages. How can you be serious? Now it has been raised, the Minister says there has been no resistance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you believe that if the Minister was not resisting what I was saying that when he rose on a point of order he would not have said that he was in agreement with me and that they intend to withdraw the Clause?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I said anything like that,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir. If I tried anything like that the hon. member would be the first to say I am making a speech. That could not arise out of a point of order at all.

Mr. WALCOTT: What I meant, Sir, is that instead of accusing me and saying there was no resistance, I thought he would rise on a point of order and say that the Government agrees with what I am saying, and therefore there would be no point in my continuing.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member wants me, Sir, to explain our position on this, I will do it now. This section is taken word for word.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just want to get it clear for the records. On what is the hon. member speaking?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am not making a reply, but merely because the hon. member would like some clarification on this point.....

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not want a clarification. I thought when the hon. member rose on a point of order that he would have indicated that far from resisting it, the Government intended to withdraw it. If the hon. member intends to reply, he is at liberty to do so, but I am making the speech that this Clause, no matter where it is taken from, gives the

company a right which conflicts with the Labour Clause Acts.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I merely, on a point of order, want to say that there is no necessity for the hon. member to labour the point, and that in so far as we are concerned, this section can come out. It was taken word for word from the Agreement signed by the last Government with Esso for the bunkering rights at the Deep Water Harbour. The hon. senior member for St. Peter did not get the chance to say his piece on it for the simple reason that the last Government never brought the Agreement here at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it this is a point of privilege.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As Your Honour pleases. In so far as we are concerned, we could not care less whether or not it came out, because it was not put in in our existence. All the legal draughtsman did was to take up the old Agreement between Esso and the Barbados Labour Party Government and stick that Clause in.
1.05 p.m.

Naturally, Sir, since Esso had it, B.U.O.C. called for it too. That is the only reason, but, as far as we are concerned, I am going to concede without any disfavour to the Government that the inclusion of the provisions made in this Section does not mean one way or the other to us but we are merely following precedent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope the position is clear to both hon. members.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am very pleased to hear it. The hon. member said: "I was not a member or party to the deciding." He used that remark in such a manner as to say that this Clause is taken word for word out of something which we have passed already. I want the Hon. Minister to understand this clearly. The Hon. Minister and I were insistent in this Chamber even when the Esso Agreement came before the House that we were against these things. We said that the same way that you can come here and get a company selling oil from somewhere else, I am not one of those people who will come in here and say that I am opposed to B.U.O.C. refining oil.

The Hon. Minister said that all of us joined together and agreed to the Agreement between Esso and the last Government. We did agree but we did not see what was in the Agreement. I am sure with the composition of the House then with that opposition which we had during the time of the last Government that we would have passed that agreement today next year. Christmas would have come and found that we were still debating it if they did not intend to withdraw it. With the opposition which we had on that side of the House in the last session, whenever the Government over here brought in any obnoxious clause, they would have to sleep in here for a couple days and nights before they could get it through. Today the Opposition is not as vigorous as what it was then.

Sir, although we have agreed to the refining of oil here and although we have agreed to the Agreement in principle, do not put anything in the Agreement and say that we have agreed in principle to it. I pointed out on the last occasion that I did not like the contents of Clause 12. The reason why I say that is because I am the only person in this Honourable Chamber who has to watch the rights of the Union. Other hon. members are not involved in the Workers Union as I am.

This is what you state:

"In the event that the failure of The Company to make the petroleum products referred to above available to meet the demand of Barbados in whole or in part is due to any of the causes set out in Article 12 hereof, then and in such event The Company shall have the right to import such petroleum products to make up the deficiency resulting from the loss of refinery production, such importations of products to be subject to all of the benefits which The Company enjoys hereunder in manufacturing and selling such products, including the right to the discharge by The Government of the consumption tax obligation of The Company as provided for in Article 5 hereof."

Some hon. member has said that oil companies are powerful things. They are, but when you read Clause 12, you will see that in it they put in things which are not only acts of God. You see not only fire, frost, earthquake, lightning, storm, tide, tidal wave or perils of the sea, accident of navigation or breakdown or injury of vessels among other things but they also put in strikes or combination of workmen, lockouts or other labour disturbances. You know what that is. You go and ask for wages and B.U.O.C. says: "we are not paying anymore." You call a strike and the Government gives the Company the right to import oil. When you do that, you will be giving them too much power because when you give them power to be able to import oil in that case, they will not care what the workers do. You will see how dangerous it can be for the workers in that case. Even this Article gives the Company the right in a strike or lock-out to get this oil and the Government has to make provision further to bring it in. I do not think the Government should be a party in an industrial dispute so that one side is able to put it over the other side. If there were a strike by the other side, the Government was not going to help us to bring people from Trinidad.

Sir, I feel this is giving the Company very wide powers because they are able to bring in oil in this case and then the Government is making certain regulations to assist them. These things should only come in if a state of emergency has been declared but in normal circumstances you should not permit a company to get out of its obligations. I hope the Hon. Minister will see that so far as I am concerned I have nothing against the company operating as a company but do not say that if I agree to this Agreement in principle that I agree to all of this because I cannot agree to all of this.

The Hon. Minister spoke about the Attorney General and said that this thing was in the hands of lawyers. This Agreement has not been in our hands before neither do I regard these matters as matters concerning myself alone. I represent an organisation which has legal advisers just as the Government has legal advisers. We have been advised that this is a badly drawn up agreement and that there are clauses which are written in the Agreement which are going to militate not only against the best interest of workers but against Barbados.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I will be glad if the hon. member will indicate those clauses. Be good enough to specify those clauses to which the hon. member has remarked that they will not only militate against workers but against Barbados. 1.15 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: In addition to those two Clauses which I have mentioned about strikes and so on, this is where I feel that people who have given a study to this matter should be given the opportunity to meet the Government on it. This Agreement speaks about this company being a subsidiary company and passing on some of its rights to another subsidiary company. I have been advised that that is not a very happy state of affairs because the Government would be giving the company, which is subsidiary to another company, the right to do certain things. This is what it states in this paragraph:-

"The Company at all times shall be and remain a British company registered in Great Britain or a territory within the British Commonwealth and having its registered office within the United Kingdom or any such territory, and the Chairman of said Company and a majority of the Directors at all times shall be British subjects and the Company shall not at any time be or become directly or indirectly controlled by persons or corporations which are foreign to the British Commonwealth other than Socony Mobil Oil Company, Inc. of New York in the United States of America or any other company or corporation which shall directly or indirectly be controlled by the said Socony Mobil Oil Company Inc."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has been drawn to my attention, as I have said, that this is not a very happy state of affairs. This is where the lawyers will have to fight; it has been

drawn to my attention that the rights will conflict with what you have already said you are giving to the company as a subsidiary company and this Clause together with the other one is where you are going to get a head-on collision. What I feel about this matter is that with the wide objections - I do not go in for any type of black-mailing of people, but I feel that legislation like this is extremely important and it should be given the widest publicity. I want the Hon. Leader of the House to understand that I do not treat legislation which comes down from the Government just like a person who is opposing things for the sake of opposing them. I am too busy a man for that; nor am I one of those who do not like to do my home work. I laugh sometimes when I hear members of the last Government accusing this Government of doing something when their record is black in so far as behaviour is concerned. We had to fight to get Agreements in here in connection with the Deep Water Harbour. I do not mean as to the construction of the Deep Water Harbour but I mean as to this idea of having land lease. There was a Resolution which came down here in which you would be leasing land at the Deep Water Harbour, the matter did not come in here originally and we fought against it. When the matter in relation to Esso Standard Oil came in here we made a speech on it. In principle nobody wanted to penalise the erection of this thing down there if reasons were given for it and if I had seen an Agreement like this one, I would have been opposed to it as well. As hon. members know, I would not be afraid to oppose the last Government in relation to any matter like that because my record is too well known in dealing with them. However, the last Government has not got any power now and they cannot pass any laws. They will talk just as I will talk and they cannot even talk like me. I have just awakened a member of the last Government. (Laughter). I would not even regard them as a very serious threat in so far as that sort of thing is concerned, but I feel that this is a bad Clause in here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition talking about a Select Committee; I have heard the hon. member refer to a Select Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I never said anything about a Select Committee. The hon. member might have heard me refer to what I heard the Hon. Leader of the House say, and I said that if the hon. member sat down without suggesting that this matter be referred to a Select Committee, he might find himself in deep waters.

Mr. WALCOTT: I know I heard the hon. member say something about a Select Committee. We are dealing with certain matters in here. I did not hear all the arguments adduced by hon. members of the Opposition but if there is any objection to certain Clauses in this Agreement it seems to me that referring the matter to a Select Committee might be the remedy, with the instruction that the Select Committee report on this matter with a certain time, and that will give everybody the opportunity to deal with this matter. If there are other objections to this Clause, I would move that this Agreement be referred to a Select Committee. (ASIDES.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there is any difficulty about the Rules of the House as to this Resolution being an abstract Resolution, and it cannot be a matter to be sent to a Select Committee, I would like to say that we can decide what we want to do with any matter which comes before us. We can postpone this matter so that the Government can have second thoughts on it and come back with amendments to this Agreement. That is where I would say that it would be difficult to ask us to agree to this Resolution as it is, and I would be very glad to have this provision. It does not matter if the Clause about which I spoke is taken out. 1.25 p.m.

It would be difficult to ask us to agree to this matter as it is, but I am glad that the hon. member has said that it does not matter if this Clause is taken out. I think we would all be glad to know what is the Minister's intention now that he has heard these comments on the Resolution, because if the principle is accepted by and large by the members of the House, the Government should not be

resisting any attempt to make the Agreement conform with what members feel. I do not know what are the Rules, but I would move that the Resolution be sent to Select Committee so that all of us can have an opportunity of discussing it. This is not done as a means of killing the Agreement because it is already an Agreement, but it is a matter of making a clause more in keeping with what we feel.

I beg to move that this Resolution be sent to Select Committee.

Mr. SEALEY: I beg to second that. From the very outset of this contribution which I am going to make to this debate, Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion?

Mr. SEALEY: I am seconding the motion for the Resolution to be sent to Select Committee, and at the outset of the contribution which I am going to make in a Barbadian context, I should like to make it abundantly clear that I am in wholehearted agreement with any local industry in the Island of Barbados. I regret, however, that I cannot give wholehearted support to the Agreement between the Government and the Barbados Union Oil Company. I have got from reliable sources, Sir, that the Barbados Union Oil Company knocked some time back at the Government of Trinidad to get a monopoly to operate a refinery there, but somehow they were refused. I also got from reliable sources that they bought the Barbados Union Oil Company with the expectation of getting the bunkering at the Deep Water Harbour. I also understand that application was made to the former Government and they were refused, because it is commonly known that the standard of petrol or petroleum used by the Barbados Union Oil Company is not up to the international standard of gasoline supplied in the Island of Barbados by other refineries.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, in so far as I am concerned, I am not in a position to talk about the standards of oil in Barbados or anywhere else. I am not an oil expert, but I do know in this Agreement, if the hon. member has read it, he would understand that in so far as the standards of petroleum products to be refined in Barbados are concerned, the Government is protected and the standards have to be the same as those internationally accepted. With regard to the hon. member's broad accusation against the Company, that is a matter for him and the Company and its advisers. I am sure you appreciate what I am saying, and I need not say anymore.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a well known fact that the gasoline produced by the Barbados Union Oil Company is entirely different from the gasoline from other recognised companies like Texaco, Shell and Esso. This is not hard to understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You can actually go and put yourself between any of the taxi drivers and they will tell you that. I sell gasoline and I am not holding my mouth down on this, because I do not owe any man one cent on my gasoline. I am sure this will affect the whole public of this Island. (A VOICE: What do you sell?) I sell Esso, the best. Of course, with a Vanguard you can use anything; you can use kerosine oil or turpentine, but not in a Rambler or a Jaguar.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Barbados Union Oil Company has been operating here for the last 43 years and has been faced with the greatest amount of competition by other oil companies, and up to now, without legislation, they could never get themselves on the market. Their product as it stands is below the standard of petrol used today; it is not up to the recognised standard required by international oil refineries.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member has said that this Agreement is going to affect the entire Island, and then went on to say that the standards of the Barbados Union Oil Company are not up to internationally accepted standards. Now I said just now that apparently he has not read the Agreement.....

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that a point of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that the point of order relates to the question of the international standard of oil, and I am hearing that point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am saying, Sir, that this is the second time the hon. member has accused the Government, but under Article 6G of the Agreement.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I see two hon. members standing. Let both hon. members sit. The Hon. Leader of the House is making a point as regards what the hon. senior member for St. Michael said in so far as the standard of oil not being up to international standards.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I said that the hon. member said that this Agreement which the Government is entering will put on the market a petroleum product not up to internationally accepted standards. Article 6G of the Agreement before the House is as follows:

"The company agrees that the quality of the products in question will be in accordance with accepted industry standards and the Government shall have the right to take samples of the said products for analysis."
1.35 p.m.

The Company agrees to pay for the cost of such analysis, if carried out by an agency other than The Government, twice a year.

Mr. SEALEY: Sir, I can quite understand what the Hon. Leader of the House says but this is part of my line and type of business. These people depend on gasoline for their daily duties. I get complaints too. You can go among the motoring public of Barbados in the Lower Green and you will see what this means to the motoring public of Barbados. I have no intention of disrupting any local industry and, as a matter of fact, I would do everything to push local industry but it appears from this that you are pushing local industry at your expense. The gasoline refined by B.U.O.C. is not up to the same standard as that you get from the other oil companies.

We have oil companies just like Shell which has over \$6 million tied up here and they actually spend \$1 million a year. (A VOICE: In what?) They spend \$1 million here. There is also Texaco which have about \$3 million or \$4 million tied up here and also Esso which has millions of dollars tied up and they have been serving Barbados for a long time and now you find a monopoly is to be given to — and I am going to call it by its name — a bogus refinery.

Now, Sir, what is worrying me, and I think it is a very serious matter which must be taken into serious consideration, is this. Are you going to show where the Barbados Union Oil Company can employ more people than the other companies put together? Can you prove to me that this will be the case? It is my feeling that this is going to end just as the Deep Water Harbour when they brought in modern machinery to displace labour. This is nothing else but something to displace labour.

Sir, I would like to know what problems will arise with the possible staff reductions which will take place with the other companies. I would also like to know if the Government had sent out for tenders, that is to say, if it was that B.U.O.C. was given a monopoly? What is the position? How does the Government stand with the other people? Were they offered tenders? Will they be asking for tenders again?

My reason for bringing this to your attention is this. Take for instance the Transport Board. I know what you have to pay for gas, therefore I would like to know if you will have the same benefits under this.

Competition is a great thing. Now, this Socialist Government has placed its faith in the same very Telephone Company at which you have breakdowns morning, noon and night but by the 20th of any month the slightest thing

happens you are discontented and it means \$1.00 more for reconnection. As regards the Electric Company, you put in electricity in your house and you pay forty to fifty years for the meter, yet at the end it is not yours. Every year, there is a surcharge for this and that and you cannot do otherwise than to pay. You either take it or leave it. Now, you go to what I will call the cruel Rediffusion which I suffer from month after month. You type your business and send it to them and ask them to clear it up for you. They will clear it up but it will be at your expense. Competition is a great thing. It keeps us on our toes.

This does not give businessmen any incentive to invest money because we are scared. As I have said, I suffer month after month through lack of competition and now we are going to have one gasoline station from which to buy. This Company cannot get their product on the market. They were here fighting for 43 years and it is not hard to understand why they cannot succeed. You can get what is sold by Shell, Texaco and Esso. The name of Mobile Oil is just a fancy name but it is the same old company B.U.O.C. Some time last year when the Mobile Oil Company was applying for a person to run their gas station, they stated in an advertisement that coloured persons need not apply. (A VOICE: That is not true.) I will get the newspaper and show you. It was when they were about to set up the gasoline station in Whitepark Road.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. They who? We have no Agreement with either gasoline station in Whitepark Road.

Mr. SEALEY: If the Hon. Leader of the House would show himself among the people he would know what actually happens. Do you not know that Mobile Oil has a gas station in Whitepark and they run it themselves?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think that the hon. senior member for St. Peter cautioned another member of this House not to pick at trivialities during the course of a debate. The hon. senior member for St. Michael is making statements which he has garnered from those ill-considered trivialities and that is quite improper. What the hon. member has referred to is an advertisement which appeared in the Press asking for gasoline attendants who must be brown-skinned girls at a station in Worthing.
1.45 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me hear the hon. member's point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Hon. Minister of Education went on the air and said that we were not going to tolerate advertisements in the Press which tended to show discrimination between one section of the community and the other; that was within a matter of twelve or twenty-four hours before any meeting of this House could take place. The gentleman who operates that station is an Indian gentleman from Trinidad, and that makes the matter all the more reprehensible. Any service station which is regulated by B.U.O.C. carries the labels of its supplier. I make no apology for saying this because a lot of the acrimony which arises is due to the lack of understanding of the implications of the Agreement. Let the hon. member confine himself to the provisions of the Agreement and take it clause by clause and oppose it; but do not let him throw out statements like that because we are in the House of Assembly. Let the hon. member remember that.

