
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 28th May, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats."

MINUTES

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, can you tell me how many Minutes of meetings are not yet ready? (*A Pause*) I should like you to investigate the matter and let us have the report for as many meetings as are not yet ready for confirmation. We should confirm the Minutes of the previous meeting at every meeting of the House. If my memory serves me correctly, Your Honour made the same report at last Tuesday's meeting.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will do that.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.5) Order, 1963;

The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1963.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier, Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.5) Order, 1963".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1963".

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Resolution to place the sum of \$81,600 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of advancing funds to the University of the West Indies to meet the cost of modification of buildings and other capital costs of establishing a College of Arts and Sciences in Barbados.

Sir, it is my intention to ask leave of the House to proceed with this Resolution at today's Sitting in all its stages. Copies of the Resolution will be available to hon. members shortly.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier, A Bill to provide for the construction of references to the Provost Marshal in the Acts and subsidiary legislation of the Island and in certain legal documents consequent upon the abolition of that office and to the Provost Marshal's Act, 1904.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On my own behalf, a Bill to make provision for the grant of concessions in relation to income tax, trade tax, the fees chargeable under the provision of the Interim Traders Act, 1909 for an interim traders licence, customs duties and package tax in aid of industries producing exclusively for export and for other matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

A Bill to amend the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958.

A Bill to provide incentives for the establishment and development of industries in this Island by the grant of relief from income tax, trade tax, interim traders' licence fees, and customs duties and for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

PRIVATE MEMBERS NOTICE

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

WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists wherever field workers are concerned as regards the system of laying off without proper notice given;

AND WHEREAS the said workers have families to support;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government notify all supervisors not to lay off any worker without giving him proper notice in order that the said worker be allowed time to adjust himself.
12.20 p.m.

QUESTIONS

Mr. YEARWOOD: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that residents in the Cliff Cottage area in the parish of St. John, although provided with a domestic water service, are often without a constant supply of water?

2. Will the Minister remedy this state of affairs as soon as possible?

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

Is Government aware that Government pensioners have to wait for long hours to receive their pension on pay days and sometimes return home without receiving such pension due to the expiry of time?

2. Is the Government aware that because of the long period of waiting several of these pensioners become ill?

3. Will Government devise some means whereby payments to these pensioners can be made more quickly and more easily?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:

A Bill to provide for the construction of references to the Provost Marshal in the Acts and subsidiary legislation of the Island and in certain legal documents consequent upon the abolition of that office and to the Provost Marshal's Act, 1904.

A Bill to make provision for the grant of concessions in relation to income tax, trade tax, the fees chargeable under the provision of the Interim Traders Act, 1909 for an interim traders licence, customs duties and package tax in aid of industries producing exclusively for export and for other matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

A Bill to amend the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958.

A Bill to provide incentives for the establishment and development of industries in this Island by the grant of relief from income tax, trade tax, interim traders' licence fees, and customs duties and for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the money Resolution of which notice was given earlier today and for which leave was asked to proceed with in all of its stages - that is, the Resolution for the sum of \$81,600.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1963-64 No. 3

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$10,483 at

the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 3, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. This is a Resolution under four Heads of the Estimates, and as is customary, these Heads will be taken separately.

HEAD 9 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, under this Head there is Item 16 (New) United Nations Technical Assistance Local Costs. In explanation of the Item it is disclosed that under the Expanded Technical Assistance Programme, the Governments assume responsibility for that part of the cost or assistance which can be paid in their own currency. They also require that some contribution in a lumpsum be made in their own currency towards the local living costs of the experts, the contribution being payable in advance at the beginning of each calendar year. Each Government is assessed the equivalent of 12.5% of the total cost of expert services to be provided to that Government under the expanded programme. In addition to that, we are also supplying the travelling allowance and local costs of United Nations experts on assignment here, and supplementary provision of the sum of \$4,815 is required. The breakdown is as follows:-

- (a) \$2,880 - Local costs for 1963.
- (b) \$ 675 - Transportation of Industrial Development Adviser.
- (c) \$1,260 - Travelling Allowance to the Economic Adviser for the period August 1961 to May, 1963,

when his term in Barbados will expire. I beg to move that Head 9 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put, I would like to get a little information relative to the local costs for 1963.

12.30 p.m.