Mr. SEALEY: The gasoline station is not signed "Shell" or "Texaco". It is run by the "Mobil Oil Company" and what I am talking about is what I saw.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member has a gasoline station and he has the sign "Esso". Is he Esso?

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the gasoline station is mine, and I can sell any product I like. I can sell the best.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. It has now transpired that the hon. member is a member of the House

who has an interest which conflicts with the debate which is going on; and therefore he should withdraw from the Chamber because he is representing a brief for a relevant concern. He cannot carry on an impartial debate on a matter of this kind. He is selling what he considers to be the best kind of gasoline.

Mr. SEALEY: Why does the hon. member not withdraw from the hotel business?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of Order. I have no shares with Hilton. I neither owe Hilton nor does Hilton owe me.

Mr. SEALEY: I do not know if the people in St. Philip like me-----

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The people in St. Michael like me.

Mr. SEALEY: I would like to know if what is before us now will result in every oil company closing down its business. This new refinery will be located in the present area which is a tourist resort, and where there is a popular bathing beach. We all know that Graves End beach is the most popular beach for all those who cannot afford to go to the various seaside residences. I would like to know whether this proposal will interfere with this beach. We know that oil companies emit intolerable smells, just like the one at Point-a-Pierre, Aruba and those places. Since this place is fast becoming a tourist resort and in that area where there are the Hilton Hotel and the Barbados Light and Power Company, will that area be able to accommodate 30 truck waggons travelling there during the early hours of the morning?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House put the matter nicely last Tuesday when he also included me-gasse as a new industry with that of the Barbados Union Oil Company; but there are two separate and distinct businesses. In these circumstances, I am not supporting an Agreement of this kind.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a matter of privilege, I wanted to say that I drew your attention last week to the fact that I had taken exception to remarks which were used by the Hon. Premier. Today the Hon. Premier entered the debate without withdrawing those remarks and I now, as a matter of privilege, move that those words be taken down. The words are that I made a deliberate attempt to mislead the House and the public. They were personal imputations against my character and I now make the motion that those words be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Last Tuesday, the hon. senior member for St. Peter drew to the attention of the Chair that the Hon. Premier had made use of certain remarks imputing improper motives to him. I told the hon. senior member for St. Peter that I was prepared to rule that day when the Hon. Premier and the hon. senior member for St. Peter were both in their seats. The Hon. Premier was not in his seat and, in my opinion, it served no purpose to rule then. That day having now passed and the matter complained of by the hon. senior member for St. Peter not being an allegation or disrespect to the Chair, I regard it that that day has passed and that the matter has come to a close. That is my ruling.
1.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you were the person who gave the assurance that you would not rule that day, but when both members are in the House. It did not require the Hon. Premier to be here for you to make a ruling that these words were improper. I want to say that if that is your ruling, only a man with a criminal mind, and that does not have to be a member of this House, would get up in here on the day which it was done and impute improper motives by saying that I made a deliberate attempt to mislead the House and the public. Only a man with an innate, criminal mind would get up and say anything like that against any other hon. member of this House. That is the mind of a person who would be murderous and slanderous and do anything if he can get up and say anything like that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me tell the hon. member that I said I was not going to rule except both members were in their seats, and I think that is sufficient for the hon. member to understand. That reference is in relation to that day and I regard the matter now as closed, because in this House both hon. members will be speaking.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must say that I am in agreement with any industry coming to Barbados that will be of benefit to the inhabitants. Under this Agreement between the Government and the Barbados Union Oil Company, I think that the Government is trying to bring in as many industries as it can to help the people of Barbados. Hon. members have criticised the action that is about to be taken but when it comes to industries, I have seen that year after year we have been having new industries. Banks Breweries is a new industry. There are several varieties of gasoline being sold in Barbados as well as several varieties of beer. When Banks Breweries first opened, I criticised the Company because I did not like the beer. I am one of the oldest beer drinkers in Barbados, and I do not think another man has ever drunk more beer in Barbados than I have.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING.

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

On resumption:

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There being no Replies to Questions, we will pass on to Private Members' Business.

Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution to approve the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance. On the 28th May, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking at 4.30 p.m. when Government Business was called.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, last Tuesday when the time for Private Members' Business expired, I was quoting from the Hon. Premier's Speech. I will go on to read as follows:-

"The principle measures which I propose should be taken to balance our budget are: consumption taxes on aerated and mineral waters, cigarettes and gasoline; and reduction of the rice subsidy. I shall also propose other measures to improve our position.

About 50 million bottles of aerated and mineral water are drunk in this island in a year, and it is not unreasonable to ask the people who imbibe these beverages to contribute one cent on each bottle to the Revenue. To give effect to this proposal a consumption duty of 16 cents a gallon will be imposed with effect from tomorrow. 2.35 p.m.

"On cigarettes I propose a consumption tax of two cents on a packet of ten."

"On gasoline the tax is to be five cents a gallon. This additional tax will also apply to other petroleum distillates, except kerosene, used in the island."

Now, the Hon. Premier has said that it would not be unreasonable to ask the consumers of soft drinks to pay a cent on each bottle. One cent per bottle, as it is, can add up to a lot of money and a lot of hardship to the workers who have to buy these drinks day in and day out. Let us take the case

of the workers first. They are the bread-winners. I mean the masons, the carpenters and the people who have to leave their homes on mornings and travel far distances to work. They have to carry along something in their bag to eat, may be a bread in some cases or a roast potato in some other cases, but it is a sure case that at the nearest shop from their place of work, they are going to buy a Ju-C or a Coke. In most cases, in order to get a long drink, they buy a Ju-C because they can stretch it further by adding water. That is a drink which is used by 90% of the workers of this country and when they are called upon to pay one penny more for such — the Hon. Premier has said one cent more but there are some people who have to pay one penny more — it will create a hardship on those people.

Now, Sir, as regards children, they have to do the same thing. Every child must have a bottled drink with his lunch. I do not mind the few who are getting theirs free; I will not go to the ones who are getting theirs through the hot meals programme, because I will have to talk about that also but Sir, I was at Holy Innocents in the parish of St. Thomas and a man met me and told me: "Skipper, what have you done with me? You have hit the soft drinks now." I said to him: "No man, it is the people whom you wanted. He said to me: "Do you know that it costs me 45 cents more per week?" That man is a policeman.

Sir, it is all well and good because 50 million bottles of these soft drinks are consumed in a year by putting one cent on each bottle it will give you a handy sum but you should think of the people who have to use soft drinks and who have to buy them and who are already burdened indirectly and directly with taxation. You have also to take into consideration that an ordinary man, may be a policeman or a tailor, or whatever he be, does not have to pay for drink alone, he has to pay school fees, bus fares and things of that sort for his child. They are other things which have to be done by him. Therefore, when you call upon him to pay for something which he never expected he would have to pay for or which never existed — and I say that because I never heard yet in Barbados that a tax was imposed by any Government on sweet drinks — that would come as a shock to the working class people of this country. They never expected it for one moment. They never were told at election time that soft drinks would be taxed. I am sure if they had the slightest hint that soft drinks would be taxed, rather than using the broom they would have used the stick.

Sir, the time will come when it is a possibility of the stick being used through the imposition of this tax on the man-in-the-street whiskey. I call it the man-in-the-street whiskey because he cannot drink any whiskey. There are some people in this country who are over 80 years old and they will tell you that they never drank whiskey but I am sure that they will tell you that they drink rum and they drink soft drinks. Therefore, whenever the Government is about to impose taxation, they should look at the matter seriously and let it rest squarely on the shoulders of the ones who are able to bear it. I am not saying that taxes should not be collected. You must run the country and you cannot run it without taxation but when you are levying taxes and spending the money in the wrong direction, that is a serious thing. Today it is on the sweet drink, it is on rice, it is on cigarettes, it is on everything. All are put on at one time.

One may say that you are not supposed to smoke cigarettes and that they are a danger to your health but if you are not supposed to smoke cigarettes and they are a danger to your health, why tax them? You are not supposed to smoke but you still smoke. There are some people who will tell you that they cannot eat a meal unless they have a smoke afterwards. That is a habit and one cannot blame one for one's habits.

Sir, within two years you have taxed us heavily and taxed us on everything that I do not know if there is anything else which remains for us to be taxed on. Last year it was on rum, chicken parts and all sorts of things. 2.45 p.m.

This year again you are not prepared to give the working-class people any breathing space because they should have a breathing space. There are things which have

to be done by the Government which should also have a breathing space. You are not supposed to do everything at one time. I do not think that all of the projects which they have in mind can be carried out in any one year, and I cannot see why you are supposed to impose all the taxation in one year; I think that it should be spread over a period of years. I understand, Sir, that the life of the present Government is three years but you have levied taxation on people when, I am sure, the programme cannot be carried out in three years — not what I understand that the Government wants to carry out. If everything can be done in three years then I will take off my hat to the Government and say that it is a good job which they are doing; but it is a question of blood and fire to find the money to get these things done. Up to the moment, as far as I can see, those who are using the most of the commodities which have been taxed are the people who have to pay the tax. The working-class people must smoke and the workman has to take "one from the shoulder" which means half a gill plain, and which is four cents more down the hill; but there are other people for whom half a gill can last three times, because with the other mixtures you can have a good cocktail. When you meet a man like a good friend of mine — I am sorry I cannot call his name — he calls for a "bishop" which is eight cents gone over the hill. You cannot blame those who take one "from the shoulder"; that is the Barbadian habit, whether it be good or bad and the Barbadian has to pay his taxes. The fellow who is going to drink a cocktail has done nothing as compared with the other man. I say that it is hard on the poor taxpayers who have to use these commodities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have made my point about the soft drinks and I have shown to the Government the mistake which has been made, because by hitting the soft drinks they are not helping the children or the parents who have children who are going to school. There are those who have to send their children to the private secondary schools and they have to pay as much as \$24 or \$26 per term. They are not getting anything free from the Government but they are contributing everything to the Government. They are contributing to the education of the children of parents who are able to pay for the education of their children themselves. I want the Government to see that they are not doing a good job by inflicting this tax on the soft drinks which are mostly used by the small man and his children. I know of a shopkeeper who used to sell ten cases of cokes per week and what I am saying is a fact; that shopkeeper carries on business which is near to a school and the parents of some children instructed the shopkeeper to give those children cokes at lunch time. From the time that the taxes were imposed upon those soft drinks that particular shopkeeper told me that the sales of those drinks had dropped to two cases per week; and she had received instructions from the parents of those children to give them mauby or lemonade. Last Tuesday when I was about to make this point I think that the Manager of the Coca-Cola Company was telling some newspaper men that his sales of cokes had dropped. If the sales of the shopkeeper had dropped, then the sales of the factory would also have dropped; but mauby or lemonade which has been properly made, will beat any coke.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that the Hon. Premier does not think about taxing the ginger beer; anyhow, I am throwing out the hint that people can get ginger out of their land and that makes a nice glass of beer. That is especially so when every shopkeeper has a "fridge" now; the shopkeepers only have to make this drink and put it into the "fridge" and when the children come out from school they can have a good drink. As a matter of fact, the children will get more than if they had the cokes. I have never measured how much liquid there was in a coke bottle but I have heard somebody say in this House how much there is in a small coke and how much is in a large one. However, when you have to pay as much as 11 cents or 12 cents for a half gill of coke you only have to pay three cents for a pint of good ginger beer; and I can assure you that the children like the ginger beer. What I have been saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are the facts and, as I have already said, I hope that the Hon. Premier does not think of taxing the ginger; as I have already said, when the children get their ginger beer they get more than if they were given the cokes.

2.55 p.m.

This is a hint to the Government that they are doing very little if they expect to get these fifteen million one-cent

pieces per year which may be just like the beer. You may have to come back and give us some cheap soft drinks for Christmas, because if the Coca Cola Company do not sell their drinks, and the sales are reduced, their returns to the Government by way of income tax will also be reduced, so there is a possibility of losing both ways, from the trade returns as well as from the income tax returns. You can replace Cokes by ginger beer, Ju-C by mauby and the other drinks by lemonade, and so long as they can find a replacement, you cannot pin a person down to buying a particular drink through which they must pay taxes. I feel that not much has been done as far as soft drinks are concerned, except that the wrath of the people has been stirred up, because they are saying and I am saying that this Government had no right to interfere with soft drinks by way of a tax. It was never done in my time and we got along and ran the Government of which I was a part, and the Government did some great things for the people without playing they were putting something in the left pocket one way and taking it out from the right pocket in another way.

Imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a school in St. Lucy which has 100 children, and the parents are supposed to be getting something free; but it is not free, because if a thing costs \$1.00 and you make me pay five cents for it, it is my property. If you agree to sell me your property worth \$1,000 for \$1.00 and I get a receipt, it is my property. I cannot say therefore, that the meals are free to the children because they are paying 10 cents for them. Five tens are fifty; so who can tell me now that this Government is giving free meals? You have budgeted for \$200,000 to spend on school meals, but the people are paying for them. They have to pay for them at the schools, and when they go to the shop they are paying again through the taxation which has been put on. The word "free" should be deleted and the word "hard" inserted, because they are making it hard for some parents who cannot see their way to put by an extra 10 cents, because the 10 cents they are paying for the meal should be kept to pay for the increased price on the drinks outside. I hope the Government will succeed, but I want to tell the people of this country that they are not getting anything free. Comparatively speaking, very few children are getting this meal. There are 45,000 children in elementary schools and you are catering to 2,700. The \$200,000 could well be spent in erecting a building to take more children, and you would not have any headaches, because I know the present Government is having headaches now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not been reading regularly during the last few weeks due to eye condition, but I understand there is a move afoot for the Local Government to take charge and help contribute. If this is true, Sir, good night nurse! Imagine these poor people in the North who are already paying through their noses being called upon to help throw away more money. What will become of us? How far is this thing going? The Government, Sir, has committed itself to something it is not capable of doing, because the finance is not there. I would like to build a nice mansion for my children, but I do not have the money; so they will have to live at the same place that I was living all these years. Here we have a Government with a lot of educated men making promises to the people of this country that they are going to give free school meals and free secondary education. If I had said that, I would be readily forgiven, because it is said that I undertake things that I cannot manage; but when you meet one of the biggest economic experts living on earth in the person of the Hon. Premier making a mistake of this sort, he cannot be forgiven by the people of this country because he knew what he was saying and doing, and could not make a mistake because he knows his figures backwards.

3.05 p.m.

He, of his own self, will forgive me because all he would say is that I do not know any better; I cannot do any better.

All I am saying to him is that he knew and he knew better and after promising the people of this country to do something for them he has come back and is saying to them, well, you have to pay. It is not fair; it is not honest; it is not good enough. These big promises are responsible for the life and breath being taken out of the workers of this country by way of taxation. The Schools Meals Programme

is responsible for the taxation on soft drinks and I hope I will live long enough to see what will be the results. If you are not able to do a thing, do not promise it. If you are not able to give your mistress a motor car, do not promise her it because she will be looking forward to it on her birthday. Do not promise your son that you will give him something should he pass an examination because you did that for him to study for it and therefore if you do not give him, you are going to throw cold water on him. The hope of the reward sweetens labour. By promising my good people of this country a freeness, they voted freely. Look now what has happened! I am disappointed. I did not receive what I was promised but one sure thing I still have my health and my strength and the day of reckoning will come when I will be able, instead of using the part of the broom which goes to the floor, we are going to hold that in our hands and use the stick. We must use the stick. We must use the stick because, because.....

Now, Sir, I have said in my opening remarks that I am going to prove where the Government was wicked, foolish and unreliable. It is unreliable because when you read the first paragraph you will see that you were told that we get better things locally, the locally produced things are better than the foreign things and we are asked to support local industry. I have raised this point already but as I am coming to the close of my speech, I am repeating it. We were told if we did not support local industry, we would have to support it the other way and that is by force. I do not know if Buddie's Pasteurized Milk is foreign or local but I have heard, if I am not mistaken, it was said that Buddie's Pasteurized Milk will never get a concession as long as the Premier runs the Government. That has been said, yet still you are asked by the same Premier to support local industry. That is one side of the mouth contradicting the other. Why is it? I do not know. If it is true, it is wicked to say.

It is foolish to say that you are going to increase the price of rice before the time comes. You told the people in plain words: "I am coming for you next week," but when you come, you found that I was gone; you found an empty house. That was said on the Tuesday night and the next morning I knew of some stores which did not have one bag of rice in stock. If you are going to lock a man up, do not tell him, because when you expect him to live up Dayrells Road near a breadfruit tree, you will find him down Westbury Road near a tamarind tree.

Now, Sir, you are unreliable. You said that you were going to give free school meals but they are not free so long as the people have to pay for them. The hon. senior member for the City is a real estate agent. If he makes a mistake and sells to me somebody else's property which is worth \$10,000 for \$1,000, that is his business. That is his business; I have bought it; I have got my receipt. If you came back and asked me to re-consider, I am going to ask you to leave my property. So long as the parents have to pay 10 cents a meal and they have paid it, it is not free.

Sir, I sincerely hope that something would be done for those parents who have to pay \$24 and \$26 a term for fees for their children at a private school. I am not saying that it is too much because these schools are not run by the taxpayer's money. The Principals or the Headmasters of these schools have to pay teachers and if they do not have their own building, they have to rent one. But I am saying that that is too much. The Government should not sit back and allow cane cutters, ordinary masons and carpenters to be paying \$26 a term for a child which I suppose has just gone into school. At that, you cannot guarantee what you are getting when you are paying that amount of fees. You cannot guarantee that you are getting value for your money spent. As I have said, some time ago, there are some private schools which I term them just like a dance house. If I am going to have a dance today or tonight, I print my tickets and I am going to sit at the door and everyone who passes through, I am going to make sure that they are not passing free but that they are paying me. But after they have paid me at the door, they can go inside and dance and do whatever they like. I do not care how many lashes they get, I have their money already.

The fees are paid but what is happening to the children?

Now, Sir, we have a Democratic Labour Government which promised free secondary education. They did not say that they are going to pick out certain schools. They said by such a date in February, they were going to implement free secondary education. Something is wrong. The Hon. Premier said that he was going to take away the portfolio of the Hon. Minister of Education if he did not implement it by a certain date. That is what caused the Democratic Labour Party to be in power today.

3.15 p.m.

When one can make such an able statement, the people will say that he knows what he is saying. They will say that he is not a fool, that he is not like the last Government. He knows economy or he is an economist and he knows what he is saying. In that case, the people are bound to vote for his Party. However, I am glad to see what has happened. The people now have a chance to assess all of the Parties but before they were only in a position to assess two of the Parties; as I say, they now have a chance of assessing all of them. I am quite sure that they will not vote on promises again; they will only vote on merit. As soon as a burnt child sees the fire, he will go off; he will not go near to fire. As the saying goes: "a burnt child dreads the fire." There is also an old saying: "Once bitten, twice shy." The people of this country have not been bitten; they have been eaten up by taxation and they have paid for it but not they alone. Somebody else has to pay for it. If the Government does not do something for the parents of the children who are attending the private secondary schools, those are the ones who will knock at the door.

I am throwing out this challenge; let the people who are now enjoying free education and the free meals vote for the Premier and let the ones who are not enjoying the food vote for me and see who will win. Inasmuch as I try to take up matters which I cannot manage I am sure that the people who are not enjoying the food will vote for me. I am saying this; let the ones whom the Premier helped vote for him and see who will be the next Premier (*Laughter*), I am appealing to the Government to do something to help the parents who have children who are attending the private secondary schools or I do not know what is likely to happen in Barbados.

Mr. YEARWOOD and Mr. CORBIN rose to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John caught my eye first.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard a lot of talk in relation to soft drinks by members in this Chamber. What annoys me is that it appears that some of the members of this House who have already spoken on this question of soft drinks have shares in three companies. I say that because every one of the members of this Chamber heard on the 7th May that the Premier in introducing his budgetary proposals decided that there would be a consumption tax on all soft drinks in Barbados of 16 cents a gallon and on mineral water. The Hon. Premier in his wisdom has told this House that approximately that would cost an increase of one cent a bottle. I believe that if most of the members of this House who have already spoken on this matter, had taken time off to consider it, to see who really was exploiting the people, they would have spoken differently on the matter; or they would have come in here and asked the Government to investigate the matter and see why the bottling companies had decided to charge the consumers three cents a bottle on each bottle of coke or soft drink. That step, in my opinion, would have been a relief to their constituents. I have taken time off to go into this matter, because I do not know how the Government arrived at a cent a bottle, and I measured the contents of a coke bottle. I have discovered that in a king size coke the amount was two and a half gills and in a seven-ounce bottle the amount was a gill and a half. Putting these two together the amount would become four gills which is a pint of liquid in two bottles. A case of cokes is 24 bottles, a case of seven-ups is 24 bottles and a case of Ju-C's is also 24 bottles. You

have 48 bottles which amount to three gallons. This is ordinary arithmetic, this is first standard work. If three gallons of coke are in 48 bottles and if three gallons cost 48 cents, that is 16 cents a gallon which must be one cent increase on each bottle.

I am told that one company charged a cent a bottle increase, that they charge retailers \$1.68 for a case of Ju-C's which are ten-ounce bottles. On the day after the gods in the commercial field, the governors of Barbados got together and they said "We cannot go on to do this: The Government has imposed a cent on each bottle and we cannot sell at a cent increase". As a result they sent around a circular to the various shopkeepers. This circular which they sent around to these shopkeepers reads as follows:-
3.25 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I am permitted to do so, I will read the circular. It reads as follows:-

"As a result of the consumer tax of 16 cents a gallon imposed by Government on all soft drinks as of May 8th, 1963, added to the increased cost of gasoline, manufacturing materials, truck and other expenses, the bottling companies have found it necessary to revise their price structure on all soft drinks manufactured and sold locally. Effective as from today, Wednesday, 8th May, the following price structure will come into operation."

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I should like to point out that that document should become the property of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that a point of order?

Mr. SMITH: I draw it to your attention.

Mr. YEARWOOD: They said that on all ten ounce bottles the price would be \$1.84 which is an increase of 40 cents a case, or 1 5/6 cents a bottle and they have invited the shopkeepers to sell them at 3 cents a bottle more. That is what I expected member to take objection to, and not the increase which Government had imposed. They asked the shopkeepers to sell their Cokes, Ju-C and Crown minerals at 3 cents a bottle more, and that is what has brought the pressure on the people of this Island; and they have only done it in an effort to destroy this Government. In November last year, Crown minerals were sold at \$1.30 per case of ten ounce bottles, and without any increase in their labour or materials, they were being told by another bottling company that unless they moved up and sold their drinks, on which they were making a profit, at \$1.44 a case, that they would have to go out of business. That increase went on and not one word of protest was heard from any member of this Chamber at that time. I stood here and heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph say that at no time during the tenure of office of the last Government had soft drinks been taxed by his Government, but I think.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, I never said that at no time had soft drinks not been taxed by my Government, because I did not have any Government. (Laughter). I said they had not been taxed.

Mr. YEARWOOD: I am very proud to hear from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that he had no Government. I quite agree with him. I believe that at least he was never an associate of a Government who had any intentions of doing good for this community. Nevertheless I will come back to my point. I remember that some years ago — and I am sure it was well within 17 years — I think there was a watchman at one of these companies who had been fired by the company, and I think his name is somewhat familiar or very near to that of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. The Trade Union went into the matter and as a result the company had to pay that one person about three weeks' wages and reinstate him; and do you know that the entire public paid a cent on each bottle of Ju-C that was manufactured by that company because of that incident? No objection at all was taken to that, although there was no increase in their materials or labour. The entire public had to pay a cent more as from the next week for that product. Today they criticise the

Government for imposing the same cent when the money that will come to Government is going to be of benefit to the people in the Island.

When you hear these things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have to sit back and wonder if some of the members have shares in any of the companies, because I do not understand this criticism of the Government when in truth and in fact it is the companies who have really put the pressure on the people.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, to say that it is the companies I think the hon. member is innocently misleading this House. I have a recollection that the Leader of the House did inform this House that he had a discussion or discussions with the companies and it was by compromise that they agreed that the small drinks of, I think, six ounce or seven ounce would sell eventually at one half-penny increase and one penny as against the others. To say that it is the companies is not altogether correct, because consequent on other expenses such as the increase in price of gasoline and what-have-you, and knowing too well the fall in the number of drinks sold, that must of necessity cause an increase. We just want to be reasonable with everybody.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I have very often asked Your Honour to be very careful about points of order, and I think members of this House are abusing the rules of this House by getting up and making the most slanderous, and most vicious and malicious statements in the guise of points of order. The hon. junior member for St. George got up on a point of order and said there was an agreement between the Leader of the House and the companies for an increase of one cent and two cents on bottles of aerated beverages as a result of the increase in gasoline. I think that my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. John, can deal with the hon. member having a higher I.Q., than the hon. member and understands these things probably in a way that the hon. member never put himself in a position that he could understand either by availing himself of the educational opportunities.....

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am listening to the point of order by the Hon. Premier.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think, Sir, that you should not allow him to get up here and make statements like that in his oily-mouth kind of way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to listen to these exchanges. Let the hon. junior member for St. John continue.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when aspersions are made to members of Parliament, you must at least hear what I have to say, because I have the right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. MILLER: But you permitted abusive language. I do not want to do anything that is not right and therefore I will sit down.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of privilege, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are you going to allow him to abuse the Rules of the House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am bound to draw hon. members' attention to the Standing Orders of this House, and as far as my interpretation goes, I am going to apply them rigidly.
3.35 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must hear the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. MILLER: You permit abusive language and then say you must hear the hon. member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am bound to draw the hon. member's attention to the Standing Orders of this House and as far as my interpretation goes, I am going to apply them rigidly.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is as far as I have taken this question about soft drinks into consideration. I can see the deliberate attempt by the soft drink companies, especially the Coca Cola Company because I know that they have made a statement and I can say that it is not true when they said that their soft drinks trade has been reduced by 50 percent as a result of the Premier's proposals. I can see that it is their intention to make sure that they kill their own product in order to kill this Government, therefore I say: let them go on.

What I expected from hon. members was that they would have criticised the companies for doing it in that manner rather than their coming here and in my opinion wasting the Government's time and criticising the Government for imposing a cent when in truth and in fact the companies have increased the price of their products by three cents a bottle.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been hearing lots of things. It seems to me that these budgetary proposals which were introduced by the Hon. Premier have brought a lot of contention by various hon. members. The first thing which we must realise is how this Government is to be run. It cannot run without money. I have heard about the increase in price of soft drinks and all sorts of things. I have sat in this House and heard the Hon. Premier say that you have to pay one cent a bottle more for soft drinks and that would have to apply to the consumers. The Companies did not have any right to increase their price by one-quarter cent. They would still make the same profit, the same amount of money.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If Your Honour will refer to the Order Paper, you will see that on the 14th May last, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas moved the passing of the Resolution which was seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew who has just sat down. Are we to understand that he is permitted to make two speeches on this matter? We are told that we are to abide by the Rules of this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the 14th May, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas moved the passing of the Resolution and the hon. member who was just on his feet seconded the motion. The hon. member can only speak with leave of the House. That is in accordance with the Rules.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member has understood me. If the hon. member would give way, but this is not in the way of a promise, I will assure you —

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to make the position clear. As far as this matter is concerned, we are not going to hold out any promises to anyone because if we start allowing people to speak twice on motions, all kinds of people would say: "I want to speak again with leave." I would say that the hon. member is having a second swing at the same bottle of coke.

Mr. WALCOTT: Know your damn place. You cannot look at hon. members and make these unsavoury references. Why do you not sit down? What are you talking about when you are talking about "all kinds of people." Who are all kinds of people you are talking about? Know your damn place. You want pelting out. Whom do you think you are? You are talking about hon. members. Who are all kinds of people?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now suspended for fifteen minutes.

The sitting was accordingly suspended.

3.45 p.m.

On Re-assembling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: About two minutes before this sitting was suspended, the Hon. Premier, in addressing the Chair, made mention of the words "All kinds of people". I think the Hon. Premier would now explain for the benefit of this Honourable Chamber what he meant.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not understand when I was urging on the hon. senior member for St. Andrew not to press upon Your Honour the claim that he should speak twice because we would not be inclined to support a suggestion like that — I did not have the idea that the words I used were unparliamentary or offensive at all. I hope that Your Honour is not so ruling. The disorder which was created subsequently cannot be ascribed to me or to anything which I said. My remarks were addressed to the Chair from the point of view of urging on the hon. member that the Government might be accused and that all points of view of this Chamber should be afforded the same privilege and legitimately so. If we allow a Government member to speak twice, that is against the Rules of the House and all types of opinion would not only be allowed but they would be entitled to speak. For any one to suggest that people from outside would come into this Chamber and be afforded the privilege of speaking twice is not only ridiculous but monstrously inept. It would be a gross misrepresentation if you were to call attention to strangers in this gallery far less to suggest that they should speak directly or indirectly on any kind of motion. I would not go on to say what I think of any one who wanted to give currency to such an idea. I have told the hon. senior member for St. Andrew that the Government is not going to support him because other opinions in the House, legitimately in my opinion, could claim the same privilege and the hon. member has followed my address.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have understood the hon. member.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I very much regret what is going on in the House today and I do not want to say anything more.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am saying that the words which were used by the hon. member were not taken down. The hon. member said: "All kinds of people" would get up in here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have heard the hon. member. Both hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Order!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will both hon. members take their seats? I am ruling now; I am not hearing any more of what was said two or three minutes before this sitting was suspended.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: You cannot do that. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has used words which were unparliamentary and they should not remain on the records of the House in an unapologised form.

Mr. WALCOTT: I want to say this; if you are running something like that I have nothing to fear. If I used any words which are offensive I will withdraw them. I am going to the people now and I will let them know what the situation is.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Just a minute, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have heard the hon. member.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Out of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, are you allowing.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not let the hon. member tell me what I am allowing. Let me hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I will listen to what he says and decide after.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rose to object to the words being used that "All kinds of people".

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do what? (ASIDES).

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot tell me anything about honesty. You are going up the wrong path if you use those words you will regret them. I said that I rose on a point of order and objected to words being used in this Chamber, in which all hon. members were involved, in a statement to the effect that if the hon. senior member for St. Andrew were allowed to speak a second time on this matter that all kinds of people would claim the same right. I objected to that as an offensive remark to hon. members of this Chamber because there are not all kinds of members in here. I do not know what special dispensation God has granted the Premier that he can stand on Mount Olympus and talk about all kinds of people. His Holiness the Pope is dead and this Holiness of fathers in here can only make the matter worse by saying that he could not mean people coming from outside the Chamber. There are only hon. members in here; he could only mean people in this Chamber and he has had the temerity to say that he meant us when he said that all kinds of people would get up in here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, how can you permit the hon. member to make an insulting remark like that to the whole Chamber and then when the remark is objected to he has had the impertinence to say that it means me? I am a member of this Chamber and I have the same equal rights as he has; I am the kind of person who has been sent back here in the same manner as he has. The point now is that the hon. member should withdraw the remarks which he has made. Your Honour will ask me what I meant when I said so and so but you do not ask the hon. member what he means by making that statement. You have to tell the hon. member that such a statement should not be made. Hon. members are in here as hon. members and not as all kinds of people. If he says that he meant that that would permit other hon. members to get up in here a second time, that would be in order. That is according to the Standing Orders. Hon. members are to be addressed as hon. members and not by implication. The hon. member has been asked to explain what he means and he is asking me to withdraw the word "damn". Mr. Deputy Speaker, that word will be withdrawn as soon as you allow the hon. member to understand that he cannot make use of the words which he has used.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would use those words again but I would be using them differently. The hon. member cannot address us as all kinds of people. What he meant by that? We are not all kinds of people but we are hon. members. References cannot be made to us like that; we are hon. members. I can do like the hon. member and walk out, but I will not do that; I will face the music.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The expression which has been used by the Hon. Premier is an unfortunate one and the expression or word used by the hon. senior member for St. Peter is, in my opinion, also unfortunate. I will call on both hon. members now to withdraw the respective statements. (Hear! Hear!)