We pretty well appreciate the transportation and travelling allowance of these officers, but should like you to give us a little closer detail and breakdown of the \$2,880 for local costs for 1963.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, before that is answered, I think the Hon. Minister should take this opportunity now to let the House and the public know something about some of these Expanded Programmes for which we are receiving this assistance. For example, I regard the transportation of the Industrial Development Adviser and the Economic Adviser important enough for the House and the public to know what these people are doing and on what aspects they are advising the Government. We should know something about this rather than just be told that this is part of the United Nations Technical Assistance programme and these people are here and we are paying their expenses. It is true that this is a new item, but you should tell us what they are doing. Some of us may know, but I do not think the House as a whole or the public generally knows. What is the Industrial Development Adviser here to do? Whom is he advising and with what in view? The economic Adviser has been here for some time, and you should let us know to what extent he is advising in his office.

Whilst I am on my feet, I should like to make this general criticism. These advisers stem from the United Nations and some from I.L.O., and it is at these overall conferences - just like at the UNESCO where they decide what they are going to do for education, at ECOSOC where they decide what they are going to do in expanding the economic programme, and at I.L.O. where they decide what

they are going to do in the labour programme in these various territories when we have problems to deal with. What is extremely remarkable about the Barbados Government, both past and present, is that it finds that the expenses are too great for it to be a participant at the conferences of these big organisations. For example, the present Government says that \$10,000 are too much to send a delegation to the I.L.O. Conference, but you find other territories like Jamaica and Trinidad participating in these things, because they are getting into the swing of world organisation, and being exposed to what is taking place in the world on these vast problems. Yet you find that Barbados remains in the backwash of this atmosphere where they are not exposed to these things, and only Ministers or those who become members of the Government of the day regard themselves as the ones knowledgeable on these things. You are getting assistance from the United Nations Technical Assistance Programme, but you will only get that because conferences have been held, and when people meet at conferences, they express their views, and then the Government bodies or smaller committees begin to work these things out. It is a strange thing to find that prior to this talk of independence, the Governments of Barbados, Jamaica and Trinidad sent delegations to the I.L.O.. It looks to me very strange indeed that the impecunious circumstances of the Government of Barbados, both past and present, have made it very convenient to have their delegations exposed to these things. I have attended these meetings, and I can say that the country benefits when you have people attending these meetings, because they are exposed to world issues and not parish pump issues dealing with pipes, a post box or something in the parish; they are exposed to big problems of the day which you have to deal with eventually. If we are catching up with automation, and new techniques must take place in the world, many of these things are going to affect us.

Mr. Chairman, there is no point in the Government of Barbados having an Economic Adviser, and then the nation with which he has a right to deal does not get the benefit of exposure which is very vital. I do hope they will begin to fall in line with more progressive countries so that what happens here today does not pass, and nobody seeks to know what the Economic Adviser and the Industrial Development Adviser are doing. Is he advising on development techniques in business? Is he asking people to be more knowledgeable of the labour business? You are spending money on these experts though they are paid for by these organisations, and we are entitled to have more knowledge about them. I think it is fair when we have Resolutions of this character for the Minister to inform the House what they are all about.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Sir, while it is true that this is a new item, the matters to which it specifically refers are not entirely new. The experts whose expenses are covered by the proposals in the Resolution have been with us for some time, and therefore I assumed that what they are doing is, generally speaking, very well known to members of the House. There is only one expert of recent arrival in the Island, Mr. Abrahams, but the others to whom this Resolution refer include Dr. Tulstrom, the Water Resources Expert who has been here for some time; then we had Mr. Stockman, the Social Security Expert who finished his stay here early last week; and we had the World Health Organisation experts working on the Environmental Sanitation programme and the Aedes Egypti campaign over a period of years, of whom at present there are three. Of all these experts, the most recent, as I said, is Mr. Charles Abrahams, and he is here as Industrial Development Adviser to carry out feasibility studies on various industries, and in consequence he has to pay visits to various sites, agricultural establishments and other areas of economic potential throughout the Island. I think he will be here for about three months, and it was considered that it would be cheaper to place a self-driven car at his disposal since we have got to provide his transport anyway. We think it more economical to give him a self-driven car than to provide a chauffeur-driven car which would cost considerably more.

In addition, Sir, we have had Dr. Von Gersdorff, the Government Economic Adviser, with us for some time; his

tenure of office expires at the end of this month, I think. Now the question of providing transport for Dr. Von Gersdorff has also been raised. He brought in his own car on which he paid freight and port charges amounting to \$650, and he has requested that he be paid \$60 a month for his entire assignment in lieu of the provision of transportation. Since in principle the transportation of these officers falls on the Government, Sir, it was felt that you would include all the transportation expenses of these United Nations experts in one omnibus Resolution for presentation to the Legislature.

With regard to the question of representation at the I.L.O. raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the decisions by the Government in this respect were arrived at purely on the grounds of economy.
12.40 p.m.

We did not feel that we could afford to spend \$10,000 on technical assistance this year for participation in the parleys of the I.L.O. at Geneva. The hon. member would recall that during the existence of the old Federation the interests in this respect of the units of the Federation were handled by the Federal Government, and it seems likely that within a very short time we will have another Federation, and therefore it is to be hoped that by next year a new Federal Government would be able to take up from where the old one left off.

Failure of the Government to participate in any of the exercises of this organization does not mean failure of the Government to recognize the importance of the decisions of this organization to this country, and of a country on the verge of independence obtaining the maximum advantages out of the very participation into these international discussions in which the solutions arrived at are aimed at solving many of our problems and at which many of our problems are ironed out. However, Sir, we had to consider carefully many of our Items of Expenditure, and facing a deficit as we are, we felt in order of our priorities that we could exclude participation in this exercise on this occasion.

I do not want the hon. member or other hon. members to think that the Government is indifferent or fails to appreciate the important solutions arrived at after a process of discussions and what not in problems of this sort.

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

HEAD 20 - LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Head 20 - Local Government - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Head 20 deals with Local Government. This is a new item - Rent. The sum of \$1,824 is required to make the cost of rental of premises accommodating the offices of the Local Government Commissioner. The rental is for a period of ten months, June, 1963 to March 1964 inclusive.

I beg to move that Head 20 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know where are these offices which the Government proposes to rent for the Local Government Commissioner. I have very strong views on Local Government as a whole, but I am not taking this opportunity to deal with Local Government. The Hon. Leader of the House has just talked about, if I may term it, Government being in impecunious circumstances for projecting other Items of Expenditure. However, I am a bit constrained to willingly agree to a further expenditure on Local Government. The Local Government itself needs very extensive investigation in order to see whether we are not spending too much money on something from which we are not getting the maximum results.

I would like to know where these offices for the Local Government Commissioner are situated at present. The offices for this Commissioner have been moving up and down for some time, and I have had great difficulty in finding the Local Government Commissioner. On one occasion I went

into the Public Buildings in search of him and then on another occasion I was told that his offices were at the New Hospital. I do now know if they were sited there because a new internee began to take up the duties of that office.

However, Sir, Government has lots of bits of buildings all about, and Government should see to it that they bring them together as much as possible. On the Wharf, you have that big building which houses the Parcel Post Department of your Post Office. This is a building which was not designed for a Post Office and the area there is not the best. I regret to say that it is time the Government should look into this matter of Government buildings and decide whether to bring them into line with modern trends.

Another example of a building unsuited for its purpose is the place which they have just bought in Fontabelle for housing the Labour Department. While it may appear that they got it at a cheap price, in the first place, when I go into that building, I find that there are a lot of little rooms and, may be, that building would cost the Government a lot of money to convert it into proper offices. I think a little examination can be made of Government offices.

I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me where are the offices which the Government proposes to rent for the Local Government Commissioner.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, as I see from the Note to this Item, this amount of \$1,300 is required to meet the cost of rent of offices for the Local Government Commissioner and this amount covers a period of ten months from June this year until March next year, which means that it would cover the balance of the financial year.

I would like to know what is operating in the Government's mind as to whether or not they are thinking of a permanent arrangement for rental of offices for the Local Government Commissioner or of the alternative of using some office in a Government building. In other words, are you making any arrangements to see whether these offices can be housed in one of the Government's building? I would be glad if the Minister is willing to say these things because it would give a different picture of what the position will be for the next financial year.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think I will agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter as regards the unsuitability of the present building in which the Labour Department is housed. We of this Government did not buy it; we found it there, but it is a most unsuitable building for a department of that size. I have resisted a lot of demands for piecemeal alterations to it mainly because I cannot see, even with the enormous expenditure on it for repairs, how it would be quite suitable for a department of that size. While the site there may be a grand one, I think the decision to house that Department there was a mistake.

Now, Sir, as regards the premises being required for rental of offices for the Local Government Commissioner, the building is located in Fontabelle at a place called "Galba Lodge".

There were other suggestions made originally. Firstly, the Local Government Commissioner was housed in the Public Buildings and then there was some talk of moving him to the site originally occupied by the Belmont Police Post. That suggestion was decided against.