4.10 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to make it clear that if the hon. member sees any reflection on hon. members in the term "all kinds of people" when I really was referring to them, I will withdraw the remark, but I used it purely in a Barbadian sense because I do not regard myself as the same kind of person as members of the Parties opposite; so I want to make it clear that there was no reflection on any member in the House at all, either the independent members or the members of the Official Opposition, but I certainly would not like to be seen dead in the same island as some of them. They are all hon. members, and honourable is as you act and not what you entitle yourself. I withdraw the remark "all kinds of people" in so far as it applies to any group or individuals in the House; but that was not the occasion of the House breaking up in disorder, and I would like you to deal with that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, without any ado, I unreservedly and unhesitatingly withdraw the remarks I

used, and regret I was forced to use such remarks, and I hope no occasion will arise again to use them. I withdraw them unreservedly.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I have asked the hon. member to do the courtesy of informing the Chair when he gets up what he is rising on, because he has me confused when he gets up and starts to talk.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do hope that all passions have subsided and we can get on with this debate which is so important in relation to the Budget Proposals of the Hon. Premier. Today we have heard what I would consider a small matter, and no great attention has been brought to bear on the real economic problems facing this Island. This year when the Premier brought down his Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure — that was in March — we were told and given figures to prove that there would be a deficit of \$1,200,000, and we were also told by the Premier that he would return to the House in a matter of weeks to put before the House his Budget Proposals for the elimination of that gap. He had to find \$1,200,000 if he intended to balance his budget, or else he had to go back and cut certain expenditure. Well the Estimates were approved and he could not do that. He came in the House on Budget day and gave us his proposals of taxing by means of a consumer tax on sweet drinks that were manufactured in this Island which was estimated to bring in the sum of about \$1 1/2 million. He also brought in a consumption tax on gasoline which increased the price by five cents per gallon, and he reduced, although he did not eliminate entirely, the subsidy on rice, a subsidy that had been placed on or had supported the price of rice for a number of years to which many of us had glanced on every budget day to see whether that removal would not ease taxation in other quarters. Those were the main proposals plus the consumption tax on cigarettes. By these he will have a very small deficit if the economy of the Island remains fixed at what it is today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, anyone who takes a good look at the economy of this Island would always pay strict attention to the progress with which the economy is moving. We have been given figures to prove that since 1957 the gross national product of this Island had not moved forward until a year ago. It remained at around \$100 million since 1957, which meant that there was no additional money either in business or industry to share out, and the Premier said that in this last year which is his first year of office the gross national product has moved forward by something like \$5 million. If that is so, that is an indication that the economy is moving forward, and unless that is sustained, and unless the economy of the Island moves forward in that ratio, with an increasing population and a barrier placed on emigration to England, it would mean a falling in the standard of living of all of us. If more people have to share the fruits of the economy, and that economy remains stagnant, or the same as it was five years ago, it is just arithmetic that we will be sharing with a greater number the same amount of money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the budget of any financial economist or of any Premier that has the facts at hand will want to do something to give a further filip and so drive forward the economy and boost it maybe another \$5 million next year, but it must be based on such a level that it moves steadily forward. This is nothing new and that is how budgets of big countries are undertaken. We are not satisfied to sit here and every year have additional increments which will only send the cost of living up and it will bear heavily on all of us. Now the comparison was drawn by the hon. senior member for St. Peter as to why indirect taxation should be at the point of \$15 million this year when direct taxation, which as we all know is companies tax and income tax, remains at under \$10 million, and when eight or ten years ago there were each around \$6 million. He must remember that the companies tax and income tax in Barbados today are of such a high nature that they do not afford businesses to plough back into their business a sufficiently large sum of money so as to drive forward the economy.

4.20 p.m.

There is not sufficient new capital coming in, either in old businesses, existing businesses or new businesses, to drive forward the economy so that is the reason why over the past five years the gross national product of the Island has remained static.

Now, the Hon. Premier has wisely had a look at that. He has examined it and realised it. That is one of the reasons why the last Government was not able to move forward the economy and why the Hon. Premier of this Government has had to look around to other means for raising this money and to see where it would least affect the economy. In an Island as small as Barbados but producing 50 million bottles of drinks a year, naturally that is a temptation for you to tax. You cannot say that the two or three factories which are producing those drinks are financially weak when you look around and see the vast sums of money which those companies have been spending by way of advertising to further increase the sale of their products, compared with the other firms, therefore, it must have been a temptation to the Hon. Premier to say that those industries are in a very healthy position and they can affect certain economies in other quarters so as to afford the Government a bit of taxation in that field. Furthermore, it would mean a spread on everyone because people from the very top to the bottom are using sweet drinks. That is why I say that it must have been a temptation to the Hon. Premier.

The subsidy on rice has been worked out at 10 cents per person a week. If by the removal of that and the increase on the price of cigarettes the Hon. Premier has been able to close the gap this year, I think he has made a spread which does not fall heavily on any one section of the community.

We are moving into a Federation. One of the major claims of Barbados if the Federation comes into being is that we should have a uniform corporation tax and income tax levied on everyone in the Federation. That is one of the conditions of all Barbadians, not today but ten years ago. The income tax both on companies and private income in the other Islands are now far below what it is in Barbados so you can quite understand why it would have been unwise for the Hon. Premier to carry that even higher because if these small Islands find it burdensome to come into the Federation if one of the conditions is stepping up income tax and companies tax to the level of Barbados or even if it meant that we in Barbados must step ours down to meet theirs, you can quite understand from the two reasons which I have given why the high rate of corporation tax is still higher than in any territory of the West Indies including Trinidad.

I am not arguing how that came about. The corporation tax in Trinidad has moved from 40% to 42%. Our remains at 40% but we have in Barbados something which is not known in any other territory of the West Indies; I do not think there is any such thing in any other part of the world. We have a trade tax which is levied on all businesses doing trade with the exception of those which enjoy pioneer status. It is levied by the Local Government and confirmed by the Central Government. In the City of Bridgetown, the rate is 19.5% on your profits. Now, that 19.5% is allowed as an expense of the business but on the remaining 80.5% of your profits, the Central Government levies 40%, therefore, the two taxes combined mean a corporation tax of 52.5%. Trinidad, mark you, is 42%. Barbados is now 10% higher than Trinidad.

The Hon. Premier is well aware of all of this and he knows it because he has stated that he would like to see more money available by way of savings in all sections of the community so that Barbados will have that fund to re-invest either in existing business or new businesses. It is commonsense and it is sound financing and I support him in that respect. I am not preaching to the Hon. Premier but it needs to be said and it needs to be said by someone other than someone from the Government side.

Businesses today are finding it difficult to find sufficient capital to plough back into the business so as to keep it up-to-date with what we consider a healthy business. Businesses have to increase their overdrafts and at great sacrifice to their directors and to their shareholders.

REVERSION TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m., we revert to Government Business.

RESOLUTION TO SANCTION AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVERNOR-IN-EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND BARBADOS UNION OIL COMPANY

The first Order stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House; to resume debate on the Resolution to sanction an Agreement made on the 19th October, 1962 between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Barbados Union Oil Company Limited. When the Sitting was suspended at 2.00 o'clock p.m., the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was addressing the Chair.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was speaking concerning the Agreement between the Government and the Barbados Union Oil Company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you desire to continue?

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has seconded this matter and unless she is granted leave of the House to speak again.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry.

Mr. CORBIN: I will have to speak but I want to know if hon. members are aware of what is going on. 4.30 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can speak on this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is clear.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was about to speak on the last occasion on this Resolution to sanction an Agreement between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Barbados Union Oil Company Ltd., I have listened to the hon. senior member for St. Michael and it seems to me that that grade of gasoline which is set out on his building is not the best grade. I am speaking in connection with pioneer industries; I have spoken in connection with Banks Breweries which is a pioneer industry. When Banks beer came into being in Barbados I tasted it, as it was given to me, and I said that I would not buy one of them. However, Sir, a girl friend gave me a bottle of this beer and now I am drinking it so much that Amstel and Heinekens have no taste for me. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have different varieties of beer in Barbados and we also have different varieties of gasoline in Barbados. Each man in Barbados will buy the kind he wants and if this company were to come into existence it would stop other companies from bringing in other brands of gasoline. I understand that there is going to be new equipment and machinery coming into Barbados for this same company which, I believe, will refine the oil and supply the quality which we expect. I am sure that every one will be able to purchase what he wants according to his pocket.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I heard an hon. member say that the competition is great, but I am saying that without competition we are no where. Competition is good for any part of this world. On the question of Banks beer again. I am saying that since that beer has come into existence Amstel and Heinekens are not being sold as they used to be sold. In the same way if this oil company comes into being, some of the other companies will have to slow down their operation; but we will have to accommodate the industries which we have here. If we do not do that, then we will lose out.

The Government will have to find ways and means of running this country. It is all right for some people to tell the Hon. Premier how to run the Government but if he has to wait for people to tell him how he must run the Government, I feel that the Government will run him. The Minister of Finance is in a very difficult position in this island. He has to know when to increase and when to cut off; he has to know when to bring in supplies and when to leave them out, that

is, when he has a full share. He has decisions in his hands, he has the cloth in his hands and he must know how to cut to suit the cloth. A man may have ten children and he has to know how to take care of them all. The same thing applies to the Minister of Finance; he has to search through the channels, he has to look into every industry and see who is making good profits and who is enjoying good benefits. He has to cut his cloth so as to take a piece from here and supply a piece there. He is in the most serious position that any one can be in; he has to stand criticisms from every quarter. When he raises the price of things he will be criticised and when he does otherwise he will also be criticised; but without criticisms he could not go through.

The Finance Minister makes me remember Joseph of old whom Pharaoh put over the whole of Egypt. Pharaoh told Joseph in so many words: "I make you Premier of Egypt today; take the whole country and run it and provide food for the inhabitants. I give you the power to be the second man in Egypt." The Hon. Premier and the Governor are responsible for running the affairs of this country and if the Premier does not know what to do, that will be his business. The Premier has to get on his knees and pray to Almighty God to give him wisdom, knowledge and understanding in order to run this country. This is what the Almighty God told Solomon who asked for wisdom, knowledge and understanding to rule his people Israel; The Lord said: "You have asked for wisdom and you will also have understanding; because you have not asked for riches I will give you riches, knowledge and understanding." When the leaders of the people get into contact with the living God that is the only means of our future existence. Apart from that, we are just like billy goats. (Laughter).

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am glad that the Hon. Premier has come into power and whatsoever I can do to assist him, whether it be by words or deeds, I will make my contribution to his assistance. Even when he is sleeping I will go into my secret chamber and pray for him. No matter what anybody thinks about "Homie" Corbin, I go into my chamber and pray. We must humble ourselves and instead of criticising the Hon. Premier we should find words of consolation for him. He has to search for the wherewithal to run this country. It is all right for us to get up in this Chamber and talk but it is the Hon. Premier who has to find the means for running this country. He has to open this gate and shut off that one; he has to do that in order to give satisfaction.

4.40 p.m.

I do not see why we should resist these things, but I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the members of the former Government ran the Government as they wanted to and forgot what they said. They promised to bring the poor people out of the hills and bring them by the wayside so that when they became ill a doctor could get to them. They were here for 15 years and the people have not been moved yet. They still have their houses on top of hills like lighthouses. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that this Government has done this and that, but his Government made false promises too. They did not fulfil all their promises in fifteen years; so how can this Government fulfil theirs in eighteen months? The time will come when we will see a better Barbados.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I never forgot when Saul was told to destroy the Amalekites and what they had, Saul disobeyed and spared Agag and some of his animals. When Samuel returned he told Saul that the people had spared Agag and some of his animals to offer as a sacrifice to the Lord; but Samuel told Saul "behold to obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken than the fat of rams."

Because he failed to do what the Lord had said, He took the Kingdom out of his hands and put it in the hands of his neighbours. Well the Government has been taken out of the hands of the Barbados Labour Party and put into the hands of the Democratic Labour Party, and unless they repent for the sins they have done to the people, they will always remain in exile. Before I close, let me say that God searches the hearts of men and gives to every man according to his ways and fruits of his doings.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we do not want to stop the hon. member's pentecostal fervour. Today is two days after Whitsuntide, but to be quite frank, what part of the Agreement do we find Saul speaking to the Barbados Union Oil Company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Some members use more powerful style.

Mr. CORBIN: This is not pentecostal. I should like to see men equip themselves to perform as men. I am very glad, Sir, to see that the Premier is taking every step to help the economy of Barbados by bringing in as many industries as he can, and I hope when the Oil Refinery goes into operation that it will give proper satisfaction to the consumers of gas, and give the best quality that they can afford. As long as I am here, Sir, I will vote for any measure that will be of help to this country. I know that I have been far off the course, but I was trying to straighten the points. I thank you for your patient hearing.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope you will forgive me if I deal with the matter in hand, that is the Agreement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You need no forgiveness for that.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we who are in the Opposition diametrically opposite the Government Party not only geographically, but also ideologically, would like to make it clearly understood that there is no question of our being in any way acrimonious or atrabillious if we make certain comments on this Agreement. Over here, Sir, you will find a standard of urbanity and gentility which might well be an example to other members who pride themselves in having low, upset points. As we say in Barbados, little pots soon get hot. We, however, would like to make some points quite clearly as to where we disagree with this Agreement and feel that certain parts of it might well be redrafted.

Now, Sir, perhaps I might well begin today with an omission, that is to say, the omission of the non-exclusivity Clause which appears in Article 19 of the Jamaica Agreement. That to our minds, Sir, is of paramount importance. The Clause in the Jamaica Agreement reads as follows:-

"It is understood that this Agreement does not give the Company the exclusive right to construct, own and operate a refinery in Jamaica. The Government may wish to enact a refinery law embodying the terms and conditions of this Agreement granting the right to operate the refineries in Jamaica for the manufacture of petroleum products to be sold in Jamaica and for export which right shall be granted to the Company upon its application in accordance with such refinery law."

I have searched this Agreement in vain for any such laws, and it is my considered opinion that such a Clause would do a great deal to safeguard this Government and the people of Barbados from what might well be referred to as a virtual monopoly. To follow the fortunes of the present Barbados Union Oil Company, it will be noted that the Company at its inception paid trade tax on profits of \$41,000, going to \$78,000 in the year 1959 and reaching the high point of \$90,000 in 1963. This is no betrayal of trust; these figures are available to anyone who would like to see them in the proper place. These profits go up to \$90,000 per annum when the Company was taken over by United States interest which installed new equipment which boasted of increased sales of 20%. These profits were subtly wiped out and have now become a loss. It might well be that the Company in selling crude to itself incurred this loss; whether it was careless book-keeping or not, it cannot be denied that they have in the recent past declared a loss.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question as to the non-employment of a number of workers by this Company has not been very clearly put by the Hon. Leader of the House, because no distinction was made between marketing personnel of the Company and the service personnel whom we were told

became redundant every other month. Clearly the people who are employed in the marketing of the Company's products would be employed constantly and continuously, but it does appear as if the now famous 15th June deadline, this monstrous bluff, has taken in the Minister concerned. We would like to have some assurance, Sir, that the permanent employees who will now be placed on the pay list of this Company do exceed those who will be displaced at the other bulk installations.

4.50 p.m.

Much talk has been made of the fact that if these people were displaced, if the company were to carry out its bluff and withdraw, these people would be placed out of work. Very little has been said about the people who would be displaced at the other installations, those people who are filling the drums for the marketing organisations and the 250 who are presently employed in Trinidad and would now be at the mercies of those employers who have been infuriated about the local situation and find themselves at the mercy of a disgruntled Government.

We would also like the Hon. Minister at this stage to deny that the local product which is being marketed by B.U.O.C. is to have larger quantities of anti-knock compound added to it so that they can get a similar octane rating as that which is given by the other companies.

We would also like to hear him on the reduction in the rate of Bunker C fuel which went from \$55 to \$36.40 after Texaco had brought in competitive fuel. The hon. junior member for Christ Church made a slip of the tongue and said Esso. It was a mere *lapsus linguae* and I now take the opportunity to correct it for him. He meant Texaco. What could have influenced the Argus-eyed Comptroller of Customs to be influenced in allowing the price of \$55 to be fixed after allowing the cost and then to find out after a few months that the product could be sold at \$36.40? That is another thing which causes us furiously to ink. There are few of us who are acquainted with oil negotiations and perhaps there are few laymen among them but we are wondering how it was that no independent consultant was called in to give his opinion before the Minister signed on the dotted line to the Agreement.

We are wondering how the future of Barbados could be signed away to the Company by this Clause: "The Company agrees that the quality of the products in question will be in accordance with accepted industry standards and the Government shall have the right to take samples of the said products for analysis."

This is a vague inconsequential phrase which no doubt the Hon. Minister will try to shelter behind. Most emergent territories are in the habit of adopting British specifications standards for products of this kind rather than taking shelter behind "accepted industry standards." In most countries, there are bureaux of standards to which standards a company, particularly a company which is serving the public, must adhere. With the size of the equipment of the company under review and the size of the equipment of other companies which ship their products to us, it must be clear that there will be a difference between the standards. Perhaps the Hon. Minister might well accept a word of warning here about the absence of standards when I remind him that the health of the community is being flirted away with the introduction of Pharma-cem products. There is no bureau to say what should be achieved. "Accepted industry standards" is just not being done. If the Hon. Minister wanted to know what are the standards of improvements, he would have taken it from the American Petroleum Institute or the British specifications which are available to all and which are free and widely circulated. That is nothing abstruse, nothing difficult; it is a matter of Government imposing certain standards to which this Company will willy-nilly adhere. We do not think the future economy of Barbados should be bound up in such vague and inconsequential phrases.

Sir, the question as to whether there will be fleets of tank-wagons journeying daily from the point of distribution to the bulk installation plants must exercise our minds also. If it be so, it will mean that there will have to be constant

repairs to the carriage way leading to the distribution points and we would like to know what disposition has been made about the repairs of such carriage ways.

If it be so that the fuel be placed in containers, we would like to know if Clause F on page five which says: "At the commencement of the Agreement the C.I.F. value, plus duties and handling charges will be computed on the basis that these products were imported during the last six months of 1961," applies. We wonder whether the Hon. Minister has taken into account that returnable drums cost \$15 (U.S.). We hope that the country is not thinking of sending out its products to the other marketing companies in the fragile drums which they are now in the habit of repossessing at \$2 per drum. They split at the seams if a loud word is spoken in their vicinity.

The question of air pollution must also exercise our minds. It is the unanimous feeling of everyone who has been near to an oil refinery that there are certain smells which are associated with refineries. We wonder whether the Minister took into account that we would be having two incompatible industries at Gravesend, the Hilton Hotel and the Oil Refinery. The Hon. Minister will tell us about air-conditioning of the rooms of the hotel but the refrigeration of impure air does not make it any more palatable to the breather than if it were at normal temperature. It might well be that the juxtaposition of these two pet schemes of the Hon. Minister of Trade — the Hilton Hotel and the expanding oil refinery — might allow the Barbados Union Oil Company personnel to come down here from the United States and direct refinery operations from the pent house of the Hilton Hotel.