It must be borne in mind that even now when the general activities of Local Government might give rise to adverse comments from time to time, some office outside of the Public Buildings would have to be found for the Local Government Commissioner; and it must also be borne in mind that apart from that, the Local Government Commissioner is required by law to be responsible for the conduct of General Elections, Local Government Elections, Federal Elections, Bye-Elections and for the preparation and revision of the Register of Electors. We therefore had to provide adequate space for him to function, and, at the moment, this area of offices at Fontabelle which is around 800 square feet was

regarded as more appropriate in view of the activities of the Local Government Commissioner.
12.50 p.m.

He does not rent the whole building. (Mr. WALCOTT: Is it 800 square feet or 8,000 square feet?) It is 800 square feet because, as I say, he does not require the whole building. The possibility of securing more permanent accommodation is under investigation at the moment. That is all I can say with regard to the question posed by the hon. junior member for St. George. There are several considerations in view, and it is likely that, by the time this period has expired, we may have something more permanent with which to come to the Legislature.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice to the voices of hon. members who have spoken against this expenditure of \$1,300. I would suggest that some accommodation be found in some of the Government existing buildings for this Officer. We know that this officer must have some reasonable accommodation for himself and his staff, but certainly we have got to do everything possible to keep down expenditure. Wherever one goes in this island he can hear about the high expenditure in this colony; with the establishment of the Government's new Headquarters I feel that some suitable place could be found for this officer and his staff, so that this expenditure of \$1,300 could be used in another direction. Someone may say that it is not a heavy expenditure, but I would say that small drops of water make a large ocean.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member tell us specifically what Government buildings he is suggesting should be used?

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, I am not picking out the place because I am not the Government. I am saying, Sir, that in order to save this expenditure, there should be some suitable place found in the Public Buildings to house this officer and his staff.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I feel that the mistake which some hon. members make about the Government is that we just pull something out of the air and ask people to spend money out of the Treasury without proper consideration being given to effecting savings in any direction. I am often surprised at members of the Chamber of Commerce at their meetings and at what I chose to call the untitled reporters of some of the Daily Newspapers, assuming that the Ministers of the Government and the members of the Civil Service who work with and under them have no intellectual discipline, and they approach the whole exercise of Government in a very haphazard and nonchalant manner. That may be perfectly true of the last Government but, as Minister of Finance, I can assure the hon. member and his colleague who is always exercising himself in matters which are too high for him that this Government does not come to this House and ask for one single penny unless we have thoroughly investigated and canvassed all possibilities which would relieve the burden of the taxpayers of this island. I want to make that clear.

I went to the old Combermere School by way of the approach to the old Combermere School at Weymouth from the eastern end. I wanted to transfer the Ministry of Social Services and perhaps the Local Government Officer to the old building at Combermere School. There is a wall which presents itself to you, and when I went inside the building I found that it was a whole shell. It was demolished after erection with the grant of the taxpayers' money and I discovered that all there was there was a shed for motor cars. I want to say that our Ministers are not satisfied with the replies and answers which are given to them; it is not that we doubt anybody, but we like to be able to speak for ourselves.

With regard to this question now before us, it is a matter of 800 square feet of space which we consider to be adequate for the Local Government Office. In Montreal, the whole of the Trade Commissioner Service for the Eastern Caribbean would be occupied on one thousand square feet

of space at \$3.60 (Canadian) per square foot. It is not only a question of the amount of money, but it is actually a question of the amount of physical space required for the proper carrying out of duties of this Officer. All of that has been investigated. I think that that is the reason why the Hon. Leader of the House asked the hon. member who made that suggestion about the use of some other building, which building he wants us to occupy. We would be glad to know. It is true that sometimes we discover that the Government owns a piece of property which you would never have dreamt belonged to the public, and if there is any such building, we would withdraw this Resolution and use that building. However, I do not want anybody to think that we have made a haphazard approach to this matter. No matter from which side of the House an hon. member comes, I deplore hon. members making these trite remarks knowing the approach which it is clear, we have to the problems of this island.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the hon. member have caused me to rise to my feet again. I think that the hon. member would agree that a comparison with Barbados and Canada would be erroneous. You cannot compare the floor space for human utilisation in a tropical country as you would in another country. In one country you try to keep out the cold air whilst in a tropical country you want to keep people far apart so that friction would be kept away. For example, the seats in the House of Commons are near per square foot and per cubic foot and they are occupied on a closer basis than we could accommodate members of the House with temperaments such as ours. If you were to place us in the same way as in the House of Commons, you would have a glorified wrestling match each day. With the offensive remarks which are made in here, you would not have to be too far away from arm's length for a decision to be made quite easily.