This is nothing more than a cost plus contract. We have to take whatever is imposed once this virtual monopoly is written into our laws.

5.00 p.m.

It may well be that some of the top personnel may find themselves operating an expanded refinery for a year at a time from the Hilton Hotel. The charge is for us to pay, not for them, and Barbados is not the worse place in the world for a holiday. Again, Sir, we are wondering why it is that there was not any consultation with competent engineers as to how the fumes from this refinery may well be got rid of. All of us who live in this area are aware of what was suffered by the people who live in the lee of the "Esso" refinery at Fontabelle. A very vivid picture was drawn to me some months ago about a Minister pacing up and down at night because he could not stand the fumes from the refinery. Of course, that was before he was a Minister. When the Esso bunkers are being pumped up you cannot stand the smell. The oil is pumped, the cover is taken off, the noisome fumes escape at the top and they can be smelt in the countryside around for many hundreds of yards. I should like to ask what is being done at Needham's Point in order to obviate this nuisance in the close vicinity to a project on which the Government is going to spend some three or four million dollars. Why was it that competent technical staff was not consulted in the matter? Are the inhabitants of Barbados, as well as those who are invited to the Hilton Hotel, to suffer just as the inhabitants have had to suffer from the fumes of the Government-owned diesel run buses despite the Minister's reply to a question posed some time ago that the fumes should be let out above the bus, which I saw being done in a City which did not have the advantage of the experts selected by the Ministers opposite? We wonder whether the inhabitants plus the tourists will be subjected to these fumes. We do not think that that will add to the tourist attraction of this particular area.

Perhaps it might not be known to the general public, but the company in question has no bunkering contract anywhere in the Caribbean area and we are wondering whether the price of their product will be directed, as no doubt we will hear, by Platt's Oilgram. There is a time when prices can be raised and no sufficient reason can be shown for the raising of those prices.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to clarify that point. If the hon.

member says that the company has no bunkering rights in the area at all I do not follow what he means by going on to say what he did say about the prices. Where does the question of prices come in if they do not have bunkering rights?

Mr. LYNCH: I have passed that point, but it was just a passing reference that this company has no bunkering contract in the Caribbean area. They are using a lever and fulcrum for the exchange of agreement to be let in here and somewhere else like San Domingo.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. If they have no contract here where are they going to sell? Is the hon. member more concerned with San Domingo than with Barbados.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know why the hon. member should jump at San Domingo. The point I am making is that oil companies work by exchange agreements and the fact that they are making an agreement here does not necessarily mean that they are not making an agreement with San Domingo; perhaps I should have mentioned other territories but I have mentioned San Domingo. This will be a severe blow to the investment climate of Barbados. They did not think that the various refining companies now operating in the island had time enough to work out their own salvation and come to an agreement. If there had been no June 15th perhaps matters might have come to a more amicable conclusion; but nobody need shed any tears for any oil company. I am thinking of the future economy of Barbados; I am not here to protect any oil company.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is the duty of us on this side of the House to raise certain points which the hon. member might not have seen. We would like to know what expert advice he had from any independent drilling consultant before this Agreement was drawn up. Who was the hon. member's fiscal adviser in this Agreement? We ask these questions because we feel that the Government and the community are being in some way affected by this Agreement. Has the Minister any means of knowing whether there will be any control of the bitumen price or whether in future our road-building programme will be subjected to the whims and caprices of this company in question? We are asking these questions purely for information. Does the Minister know whether an increase in the cost when drawing other products from the refinery may well result in an increase in the differential in the cost of aviation spirit between this island and the island of Trinidad?

5.10 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: May I rise on a point of order? I remember some time ago when my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. John was reading from his own personal notes, one of the members, senior in age but junior in experience, rose and suggested that the hon. member should make the document from which he was reading a document of the House. For the last twenty-five minutes we have had a brief read out by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, and this is clearly against the Rules of the House. I know it is the custom of the hon. member to read his speeches no matter how impromptu and witty they may sound, but I cannot have an oil company brief read out in here by a member of this House on the pretence that it is a legitimate criticism of some aspect of Government's policy unless such a document is going to be made a document of the House. I will therefore have to ask you to ask the hon. member to make that a document of the House or he must continue his speech unaided by the assistance of his brief which he even now holds in his hand.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am bringing no oil company brief. I have made certain notes in the margin in my own writing and the Hon. Premier may see it. I have seen the Hon. Premier myself reminding himself of certain points by the use of notes. I have done the same thing and will continue, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so to do, unless you advise otherwise. This is a Resolution and I have made certain points in the margin to certain little clauses. If you would like to see it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you may.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member continue.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a further point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can save the hon. member a lot of trouble, because we are following him word for word from two letters written to us by an oil company; so it is a remarkable coincidence that the two minds should think alike.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not aware that the hon. member is really reading from a document. It may be that he has a good memory from what he knows. Let the hon. member continue.

Mr. LYNCH: It may surprise the Hon. Premier to know that I have studied this Resolution and that I have made several notes in the margin which he or any other member can see. It cannot be suggested that I leave the House at this point, because I have no interest whatsoever in oil. That may be suggested to the hon. member on my left. It may be suggested that I leave when cases of education are discussed and as soon as the Minister of Social Services leaves, and I am prepared to go behind him; but it cannot be suggested that I leave now; so I will make my contribution to this debate.

As I said, Sir, it may well be that on this cost plus contract you will have the refinery operated perhaps from some penthouse in the adjacent Hilton, but it must be borne in mind that while opportunity usually provides the thief, when these opportunities are taken, it is the taxpayers of Barbados who will have to pay for them. The chief thing that exercises our minds is the fact that there was no consultation with the other marketing companies on the island before the Agreement was signed and a hasty attempt was made after signing the Agreement to ask them what they thought. It might well be that consultation might have preceded the signing of this Agreement. If the Government is prepared to place all their eggs in the Barbados Union Oil Company's basket, it is a matter not only for them, but for those who might conceivably suffer in the future, and no attempt to suggest that oil company briefs are being read will prevent me from making the points which I have to make.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether or not the product turned out by this Company is fitted for high compression engines is a matter, perhaps, for the expert. It is not for me to pontificate on that, but the point has been made that the product turned out by this Company is suited for low compression engines, and that nowadays most of the engines turned out by manufacturing companies are high compression engines. The Minister can deny that if he can. The question of the additive which is permitted to be added to crude in this area is, I am advised, the coefficient of three. This company has so far not been able to get their additive down to less than 8.3% which is to be compared or rather contrasted with the 1.6% and 1.8% of other competitive companies. Whether or not the type of fuel which this company turns out will prove a boon and a blessing to those who own cars with internal combustion engines which can easily be destroyed by a fuel with too high a lead additive is a matter for the owners of those cars, and some of them, I think, Sir, are to be found in this Chamber.

Mr. MILLER: Speaking on this matter, it is more a question of further study, and I should like to support, if necessary, the idea or motion made for a careful study in Select Committee. The questions exercising our thoughts on this particular Agreement, Sir, must leave one unhappy if a careful study is made of all that is going on. If this Agreement was tied up with the British Union operating oil in Barbados, we would have to say "yes" without further question, but it is indeed an entirely different matter. I should like to express our gratitude and our thanks to the Company that were for some 52 or 53 years pioneers in this country and spent sums of money. A tremendous attempt was made in securing oils from the wells operated by this company, now known as the Barbados Union Oil Company, and for that reason if we want to regard that as a reason at all, we would want to provide them with all sorts of incentives to help them to succeed, because it is our responsibility to encourage not only the development of industry, but its protection.

I do not know, Sir, that minute study of this Agreement would indicate that we could be doing the best thing if we are thinking of the next generation. What is worrying me, is that the oil now purchased by this company is bought from a foreign territory, I believe Venezuela or Curacao. In the event of hostilities, what would our position be? We know for certain that Mobile has been operating and several attempts have been made to get into Trinidad. If that were so, you would feel happy, at least, with the knowledge that our crude would be coming from a British territory. This is not so at the moment, and Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, did the hon. member say that in the event of hostilities we would be in a better position if our crudes were coming from a British territory?
5.20 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know what the Hon. Minister is quibbling about. I said that we would be happier if it were from a member of the British Commonwealth, for instance, Trinidad. I want to be more clear on this matter. The Barbados Union Oil Company has struggled here for 43 years. It is true that they have never indicated the wealth as in the other oil companies and we know that they are more or less pioneering time and again. For those reasons we should go a long way in providing them with incentives. However, let us assume an ambitious company would be willing to build a refinery here. That is what we have to be concerned about. We are providing this Company with an agreement of 25 plus ten years. I think that is too long. Imagine that this is passed and we are pinned to an agreement which literally gives this company an outlay for 35 years. You are thinking of a generation. If this company needs expansion and we want to help, we can, and if necessary provide them with loans from the Treasury but we do not want to permit ourselves to a period of 25 years and more. I do not know if we want to.

You have two other large operators on this Island but what worries me is this; let us assume that the consumption of aviation spirits which are sold in this Island can be manufactured from a refinery in Barbados. What consideration would be given to that company knowing that you are tied to a monopoly. We want to be assured. We will pass on from this Parliament and we want to be assured that we will not leave a shock on the coming generation which it cannot bear.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am really not even attempting to reply to the illegitimate statements which we have heard this evening but I want to say at this stage that there is no reference at all in this agreement to aviation spirits.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know what the hon. member wants to say other than he has risen to interrupt the debate. I said that for instance one of the other companies operating in Barbados wanted to instal a refinery in this Island and in addition to our requirements wanted to manufacture aviation spirits.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Under the agreement they can do it.

Mr. MILLER: The folly in the Minister's argument is that he wants to mislead us with this. You are creating a monopoly.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I, more or less, do not intend at this stage to reply to the hon. member's statements at all but too far east is west. No where in this agreement is one word said about a monopoly.

Mr. MILLER: Look what the Hon. Minister wants this House and the people of Barbados to believe! You give this company a period of 35 years and you are telling the other marketing organisations that they must buy the oil from this refinery and to stop bringing in any from outside. You have gone further and there is the question of consumption tax. You know that in a matter of three years the circumstances

must be removed and you know the number of men who must be removed from out of these jobs.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When you hear these statements, you are bound to rise and rebut them. The company has been informed by letter from the Government as far back as September last year that the Governor-in-Executive Committee has decided that the concessions given under the draft agreement will not be exclusive to the Barbados Union Oil Company and no where in this agreement is a monopoly granted to B.U.O.C. quite unlike the Jamaica or the Antigua Agreements. No where in this agreement is a monopoly granted. As a matter of fact, it is completely opposite. The hon. member is misrepresenting the facts entirely.

Mr. MILLER: This will provide the Hon. Minister with a further opportunity to interrupt me. I will read Article 5 — Refinery Incentive.

"It is recognised that it is to the mutual interest of The Government and The Company that an incentive be provided to The Company for the establishment and continued development of The Refinery operations of The Company in Barbados. To this end The Government agrees to provide certain incentives to The Company in the form of the application of a fiscal system which encourages the purchase by all marketing companies in Barbados of their requirements of petroleum products in Barbados from The Refinery."

Am I to understand that that will be provided to the other companies? The Hon. Minister is referring to "The Company". The Company referred to is the B.U.O.C.. Is it unfair to say that? Sometimes we get into trouble with the truth.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member finds it impossible to understand plain simple English, that is not my fault, I cannot help that. I am sure that every other single hon. member in this Chamber understands what I said. I said that this agreement is different from the Jamaica Agreement and the Antigua Agreement. The Antigua Agreement does not allow any person other than the present company to operate during the period commencing 28th March, 1963 and terminating 25 years from that date. It says that no other company can engage in operations. There is no hon. member who can get up and quote one single line in the Agreement to show that we are giving monopolistic privileges to this company.

Mr. MILLER: It is obvious that the Hon. Minister himself is unable to understand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister says that you do not understand and you say that he does not understand. Let it stop at that. I am getting very impatient. If the hon. member will let that go and proceed, I will be very glad.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Minister is reading the Agreement of Antigua. We are concerned with Barbados. The incentive says specifically, the Barbados Union Oil Company. The incentive is for the Refinery and for the operations in Barbados not the region of Antigua. You get this sort of green lizard which you see across the path. How is it going to result? What is likely to happen? What position the Government of Barbados will be in when the time comes? This company has pioneered and it is our duty to go a little way and provide them with incentives but because the word "monopoly" is not written in the Agreement, does the Hon. Minister want us to say that that is not so? We understand that this company has failed any number of times to operate efficiently with the other companies in the sister territory of Trinidad.
5.30 p.m.

We would like to know what is going to take place with customs union and I am wondering if the hon. member would interrupt me to say what will happen. If, for instance, Antigua is in a position to ship fuel cheaper — and we know that crude oil obtained from certain wells is capable of

making a high grade of lubrication oil. We are not in a position to say that that will be the position and therefore all of these things need to be studied. I am suggesting that the mere force of sound argument ought to be enough to have this Government accept the suggestion of sending this Resolution to a Select Committee who will study this matter. You have to remember the things which we need to fear; you will have two other companies operating here. I am thinking of staff and equipment generally. Petroleum equipment must be kept up to a very high standard and in a short period we are going to see the pump boxes removed from the two areas.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am told, I really do not know exactly, but I know that this country will find it advantageous to take its fuel from the refinery. Apart from the cost of pumping etc., are you going to see these things decay or probably shipped to other islands and the only unit in Barbados to provide us with our requirements will be this firm? Mr. Deputy Speaker, you can reduce it to whatever you like; it is just a matter of time. These tanks will go into misuse and you will have to say what you are going to do with them. Probably it would be better to use the land for some other purpose rather than have the tanks sticking up into the air. You are going to have to divert these trucks to one refinery.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am unhappy about this matter and all rational minds will feel that we want to face this matter with some fear. We have nothing against providing incentives or protection to the company and since this company is our only refinery at the moment, we should be able to assist it; but that does not mean that we are carrying things to the limit and hurting investments of other companies which provided facilities here when this same company was unable to undertake the operation. Now you will foreclose with a simple Agreement like this and you will probably destroy millions in the way of enterprise. You must of necessity see these bulk stations die and all the vehicles carried away. We want to foster happy relations with the territories with which we are now so ready to federate. It is a question of expanding your trade interests which this Agreement is likely to curtail and we will stand to see them die. I am not satisfied with the Hon. Minister who is in charge of this matter. A number of things can happen in 35 years; and if one of the existing companies want to extend its further exploration for oil and it wanted to compete with another company, those are things which we have to consider. Suppose we find that oil was discovered in commercial quantities and a company wanted to operate a refinery! Can't you understand that we will be forced to be purchasing oil from a foreign territory? You may even read the Jamaica agreement on this matter but we want to be concerned with this Clause. We want to be sure that this company will continue to operate successfully and we must continue to persuade investors to invest with us. We do not want to go too far left from right. I am saying that mere reasoning and simple force of argument must persuade a thinking Government to refer this matter to a Select Committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that we need to add anything more in connection with this Agreement, insignificant as it may appear. We must not fail to pay the attention which we should pay to it.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a long time now that the public of Barbados and hon. members of this Chamber have been very interested in the outcome of the signing of this Agreement. Already on the Order Paper you will remember that there was something relating to this Agreement and by default some Minister had the item taken off the Order Paper; now we are faced with a Resolution which is asking us to ratify this Agreement. I only saw this Agreement about a week ago and all sorts of rumours were current in Barbados about this business; therefore it is a good thing that hon. members have this Agreement in their hands, and they are therefore in a position to debate it. I cannot claim.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member has said that he only saw

this Agreement about a week ago. The Resolution was introduced in this House originally in January of this year; then it lapsed through being on the Order Paper for three months without any action being taken on it, and it was taken off the Order Paper and was re-introduced on the 7th May. Today is the 4th June, so that if the hon. member has only seen this Resolution a week ago that is no fault of any hon. member of this House.

5.40 p.m.

If the hon. member has only seen it a week ago, that is no fault of any member of this House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not condescend to reply to the hon. member. The Resolution referring to such an Agreement was on the Order Paper of this House and by default was taken off. Here again I do not remember seeing any Agreement during the time the Resolution first appeared, but recently, I saw what purports to be a copy between the Government and the Barbados Oil Company. This matter has been the concern of almost every adult Barbadian, because as rumours had it, it savoured of the introduction of a monopoly.

Now I was not in the House when the Minister made his introduction of the Resolution, but I heard the hon. junior member for Bridgetown and the hon. junior member for St. George. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown claims to be no one near to the oil magnets. Like him, I am not speaking on the technical side of this Resolution, but I am a Barbadian and I am interested in the welfare of this country. Because the word "monopoly" is not mentioned anywhere in this Agreement, that does not mean that there are not certain obvious monopolistic trends in this Resolution, and I believe that this Agreement must cause a storm of protest in Barbados. I listened carefully to the hon. junior member for St. George and I agree with many points which he made. I was at a loss when he made references to what seems to be clearly set out in Article 14 of the Agreement, and I have been informed that at any rate the particular company has a contract for bunkering at the present time. I am not a technician nor have I been briefed by any company interested in petroleum products in this island, but I do believe it will be possible for this company in its own interest to bring to standard its gasoline that it can sell with other gasoline sold by competing companies in this country. I believe that is scientifically possible, and hard businessmen that Barbadians are, they can manage to hold their own as far as providing the quality of gasoline that will be equally as good as that which is presently sold to the motorists of Barbados by competing companies such as Texaco and Shell.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very interested in what would be the position — I am not just repeating what the hon. junior member for St. George has said — if another company applied for similar provisions and sought to get an Agreement between the Barbados Government and itself to do what the Barbados Union Oil Company is hoping to do. It would be a very interesting position. Although the word "monopoly" is mentioned nowhere in the Agreement, that would be telling everybody in Barbados that the Barbados Union Oil Company has a monopoly. That would be the obvious proof. Now Article 4 on the marketing of petroleum products on page 3 of the Agreement reads as follows:—

"The Company hereby undertakes to supply the full requirements for petroleum and petroleum products of Barbados from the Refinery."

The moment that was included in the Agreement, it would be pointless to have another Agreement reading the same way. How many companies would you sign an Agreement with declaring that these companies undertake to supply the full requirements for petroleum and petroleum products of Barbados from their refineries? It is obvious that no one can gainsay that unless it is French which is understood only by certain hon. members at that. On page 4 the Agreement reads as follows:—

"The Company shall have the right to increase the capacity of the Refinery. A reasonable period following the

date of execution thereof will be necessary to increase the capacity of the Refinery."

Then in sub-paragraph 1 on the same page, there appears:-

"In the event that the failure of the Company to make the petroleum products referred to above available to meet the demands of Barbados in whole or in part is due to any of the causes set out in Article 12 hereof, then and in such event the Company shall have the right to import such petroleum products to make up the deficiency resulting from the loss of Refinery production, etc."

Also in Section D it is stated that:-

"In the event that a need arises for a petroleum product which is not being manufactured or processed in the Refinery, The Company and The Government shall consult to determine the conditions under which such petroleum product may be manufactured or processed in the Refinery and the particular formula for which such product may obtain the advantages of the provisions of Article 5 hereof."

That does read like a monopoly.
5.50 p.m.

The hon. member for St. George was making the point about what would be the position in the event of hostilities. In other words, if the British Commonwealth finds itself involved in a War with a country from which the fuel oil was imported, what would be the position. That point is answered in the Agreement. I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. George did not remember it but on page nine, Article 12 — *Force Majeure* — it says:-

"No failure or omission to carry out or to observe any of the terms, provisions or conditions of this Agreement shall give rise to any claim by one party hereto against the other, or deemed to be a breach of this Agreement if the same shall be caused by or arise out of war, hostilities, etc."

Mr. MILLER: I want to be very careful about this point. I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. Peter is aware but this company is tied to the United States which unfortunately is a foreign company. It is for that reason I said what I did.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Well, Sir, in the event of war, the company is defended by this article which says that no claim can be brought against them. Article 12 protects them from this obligation to produce the full requirements for Barbados.

Sir, from what little I have been able to read about the provisions of this Agreement they do not have the word "monopoly" inserted but it is so obvious. Members of the Barbados public — and I daresay the Barbados Workers Union has been interested in this part of it — would like to know what is likely to happen if certain workers become displaced eventually as a result of the operation of this company authorised by this Agreement. The hon. junior member for the City has referred to that too. That is a matter which the Government will have to face consequently and, of course, it is a matter which has to be handled by the companies also.

Like the hon. junior member for St. George, I have nothing against the Barbados Union Oil Company, formerly operating as the British Union Oil Company but on the wording of certain articles in this Agreement I am strengthened in my pre-conception that this Agreement is nothing else than a monopoly in a grand way. I am opposed to it and I say so here and now. It does not matter to me what are the opinions of other hon. members no matter who they are or where they are. As I see the thing, it cannot be contradicted in the phrasing of the articles that obviously this company is being protected and this company seems to be asked by Government to fulfil something which they could not ask more than one company to do at the same time, hence agreeing to give that particular company a monopoly.

Because of that, I am opposed to this Resolution which would implement this agreement.

Sir, I heard an hon. member speak, and I would like to know if what the hon. member has said was addressed to the Chair. If that is so, it can be repeated to be understood by Parliament. I heard the 15th June mentioned many times. Sir, I do not know whether you have been addressed; I do not know what it conveys to you but it seems as if the hon. member was speaking in some sort of way. What is proposed for 15th June? It is still a mystery to me. In debate I would not make use of that statement unless I was prepared to clarify it to the House in order that what I say would be easily and readily understood by all hon. members. I am not speaking in defence of any hon. member but I regret I cannot say that I understood what the hon. member was referring to when he made use of that statement. A statement was made to somebody by somebody and the date of 15th June was involved in that matter. I feel that there should be no code, none whatsoever, and whatever is said should be said in simple English, at least English which is intelligible so that every hon. member who is listening or cares to listen would be able to appreciate what another hon. member is saying when he is on his feet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Minister will have the right to reply, possibly more than once but there has been a hint. I am not prepared to initiate a motion for sending this matter to a Select Committee but I would certainly stand by it. I think this Resolution is of so much importance and it means so much to the economy of this country one way or the other and I think that the companies who sell petroleum products in Barbados are very much interested and they too see a monopoly being granted to this one company therefore, I feel a matter of such importance really should go to a Select Committee.

There are certain hon. members who are businessmen. They know more than I do; they are much better acquainted with the repercussions but I do feel that this is a matter which should go to Select Committee.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this particular agreement was taken off the Order Paper and when the Hon. Premier took it off he said it was there waiting for the getting together of the other companies and they would not get together and it was taken off.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Resolution was taken off the Order Paper not by the Hon. Premier but by the Hon. Speaker whose business it is to concern himself with these matters. According to the Rules of this House, any matter remaining on the Order Paper for over three months and not having been attended to automatically is taken off the Order Paper. So it is purely a question that it was not attended to for a matter of three months which caused the Hon. Speaker to rule that it should no longer be placed on the Order Paper.
6.00 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, imagine that the Government had business on the Order Paper and the Speaker of this House had to take it off because the time ran out and nothing was done about it! I was in the House at the time when the Hon. Premier gave reasons for this particular Resolution having remained on the Order Paper for so long. I do not think that the hon. member, who is in charge of the Resolution, was in the House then.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is quite correct. I was not in the House on that occasion.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister was not in the House and still he wants to defend the position here today in saying this, that and the other. It was the Speaker who took the Resolution off the Order Paper because that was in accordance with the Rules of the House. Only a moment has passed and the Hon. Minister has changed that. He must be the automatic changer.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not present at the Battle of Waterloo

either, but I know when it was fought and who won. This Resolution was not taken off the Order Paper by the Hon. Premier; it was taken off by His Honour the Speaker as he heard that time was being given to the other companies to come to an agreement with the refining company.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, how would I know that? I am not in the Government.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That was said by the Hon. Premier himself as to why this matter was taken off the Order Paper.

Mr. SMITH: I am wondering now, and I hope the Hon. Minister in replying will let us know, if these people who could not get together at first have been able to get together now. That is all I want to know, the reason was given for this Resolution having been kept on the Order Paper for so long and I would like to know the reason why it was re-introduced so quickly now. I would like to know if the particular companies have got together in connection with this matter. I would like to know if they were consulted and if they had any knowledge to pass on to the present Government, because I do not think the Minister, who is in charge of this matter, is an oil magnet and if he were to take time off, he would get some help offered by other people who would help him. In dealing with them he might be able to understand something which he did not understand. This is an Agreement which is for the purpose of protecting the B.U.O.C. and if this company applies to this Government for protection then it is the duty of the Government to protect it. When we want to protect companies, we cannot say that one thing was not good and last week it was better; we want to stop doing that and give more study to the matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is an old saying that too much pudding can choke a dog; similarly, if we give too much protection to this oil company it may cause the consumers, the people who have to use this gasoline, to pay more than is necessary. Therefore we have to be very careful in dealing with this Agreement; we have to be careful about granting these safeguards and this protection. On page 4 (c) (1) of this Agreement this is what is stated:-

"In the event that the failure of The Company to make the petroleum products referred to above available to meet the demand of Barbados in whole or in part is due to any of the causes set out in Article 12 thereof, then and in such event The Company shall have the right to import such petroleum products to make up the deficiency resulting from the loss of refinery production, such importation of products to be subject to all of the benefits which The Company enjoys hereunder in manufacturing and selling such products, including the right to the discharge by The Government of the consumption tax obligation of The Company as provided for in Article 5 hereof."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am wondering if this particular part of the Agreement is not granting a monopoly; if that is not so, then I do not know what a monopoly is. These people are agreeing with the Government to supply the island's demand but if they can prove to this Government that they cannot supply the demand, the Government is giving them the right to import petroleum products to make up the deficiency. That is all right. These people will have to spend more money; they will want more capital to expand the refinery. These people are all businessmen. Suppose when they go into their figures, they discover that they are spending too much money or so much money by way of expansion, that they stand to lose money and they have to import what they want! If these people find that by spending more money they stand to lose and by importing this material they stand to make a profit, every business man can say: "We will make out a case to this Government with regard to supply and demand." What will happen then?

6.10 p.m.

You do not know one thing about their figures, but it is the duty of every businessman to make a dollar rather than lose one. You are giving them the right to import if they cannot supply demand, and I feel that is too wide. It will

encourage these people not to spend the money, because the Government would not know whether or not they can supply. They will have to do a lot of expansion up there or wherever they are going to put down the refinery, and I should think by doing the expansion that they should employ more labour. I do not know if these people will import old machinery which will cause them to employ more people; it should be modern machinery to displace labour, because you are modernising. I am therefore a little worried over that. These people know more about business than any of the members in the Government, and if they do not know, there are those who can work for them; so we have to be careful in an Agreement of this kind because there is a possibility that the consumer may have to pay more for gasoline than is necessary.

Now, Sir, you are going to try them for twenty-five years, but twenty-five years in my opinion is too long for a trial. There is nothing here to say you will give them fifteen years, and if all goes well, another ten years, and if everything continues well to give them 100 years more. We should not bite off so much, because 25 years are a lot of years. To some people today three years is a long time to do a certain thing; so what do you think of 25 years? I am going to throw out a hint to the Government. They do not want to hear anything from me anyhow, but if it is worthwhile, they are not going to say that what I have said caused them to do it, but they will do it if it is right. I am thinking more of the people at this time because the Government may only be twelve members, but it is a lot of people who tends to suffer and I would not like that to happen. I will have to call this a monopoly though the word does not appear in the Agreement. The hon. introducer of this Resolution threw out a challenge to any member to show where a monopoly appears in this particular Agreement. I have not seen the word, but you do not have to see m-o-n-o-p-o-l-y to know that it is a monopoly. You can get it in actions, and actions can be more dangerous than letters.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is nothing to prevent this Government from protecting the Barbados Union Oil Company in this way without pushing out the other marketing companies immediately. They can restrict the other marketing companies; that is to say, if the consumption in Barbados of gasoline is 1,000 gallons and you are going to try out the Barbados Union Oil Company with 500 gallons, you can restrict the other marketing companies to the other 500 gallons, and if the company can make out a case that it can produce the other 500 gallons, by all means turn on the heat then on the others. You should restrict the others before you give a monopoly immediately to the Barbados Union Oil Company without knowing how they are going to start off, because the Refinery is not finished yet. They are not geared up yet to supply the Island's demands, and you should not take the chance right away. It would be better and more sensible for them to convince you that they can produce the oil, and it would make them get up and think twice, and since they are out to get the monopoly, they would bring in all the necessary machinery so as to get the trade. If you give them the right in this Agreement to import if they cannot supply the demand, they are not supposed to hurt their heads or go out of their way.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I do not think the hon. member is right and justified in conveying the impression that B.U.O.C. is entitled to import oil if they cannot supply it. There is only a very restricted, specified number of conditions under which oil can be imported and the hon. member should not convey the impression that it is a general privilege. I think in fairness to the Agreement or what is before the House, he should say under what conditions they should import. There must be very exceptional circumstances such as revolutions, wars, and riots, otherwise they cannot import.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can only go by what I see in the Agreement, and I will read it again, although I cannot read too well.

"In the event that the failure of the Company to make the petroleum products referred to above available to meet

the demands of Barbados in whole or in part is due to any of the causes set out in Article 12 thereof, then and in such event the Company shall have the right to import such petroleum products....."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am grateful the hon. member read that. What I want him to do now is to read Article 12. 6.20 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: He wants me to read Article 12; he can read 12 too.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order. I will read it for him. My point of order is this. Under Article 12, the only way in which they can bring in oil is because of hostility, acts of enemies of the United States or of the British Commonwealth or of the belligerents, sabotage, blockade, revolution, insurrection, riot or disorder, arrest or restraint of rulers of peoples, expropriation, requisition, confiscation or nationalisation; and so on, and it goes on to say epidemic, quarantine, strikes or combination of workmen; lockouts or other labour disturbances, and so on. As you can see, those are very, very exceptional circumstances; they are not ordinary circumstances.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister has said that those are very, very rare cases but suppose these people cannot supply with these things happening, it is a possibility then that these things can happen. Suppose these people go ahead. Bear in mind you have no earthquake or storm or anything but the Island's stock runs low and you cannot supply it. What is in the agreement to make you carry out the contract?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Read the Agreement.

Mr. SMITH: I am not happy at all in your giving these people protection for 25 years when the refinery is not there yet to supply the Island's demands. If the refinery was there and they said that they were ready to supply the Island's demand, well then, that will be an agreement, but you have agreed and they have agreed to something when they are not yet ready to do the job.

This is where what I have said should be able to work. Do not throw everything on these people one time and push the other marketing people at their whims and command because these marketing people will have to take the products from them. Try it out first. Any intelligent person would do that. They would not take such a risk as you are taking. Try it out. I believe the company would agree to that. They would agree much quicker when they know that it can be done.

Sir, rather than put everything into their hands at one time, give them a try out. Say to them, let us give you a try out. After ten years and you are satisfied that they can supply the demands of the Island, you will say to them we are going to give it to you in full. Here it is, you have other companies which are supplying according to my belief most of the gasoline and this company supplies the least. I know there was a time or sometimes when the same B.U.O.C. had to take gasoline from the bulk installation of the other marketing companies at Black Rock. It is a fact that most everybody will say "Esso", others will say "Shell". Others will say this thing and that thing. I know of a particular person whom I often see drive in a gas station and pulls up at a Shell tank all the time but little does he know that the gas he is putting in comes out of one tank. It is only a question of name. Whenever that fellow came to this particular gas station, Esso gas used to come out of that tank as well as Regent gas but this particular person believes so much in Shell that he would not take any other.

As I was saying, B.U.O.C. used to get gasoline from the bulk installation at Black Rock. But since Esso has a bulk storage they sell for themselves. As I was saying all the gasoline used to come out of the same tank.

Sir, we may feel that we are protecting Barbados but after a time you are going to find out that all of these people are going to come together. These particular people will then come to the Ministry and will put up a case stating

that they cannot manufacture under these conditions and you will have to give them more money for their products or allow them to pay more for it. They are going to put up figures to state their case and then who will suffer? The consumers will suffer.

Sir, I am only thinking of the people. You can go ahead with the Agreement but there are more to suffer than my one and that is why I am a bit unhappy about this Resolution. I would not use the word "monopoly" in this case, but I know of a man who had a telephone in his house which he had rented out. The tenant left that house and went to another house with another telephone. The owner of this other house moved into this house and took out the telephone but left the speaker inside. The man applied to the Telephone Company to allow him to use the telephone and he was quite willing to use the telephone but the other people would not allow him. The speaker stood inside that house for over three months and then they came and took it out but the wire is still there. Those people would not allow that man to use that telephone. Of course, they did that to him because they heard that he was a Christian. But if the speaker was in my home and I saw any of them come to take it out I know what would happen. Can you wish for anything worse than that?

Sir, it is time that the Government exert some control over these companies. They did not have to put down any more poles or run any more wires to allow this man the use of the speaker. That was a wicked thing, therefore, I am afraid of giving this company all of this protection and for those reasons, if something is not done, I am forced to vote against this Resolution. It is not that I am against the company, I am willing to protect them but not to give them everything at one time. I am willing to protect them but not before they can prove to us that they can supply the Island's demands.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the two occasions when this matter was discussed on the floor of the House we have listened to such a spate of criticism and ill-informed arguments that I am inclined to say that in all of the time that I have been in this House, never have I heard so many unwarranted and misguided criticisms against any measure. This has been followed by rash statements in the newspapers which were no less ill-informed and we have now got to the point at which I am forced to ask if the hon. member, or most of them who have spoken, has ever read the agreement at all because it does not seem so to me. 6.30 p.m.

If they have read the Agreement then I am only forced to one conclusion; that is, that if they have read the Agreement and they have adopted the attitude which they have adopted, then it means that they have no interest in the island of Barbados and they are more concerned with the profits and operation of a few foreign oil companies than they are concerned with the people of this island. Otherwise, I do not see how it is possible that any hon. member representing the people of this island could make the speeches and adopt the attitudes which they have adopted in this House for the last two meetings.

To begin with, I want to deal with the two points of objection which were raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. As a matter of fact, in the whole spate of arguments which were used, the arguments of the hon. senior member for St. Peter were about the only two points which were tenable. I refer to the hon. member's comment in respect of the Clause with regard to wages and also to his comment on Article 12 as to the conditions under which the company will be allowed to import petroleum products into the country. Article 6 (1) deals with the question of wages and this is what it says:

"The Company shall give preference to Barbadians in the staffing of the refining operation to the extent that persons are available who, in The Company's judgment, have the qualifications and skills necessary to perform efficiently the duties and discharge the responsibilities of the positions involved and shall undertake to pay to such employees, and shall require its agents and assigns to pay

to those regularly engaged in service and business under this Agreement, wages commensurate with prevailing wages paid by other employers of Barbadian labour for like job requirements, such prevailing wages to be determined by The Company who will make actual surveys of the labour market from time to time....."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said earlier, today, that Clause has been taken word for word from the Agreement which was signed by the last Government with Esso for providing bunkering facilities at the Deep Water Harbour. In the Agreement with Esso on page 9 paragraph (k) you will find the exact words:

".....and shall undertake to pay to such employees, and shall require its agents and assigns to pay to those regularly engaged in service and business under this Agreement, wages commensurate with prevailing wages paid by other employers of Barbadian labour for like job requirements, such prevailing wages to be determined by Esso who will make actual surveys of the labour market from time to time....."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in drafting the Agreement with the British Union Oil Company, naturally the text of the Esso Agreement was drawn up and this Clause was included. The hon. senior member for St. Peter could not have objected to the inclusion of this Clause because this House never saw the Esso Agreement for discussion before ratification. I am amazed that hon. members of the Barbados Labour Party today could have the brazen effrontery to talk about this length of time given to the B.U.O.C. in the Agreement and about sending this matter to a Select Committee and that sort of tripe. The Agreement with the British Union Oil Company and the Government is for some 25 years. Neither the hon. junior member for St. Joseph nor the hon. junior member for St. George at any time have said that the bunkering Agreement was for too long a period and it should be tried out first. Furthermore, what has actually had me aggravated is this; the business to be done by Esso bunkering is far bigger than that to be done by B.U.O.C. Those hon. members sat in their seats and allowed their Government to give a contract for bunkering which was an infinitely far greater turnover than that of the B.U.O.C. They never brought the Agreement here and they gave it to a Company which does not need a single thing more than the gasoline to be put into the biggest transport vehicle you could find and put that gasoline in tanks and they did not employ one Barbadian except those who are living in Trinidad and who are domiciled there. Now they are telling us that we should perpetuate these conditions where a Government employs people here; but because a few oil companies feel that they will be put at a disadvantage they have briefed certain hon. members to come in here to misinterpret the Agreement and then they tell people outside that we do not know what we are doing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the granting of this Agreement to B.U.O.C. will not interfere in the slightest iota with the operation of the distribution companies here. All it means is that instead of oil coming from Trinidad in tankers, we will import the crude here which is refined at the Garrison and it will be taken from there in the same vehicles and given to the same distributing centres of Esso, Shell and Texaco. That is all it means. You cannot provide less employment for people who are now employed in the petroleum products of the island.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has in one single second wiped out every single thing we have heard in here today. All of this talk about quality and standards is sheer eyewash. All of this Tommy rot by the hon. junior member for St. George was wiped out by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph when he said that one tanker brings in all the gasoline. Shell and Texaco come in the same tank; they give half of the tank to Shell and the other half to Texaco. Then the hon. junior member for St. George added more fuel to the folly when he talked about not importing crude from British Commonwealth sources and that we could get it from Trinidad.

6.40 p.m.

Trinidad herself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is importing half of the crude she is refining from Venezuela and the Middle East. It is not to say that we are importing refined products in Barbados manufactured from crude from indigenous quarters; so therefore we are to sit down and allow Trinidad to continue to import crude from non British Commonwealth sources, provide the Government of Trinidad with income tax from the oil refined there, while it is sent here and put in gasoline tanks and sold to the public, because we were all born on the 1st April. I have never heard anything worse in all my life.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but he has probably heard so much in this matter that he is mixed up. I simply said that Mobil is not operating here, and the oil that is coming to Barbados is from a foreign source. The Agreement places no responsibility on the Company in the case of hostilities. Let us think of war and they were unable to get oil to satisfy the requirement demands the Government would have. I never indicated that you must get the oil from Trinidad, and I further said in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the bulk of oil in Trinidad is tied to American currency. Probably the hon. member has been hearing too much debate and is not sure where he had heard it from.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: All I am saying, Sir, is that this Agreement is for the same duration of 25 years which his Government gave to Esso for bunkering at the Deep Water Harbour. It is bigger business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not have these asides either from the member standing or the one sitting.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As a matter of fact, Sir, I go further and say that no Government in this country had any right to award a contract of that magnitude to an oil company unless they were going to do the refining here. If you are going to give an oil company the right to bunker at a Port to the extent that Esso is going to bunker here, you should have compelled them first and foremost to put a refinery here, because the volume of business is more than B.U.O.C. would handle in gasoline, kerosine and diesel oil, and furthermore in any case the old Agreement with B.U.O.C. still has another six years to run; so that our Agreement only goes for nine years more than the existing Agreement runs. They gave Esso the Agreement for bunkering. There were other companies competing, but so far as we know, B.U.O.C. is the only company prepared to expand the refinery to the point that it can produce all our petroleum products in Barbados. The Jamaica Government has just given Esso an Agreement for refining there. Do you think there is anybody in the Jamaica House of Assembly who is purblindly obscure to the wishes of Jamaica to get up on the floor of the Jamaica House or on a platform to tell the people in Jamaica that Esso should not be allowed to have a refinery in Jamaica or that Shell, Mobil or Texaco should not be distributing on that basis? They would run him out of public life. Any Jamaican member of the House of Representatives who was so crazy as to get up and say that the Jamaica Government should not enter an Agreement with Esso or any oil company that would put a refinery to process oil in Jamaica would be run out of public life in Jamaica. Similarly in Antigua. Do you think any member of the Antigua Legislative Council would get up and say that the Antigua Government should not agree to establish an oil refinery there, but should go on importing oil refined in Curacao, Aruba or Trinidad into the country? What are we supposed to be; just a distributing centre for the refined oils of other countries?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Barbados has the big advantage of being in the position in which we already have a small refinery operating. In the normal course of events, any public spirited Barbadian whether or not he or she was a member of the Assembly would consider even asking the Company if it were not interested in expanding its operations in order to refine all of our petroleum products here. Now that you get a company willing to put down a refinery and employ people in it, you get almost every single mem-

ber on the other side who says he is interested in industrial development asking the Government to postpone the Agreement and send it to Select Committee. We are not sending it to Select Committee at all, it has been before this House too long and hon. members have had it too long to consider sending it to Select Committee, because there has been no point raised by the Opposition today or last Tuesday which cannot be answered. The majority of points do not merit answers at all and seven-eighths of what was said has merely served to disclose the profound ignorance of hon. members on the matter before the House. Either they have not read it, or when they read it, they did not understand it or did not try to understand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to return to the points raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter about the Jamaica Clause taken from the Esso Agreement and one or two matters in the Force Majeure Clause, I am willing to concede that they need some consideration, and I am prepared to suggest to the Government that they should endeavour to enter a supplementary agreement to take care of those two minor points, because the fact that there has been this Clause in the Esso Agreement has not prevented the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Trade Unionist, from negotiating with Esso for wages. As a matter of fact, they are now in the process of negotiating with B.U.O.C., and the hon. member for St. Peter knows full well that this Clause really could not stop any organisation of workers in the country from fixing wages.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, the hon. member said that the other member for St. Peter knows full well that some particular Clause does not prevent the Trade Union from negotiating. He made reference to the hon. senior member, and I happen incidentally to be the junior member; so he must be referring to me. I heard him say "the other member"; I do not know what Your Honour heard. I never made any claim whatever that the Clause would prevent the Union from negotiating. As a matter of fact, I said it would be the concern of the Barbados Workers' Union to enter the matter if there is any likely displacement. That is all I said.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said "the hon. member". As a matter of fact, it is obvious that I meant the Trade Union's member of St. Peter. As I have said before, nobody in this Government wants to give organised labour the impression that this section does in any way interfere with the rights of organised labour nor was intended to.
6.50 p.m.

I have told the House before that this Section does not in any way interfere with organised labour.

The other point which the hon. member made was as regards Section 12. As regards Section 12 which includes strikes or combination of workmen, lockouts or other labour disturbances, which would be reasons for the company to import oil from outside, the hon. senior member for St. Peter argued with some justification. I do not know who is going to distribute the oil but nobody in this Government wants to convey the slightest feeling that we are not 100% jealous in preserving the rights of organised labour. I personally feel that the points which the hon. senior member for St. Peter raised in this connection can reasonably be taken but apart from those points, the plethora of nonsense which we have heard from every opposition member is actually a discredit to the House.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church began by talking about a monopoly. He was followed parrot-like by all the others and the Press took it up. There is not a single part of this agreement conferring monopolistic rights on the company. Can you imagine that we would be so naive and dumb as to have given B.U.O.C. monopolistic rights in this direction? We have had four different oil companies here to explore for oil in Barbados since we were in office. We have recently given B. P. Sinclair the rights to explore for oil. As a matter of fact, they have had a geologist working here for almost nine months making the preliminary investigations but let us say that B. P.

Sinclair was going to apply for a prospecting licence when the preliminary licence has expired in eighteen months and let us say that they found oil here. Do you think we would be so silly as to give the local company the refining rights when they could not find it?

According to the speech of the hon. junior member for the City, the Opposition party had the advantage of all the legal and scientific talent in the oil industry in the preparation of their brief to oppose this matter in the House. There is no person who could have presented a more scientific dissertation today from that particular point of view than that made by the hon. junior member for the City. Of course, that part of the opposition have had the benefits of all the legal advice in this matter but you would have thought, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with all this advice that they have had in this matter they would have at least got an opinion as to whether or not this agreement constitutes a monopoly. If it had been a monopoly, you would have had a clause in it conveying exclusive rights to B.U.O.C. but no where in this agreement do you see any clause saying that.

We had a Cabinet meeting and decided formally that this was to be no monopoly and then we sat and wrote a letter to the company on the 17th September, 1962, which is nearly nine months ago stating that. The letter reads in part: "I am instructed by the Minister to inform you that the Executive Committee has approved of the terms of the attached Draft Agreement. The Governor-in-Executive Committee has further decided that the concessions provided for under the Draft Agreement will not be exclusive to the B.U.O.C...."

That was what we put in a letter to the company. We go further. We did not put one single word in the agreement about a monopoly but then, Sir, hon. members like a bunch of parrots have come in here and plodded out this word "monopoly". They would not look at the agreement. As a matter of fact, I said that the Antigua Agreement does offer a monopoly to the refining rights in these words: "No person other than the enterprise that is at present engaged in the processing of oil in Antigua during the period commencing 28th March, 1961 and terminating 25 years afterwards....."

I will even go further. In Antigua they have exempted this Refinery from income tax for fifteen years. (A VOICE: How long is that?)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am having no cross talk across the Chamber.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Well, Antigua has exempted the Refinery from taxation, and that is consequent to the Act. This is in addition to the text of the Agreement and what not.

To get Esso to put a Refinery in Jamaica, the Jamaica Government had to agree to give Esso ten years free of income tax. We have done no such thing in Barbados. From the beginning, B.U.O.C. would continue to pay rates. Of course, they are not paying anything now, because they are losing money. We estimate in the first year that we can collect \$1,700 in income tax, and within ten years afterwards the income tax which we expect to collect from this Refinery will be \$1/4 million. From next year the Company will be paying \$100,000 in income tax.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member can close in ten minutes then he can continue.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is impossible.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

On-reassembling.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no quorum present and I am asking that the Bell be rung.

On the bell being rung a quorum was obtained.

**RESOLUTION re AGREEMENT WITH THE
GOVERNOR-IN-EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
AND B.U.O.C.**

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the Hon. Leader of the House was replying to the debate on a Resolution to sanction an Agreement made between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Barbados Union Oil Company Limited.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, to resume from where I left off, the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown who is not now in his place, made some reference to the fact that there were 250 Barbadians in Trinidad working in the oil industry there and apparently he was concerned with their future. This Government is concerned with the future of the 250,000 Barbadians in Barbados. The Barbadians who are in Trinidad, as I pointed out before, have been there since before and during the War and under the present Constitution of Trinidad, after two years' residence in Trinidad, you are entitled to assume Trinidad citizenship. Therefore, if the 250 Barbadians are not Trinidad citizens, they can easily become so. We need not therefore concern ourselves unduly with those 250 Barbadians, but the 250,000 Barbadians are here to remain with us and we have to consider them. Our conception is that the ratification of this Agreement is without doubt in the interest of these 250,000 Barbadians and that is why we are seeking the approval of the Legislature to ratify this Agreement.

There are some countries in this area like Curacao and Aruba which exist on refining oil. They do not even produce the crude; the crude is brought in from Venezuela and elsewhere and the operations of refining in Aruba and Curacao have given employment to thousands of people in the West Indies and elsewhere. I have only said that in order to show that we should be lacking in our sense of responsibility and in fulfilling the obligations which we owe to the community who elected us here to office, if we fail to grasp the opportunity which is presented to us by the fact that we have a small refinery here and we can allow these people to invest their money in expansion to a degree which would take care of all our petroleum requirements.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church, who is also not in his place now, made some reference to some oil imbroglio in Trinidad and stated that this Agreement was the result of some backwash from the controversy there. Personally, I have known nothing about it and I doubt whether any other member of the Government knows about it either. I never heard about it until I heard the hon. member mention it, but I want to assure this House that this Agreement has nothing to do with the imbroglio in Trinidad or with any backwash of any controversy there. And I do not think that we are concerned with it either. Mr. Deputy Speaker, all we are concerned with is that we get an oil refinery in Barbados which is big enough to produce our own requirements and which will pay some taxation on its profits and save us some money in our remittances abroad. That is what we need because if we import the crude product instead of the refined product then there must be a resultant saving which represents the differential between the value of the refined product and the imported crude. In addition to the fact that we will be able to get taxation and so effect a saving in our remittances abroad, we are also going to provide steady employment for an appreciable number of Barbadians. If that is not an opportunity to take advantage of, then I do not know what it is.

The hon. junior member for St. Michael talked about the quality of the petroleum products to be refined. I should like to point out that that is all guaranteed in the Agreement in Article 6 (g) on page 7. This is what it says:

"The Company agrees that the quality of the products in question will be in accordance with accepted industry standards and the Government shall have the right to take samples of the said products for analysis. The Company agrees to pay for the cost of such an analysis, if carried out by an agency other than the Government, twice a year."
7.55 p.m.

I do not know what more we can do to ensure that the products correspond favourably with similar products produced elsewhere. With regard to prices, if you look at Article 4 E, you will see that the Company shall make available gasolenes, kerosine, distillates and fuel oils in bulk quantities to the marketing companies in Barbados at the Refinery, the prices of which shall be equal for each product, on the date of delivery, to the arithmetical mean of low quotation by Platt's Oilgram for cargo lots of such product at Aruba, Curacao, Amuay and Cardon for the calendar month immediately preceding that during which the deliveries in question are made plus insurance, ocean leakage and a freight component determined in a specified manner. In other words, Sir, the prices of petroleum products in the area are fixed monthly by a publication known as Platt's Oilgram. This fixes the price for Curacao, Aruba, Trinidad and Venezuela and other oil-producing countries, and the company is obligated under the Agreement to supply prices to the distributing companies at a level fixed monthly by Platt's Oilgram. There is no more that any Government can do in this respect, and neither Jamaica nor Antigua could take any different step.

The marketing companies here, Sir, were instructed by the Government to endeavour to reach an Agreement with B.U.O.C. with regard to the manner in which they received supplies and we left it with them to do that. We could not be expected to hold this Agreement up indefinitely until such time as they reached an Agreement. In Jamaica where Esso has an Agreement with the Government, Shell, Mobil and Texaco have had to come to terms with Esso. In Trinidad Esso has no refinery neither has Mobil; but they both sell gasoline in Trinidad. As a matter of fact, this is the answer to the question raised, I think, by the hon. junior member for St. George when he asked what would happen with regard to tenders. If we conclude this Agreement, it means we are placing ourselves at the mercies of B.U.O.C. with Government tenders, because in Trinidad both Esso and Mobil which have no refinery tender for Government requirements and get them too. It is merely a question of the extent to which the tendering company is prepared to forego a percentage of its profits. If one company is prepared to forego more than the other, the lowest tender gets the tender. The fact that Esso is operating in Jamaica does not mean when the Government calls for tenders either for transport or any other requirement that the distributing companies in Jamaica will not also submit a tender. In addition, Sir, the consumption tax which the distributing companies now have to pay, they will not be compelled to pay on supplies provided for Government; so they are therefore starting on the same basis as the local refinery.

I said a little earlier, Sir, that the existing lease under which B.U.O.C. operates has another sixteen years to run. This was an error. It is only six more years that it has to run; so that our agreement will carry them on for another period of nineteen years and not nine years, which is the same period, as I said earlier, as the Agreement which the Government gave Esso and the same period enjoyed by the proposed Refinery in Antigua, and the Esso Refinery in Jamaica. I do not know, Sir, that there are any other points not covered. I was talking earlier about the extent in the volume and value of the business done by Esso bunkering people at the Deep Water Harbour in comparison with the volume and value of refining operation in Barbados to provide all our petroleum requirements. The total value of our petroleum imports excluding bunkering oil imported by Esso is about \$2 1/2 million. The volume of business being done by Esso importing bunkering oil or fuel is over two million barrels a year, and that reinforces my argument that the Esso bunkering contract is worth far more than the value of business to be done by B.U.O.C., and that is why I said earlier and I want to repeat again that the Government should not have put all this business in the hands of a company which made no effort at all to do refining operations here and an essential prerequisite to this contract of bunkering at the Deep Water Harbour should have been that whoever was awarded the contract should do refining operations here and provide work for the people of the Island in this refining operation.

I have already said that we have B.P. Sinclair doing some exploratory work and it is confidently expected that they will now ask for an exploration licence - what they are doing now is merely geological and geophysical surveys - in the very near future, so that even if we had been stupid enough without that not to have appreciated the importance of not granting any single company a monopoly, that alone would have brought us to our senses and make us realise that the likelihood which we hope will develop into a distinct eventuality of finding oil in Barbados must give rise, Sir, to a demand for another refining operation, unless of course the prospecting company reaches an Agreement with the refining company of refining all the oil discovered. But we would not have wanted to place either ourselves or the prospecting company in that position; so we would naturally have left the road open and clear for any company finding oil in Barbados and refining the oil found here providing they could not reach agreement with the existing oil company. That is why I say it is in the face of these circumstances and in the face of the fact that the Agreement said nothing at all about a monopoly, that it is wicked and malicious, I almost said vicious, propaganda for anybody either in this Chamber or outside to perpetuate the allegation that we are giving B.U.O.C. a monopoly. We are doing nothing of the kind, and it is absolutely unfair for responsible members of this community and of this Chamber to trot out this allegation as has been done in here and in the public Press.

8.05 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Although in the Agreement no mention is made of a monopoly, we on this side imply that a monopoly can arise by the elimination of the other companies in the marketing business. If you can eliminate the other three marketing organisations as a result of this Agreement, what is it but a monopoly?

The Barbados Biscuit Company is the only company now manufacturing biscuits in this Island. There used to be two biscuit companies, and they were competing with each other. After a time they amalgamated and they have now become one company. Can anyone say that there is not a monopoly in the Barbados Biscuit Company? I say it is. If the Barbados Union Oil Company eliminates the other three marketing companies because this Company would have the means of dictating terms to them, certainly there would be a monopoly.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: How do you mean "eliminate?" I do not know which oil company is being spoken of on the other side, but if the hon. member wants to test out whether B.U.O.C. has a monopoly, let the other company send in an application. I am making this offer. If Esso wants to put a refinery to supply oil to the Deep Water Harbour, they can if they want to. They can put one there if they want to tomorrow. Esso has a guaranteed market for supplying oil at the Deep Water Harbour and they are protected under the Esso Agreement of last year. B.U.O.C. cannot send one single gallon at the Deep Water Harbour, so you can see that Esso has a protective market there for 25 years. Let Esso send in an application for refining Bunker C fuel tomorrow and they will have it.

In 1961, they supplied 3,230,315 gallons at a value of \$563,000 in Bunker C fuel at the Deep Water Harbour. Last year the supply was 39,000,000 gallons at a value of over \$5 million. The entire petroleum products to be marketed by B.U.O.C. would not be more than \$2 1/2 million. Let Esso send in an application for a refinery there and you will see how fast they will get it. (A VOICE: For what?) To supply Bunker C fuel. We are not saying that they can sell other petroleum products but they have this guarantee for supplying Bunker C fuel.

So far as I can see, hon. members on the other side of the Table do not want any industry here. They want us to continue importing oil and letting the other people sell it here. That, Sir, is the answer to the charge of monopoly.

Other than that, any other oil company can submit an application to the Government now for refining operations

and it will be considered. If B.U.O.C. had a monopoly, we could not even entertain any other application from any other oil refining company.

Sir, there were a few other points made by the hon. junior member for the City, but one famous scientific point was as regards the question of the anti-knock product which B.U.O.C. would have to put in to bring their gasoline up to the standard as that of some competing companies. I am no anti-knock expert therefore I do not know how much anti-knock Shell and Texaco have in their gasoline, therefore, I would not know how much Mobil Oil would have to put in their product in order to bring it to the same standard as that of the two other companies. Shell and Texaco have no refineries here, they have refineries in Trinidad. As far as I know, Esso and Mobil Oil are sold in Trinidad and at the same price as Shell and Texaco. These marketing companies will have to operate on the same basis when they have to take the product from B.U.O.C. here.

Sir, imagine the hon. senior member for St. Michael talking about distributive companies laying off people if the Agreement is concluded! The hon. member says that we are going to have more unemployment because distributing companies would have to close down. For an intelligent man like him, I do not know who put that nonsense in his head. The point is, whether or not you have a refinery here, the consumption of gasoline would remain what it is or expand, so you must have the same distributive people. Because you will have a refinery, it does not mean any decrease in distribution. If you have 60 gasoline stations now, you will have the same 60 and the same people in attendance at the distributing centres. The hon. senior member for St. Michael who says he has an Esso Service Station, if he distributes 500 gallons of gas a day and employs twelve people, he would continue to distribute 500 gallons and have the same twelve people employed whether the oil comes from Trinidad or Barbados.

They will all pay the same income tax. They will distribute the same amount of gasoline now as they did before and they will make the same amount of profits. The hon. member said that they will employ less people and we will get less taxes from them. All we are saying is that we will continue to have the same level of employment at the gasoline stations and collect the same taxation from them and in addition we will also be getting an increase from this refinery which we do not get now and which goes into the pockets of the Trinidad Treasury.

8.15 p.m.

That is the difference; the profits on the refining of petroleum products which are utilised in Barbados which now go to Trinidad will now come here by virtue of this Agreement. Provision is made in the Agreement whereby we will not lose one single cent in customs duty which is now collected on petroleum products for the simple reason that the British Union Oil Company will continue to pay the same duty on all of its imports. The only point is that whereas other companies would have to pay a consumption tax, the British Union Oil Company will also pay that, but it will be refunded to them. We will get employment for our people; we have the possibilities of additional sources of employment as the refinery expands and for the life of me I cannot find one single legitimate reason for hon. members to oppose this Agreement. I am left to find out how any hon. member of this Chamber could attempt, with any degree of justification, to find himself in opposition to this Agreement today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think I need make any further rejoinder at this stage to the points which have been raised by hon. members. There were a few minor points made by some hon. members but the answer to every single point which has been made is to be found in the Agreement. All that is needed is an intelligent perusal of the points in the Agreement.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Minister is about to wind up the debate obviously, but he has not yet replied to the question which has been posed in relation to the abysmal ignorance about oil in which

he confessed he did not consult any independent consultant in the drawing up of this Agreement.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Because I know that the members of the Opposition would do that.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not hear what the hon. member really said. I regard the points which I have raised as major points, because those points relate to giving this Company the power to do something which they should not do. When we pass this Resolution ratifying this Agreement, this is a legislative enactment and I cannot vote for this Agreement with this Clause in it. Strikes or combination of workmen or lock-outs have nothing to do with epidemic, quarantine and adjuncts of shipping or navigation. This is an industrial matter. These are important matters and I cannot vote for this Clause in this Agreement because it is against my conscience to give any company the right to determine wages with the statute as I have read as to labour legislation in Barbados. If the hon. member is unwilling to remove this Clause then my willingness to vote for this Resolution is as I have indicated.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two motions before the House. One is a motion made by the Hon. Leader of the House that this Resolution do now pass; and there is an amendment moved by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that this Resolution be referred to a Select Committee. I will put the amendment first. The question is that this Resolution be referred to a Select Committee. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. WALCOTT, HOLDER, SMITH, SEALEY, LYNCH, GODDARD and MOTTLEY - 7.

NOES: Mr. BATSON, HON'BLE E. W. BARROW, W. A. CRAWFORD, G. G. FERGUSSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, J. C. TUDOR, MESSRS. CORBIN, WEEKES, LOWE, YEARWOD and BOXILL - 11.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the negative, seven hon. members voting "Aye" and eleven hon. members voting "No". I now declare that the "Noes" have it. The question now is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BATSON, HON'BLE E. W. BARROW, W. A. CRAWFORD, G. G. FERGUSSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, J. C. TUDOR, MESSRS. CORBIN, WEEKES, LOWE, YEARWOOD and BOXILL - 11.

NOES: Messrs. WALCOTT, HOLDER, SMITH, SEALEY, LYNCH, GODDARD and MOTTLEY - 7.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, eleven hon. members voting "Aye" and seven hon. members voting "No". I declare that the "Ayes" have it.

This Resolution has now been passed.
8.25 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Order of the Day is Order No. 2 to move the second reading of a Bill to consolidate and revise the laws relating to Trade Unions. I think that this is bound to be regarded as controversial. Peaceful picketing at houses and so on has never been supported by the Opposition. I do not know if we can do Order No. 4 which is the second reading of a Bill further to amend the Casual Employees Pensions Act, 1961. I do not know if that is regarded as non-controversial. If hon. members are willing to support this as non-controversial, I beg to move that Order No. 4 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

THE CASUAL EMPLOYEES PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1963.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to move the second reading of a Bill further to amend the Casual Employees Pensions Act, 1961.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Bill which we have before us is remarkably simple in its operation and in its application. Before the Casual Employees Act of 1961 came into force, casual employees who had worked for not less than 250 days in the ten years last before retirement, were awarded pensions on the same basis as public employees, and they were allowed to exercise the option of receiving a gratuity and reduced pension in lieu of the full pension. Recently it was brought to our notice that there is no provision under the Act of 1961 for a casual employee to receive a gratuity in lieu of pension, and a sub-Committee was set up of people in the Government Service concerned with these matters such as the Auditor General and so on and members of the Whitley Council, to review the basis of the award of pensions to casual employees particularly in this respect; but for some reason which is very difficult to understand, although they had every intention of making this recommendation, the option which we now seek to give the casual employees was omitted from the recommendations in the drafting of the provisions. This was unfortunately omitted, and all that the instant Bill seeks to do therefore is to place these employees on the same footing as other Government pensioners whereby they will have the right to exercise an option and accept a reduced pension and receive a gratuity in lieu thereof.

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. Deputy Speaker, I am not opposed to the Bill.....

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 8.30 p.m., and according to Standing Order No. 5 (4) I must enquire if the matter under discussion is controversial.

Mr. SMITH: Yes. It is controversial.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Under Standing Order No. 5 (5) "any business which when called during the time of unopposed business is objected to by a Member shall not be proceeded with, but shall stand over until the next meeting of the House in the place in which it shall be fixed upon the fixing of the Order Paper."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I think in fairness that Your Honour ought to point out to the hon. member who after all is not a lawyer that in this context and not in the Barbadian context, it means you have to actually object to the passage of the Bill for it to be controversial under this Order, and I think the hon. member, if he is saying he objects to the casual employees having reduced pensions and gratuities — that is the only grounds on which he can object at this stage —

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can only presume the hon. member knows what the Standing Order means.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Then I take it the hon. member is objecting to the terms of this Bill. I think Your Honour ought to tell the hon. member that this is the effect or the intention of any statement he makes to that effect.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That settles the matter. The hon. member has heard, and according to Standing Order No. 5 (5) this matter shall not be proceeded with, but shall stand over until the next sitting of the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In other words, Sir, the hon. member is opposed to the granting of a gratuity and reduced pensions to casual employees. That is all we want to find out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has objected to it. Other hon. members have explained it and I can only regard the matter as closed. Is there any other item under Government business which can be regarded as uncontroversial?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Order No. 9 also deals with pensions.

I beg to move that the Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order 1963" to be the next order of the Day. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is very interested in pensions, Sir. 8.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: I doubt very much that that Bill has been circularised. I do not know what this Pension Bill deals with. I have now been informed by an hon. member on my left that it has been circularised and it deals with this Attorney General business. If I may point out to Your Honour, you cannot deal with this now. There is a Bill coming now dealing with these offices so how can you deal with this Resolution now?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, for the benefit of hon. members of this House, I say this. The hon. senior member for St. Peter asked how can hon. members deal with this now. This Order which is entitled the Pension (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1963, was made and signed by the Officer administering the Government of this country. Orders under the Civil Establishment Act are made and after they are made, a Resolution has to come to the House. There are two things connected with the Order. The Order has to be published in the *Official Gazette* and this has already been done and the Resolution has to come to the House for approval. You cannot compare the reference to the Provost Marshal and say it has something to do with Order No. 10, which deals with references to the Provost Marshal. This is a Pensionable Order dealing with the pensioning of these posts and reorganisation and it means that all the holders of these posts will now have a pension and, therefore, this Resolution only relates to pensions of these persons. It is a very simple matter and it is not in any way depending on the passage of any Bill through the House. This Resolution is one to give approval to the pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1963, which was made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and published in the *Official Gazette*.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is another Resolution here on the Order Paper. The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, states about these things and this Order has to pass this House of Assembly first. It says: "Resolve that the Order entitled 'The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1963' made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 23rd day of May, 1963, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, be approved."

This has to be approved by the House of Assembly. It has not yet been approved.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not say that that Order did not have to be approved by the House. I said that it did not have to depend on the passage of a Bill. There is a Bill with reference to the post of Provost Marshal. I said that an Order has to be published in the *Official Gazette* and the Resolution embodying it has to get the approval of the House of Assembly. I thought I made myself clear on that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member does not know that Order No. 9 to approve the Order entitled the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1963, is dependent on our giving approval to Order No. 8 dealing with the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1963.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is the very Resolution I was speaking of. The hon. member apparently did not hear.

Mr. WALCOTT: Order No. 8 is the one which you should deal with first.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This will not do. Let me put the question. Is Order No. 9 controversial?

Mr. WALCOTT: Order No. 9 deals with pensions. This Order is to give approval to these posts which are set out in the Order. I am saying if you are going to deal with the pensions of these officers to let us deal first with the posts which you have to approve of because if the House does not approve of the Civil Establishment Order setting out those posts then, you may be passing a pension for something to which you have not given approval.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that Order No. 9 under Government Business is controversial.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Why did you not say so?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is there any Order under Government Business which is not controversial?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what about Order No. 5 which is to give approval to the lease by the Executive Committee of land in the Port area to Messrs. Booth Steamship Company (Barbados) Limited. (A Pause)

I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not opposed to this but what I do not understand. An Order is not controversial based on the fact that you want to speak on it. I take it that they want us to give acceptance to a thing without saying a word on it. Similarly, about this question of giving approval to the lease of this nine acres of land at the Port area, it does not mean that it is controversial if we want to discuss it.

The question that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION RE LEASE OF 900 SQUARE FEET LAND AT PORT AREA

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks to lease to the Booth Steamship Company 900 square feet of land in the Port Area to house a building for stevedoring purposes. In the Port Area, Messrs. DaCosta & Company Limited has already been given a lease of a parcel of land for housing their stevedoring equipment. The Booth Steamship Company is now seeking provision of this area of land for the purpose of housing their stevedoring equipment. The price per square foot is two cents per month or 24 cents per year. That is the same amount as what Messrs. DaCosta and Company Limited pays for the area occupied by them for similar purposes at the Port. 8.45 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the matter is set out in the Addendum to the Resolution as follows:-

It is proposed to lease approximately 900 square feet of land at the rate of two cents per square foot per month to be paid annually in advance. The period of the lease is to be 10 years with the option of renewal for a further ten (10) years. A condition of the lease to be that Government be given the option of acquiring the building at the appraisal value on the termination of the lease either upon by non-renewal after the first ten (10) year period at the expiry of the twenty (20) year period if another lease is not then arranged. The other terms for the lease are to be such as are normal for such undertakings. The drawings of the

elevation of the proposed building will be submitted for the approval of the Town and Country Planning Officer before the erection of the building.

With those remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is there any other Order under Government Business which is not controversial? (After a pause). I hear voices but I do not see any hon. member standing.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the consideration of the Resolution which we have just concluded

brings Government Business to an end for the day, since it does not appear that hon. members want to co-operate in having any more work done.

The Order Paper having been fixed,

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 11th June, 1963 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday 11th June, 1963 at 12 o'clock Noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.52 p.m.