I think it must be quite clear that hon. members must not make personal references.
1.00 p.m.

I would say that it is a Barbadian cult, and the Hon. Premier is a Barbadian; but he cannot in one breath say that people do not give credit to the Government for undertaking these things and in the same breath tell the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that he is dealing with matters that are above him. I personally do not feel that those unnecessary, vulgar and personal remarks are worthy of people to make, because it is a typical Barbadian trait to say that people do not know about something when they do not know what the person really knows, because they have never really made an examination of the person to know if he knows what he is talking about. The hon. member said that if someone can tell him where they can get an office, he would withdraw this Resolution. I do not think he really means that. I think the hon. member should try to appreciate the fact that we are not in Government to make these decisions, but he cannot assume when these things come down that we have not given them study. I would say that even with the note written on this, if someone other than the Premier was reading it, he could not come to the same conclusion he came to because it says "an amount of \$1,300 is required to meet the cost of rental of premises accommodating the offices of the Local Government Commissioner." When you read this, at first blush one would think you are renting premises and not office space, but a lawyer may say that office space is premises.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said this is some place called "Galba Lodge", and that is why I asked about this 800 square feet which you are going to rent at some place called "Galba Lodge"; but it turns out that you are not renting "Galba Lodge", you are renting office space in "Galba Lodge", which is a different thing. I intend to speak on another aspect in this Resolution on the Post Office to justify what I have said, but I do not consider that you should compare the cost of 800 square feet in Barbados with the rental in Canada. It would be madness and fantastic to make any comparison between the value of land in these two places. What I do not like about these things is that the Hon. Premier was in this House for longer periods an ordinary member than as a member of the Government, and if any member exercises the same freedom that he

exercised before he became a member of the Government, he must not tell the member that he is talking about matters that are too high for him, because that has a very peculiar way of rebounding like a boomerang. If the Hon. Premier tells the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that, there are members in his Party to whom that would apply, and he can look around and see. Maybe that is one of the reasons why you cannot utilise them, because you consider politics too high for them and they cannot be brought into the whole swim of things.

I feel, Sir, that in the House no member has the right to make these unnecessary remarks, more so if you profess Socialist philosophies, because the gap between the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the Premier is only a matter of accident and not a matter of design, because their great-grandfathers did not have anything.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member spends most of his time telling the Government what to do, how to behave and what to say, and he is always saying that he is not working for anybody. When he is talking about vulgarity, I consider that the essence of it, but I want to make this straight. I understand he made some remarks about me being impertinent to go off on the people's business.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is not a point of order, if you know what you are talking. A point of order relates to a remark. If the hon. member wants to hear what I said, I said that he went off, and I can repeat it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: What was said on the previous occasion is not a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter take his seat?

Mr. WALCOTT: What I said on a previous occasion is not a point of order. If you do not know the rules, I will tell you that. Let me make it quite clear to you, Mr. Chairman, that he is Premier of the Government but not of the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, you asked the hon. member to sit down.

Mr. WALCOTT: Let him ask the Marshal or a Policeman to come and take me out. You will soon want to pass laws that we can't get up in here and speak, but you will do that over my dying body and not while I am alive.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Rules of the House are.....

Mr. WALCOTT: The Rules of the House are that if you rise on a point of order, you should make it and not make a speech.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member is going to stand up, I will stand up too. I am observing the Rules of the House, and when you rose, I sat down, but I will deal with him afterwards. I just want to make it clear on this point of order that I can make any statement I like. I do not have to say I do not work for anybody, because I never worked for anybody.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order. Do you want us to go on like this the whole day?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am going to stand up; I am not going to sit down this time.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not going to sit down either.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier is making a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: He cannot make a point of order by saying what he is saying. He cannot refer to what I said last week in making a point of order, and he has to understand that we have Rules here.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member is making a speech and is on a point of order, ...

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there are three members on the floor; please rule on this matter.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, it is your prerogative to rule, and if you cannot rule, ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will all hon. members please sit? I will listen now to the point of order by the Hon. Premier.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was not dealing with the Resolution, but acting as some kind of self-appointed mentor of the members of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order. Read the Rules. A member must rise and say what is the point of order on which he has risen. He cannot rise on a point of order and start off by saying the hon. member is acting as some self-appointed mentor. A point of order, as I said, is on something which is contrary to what was said, and you should go and read May's Parliamentary procedure. I was making a speech and said that the personal reference made to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was not correct, and it was improper and unnecessary to do it. If that is what the hon. member is rising on a point of order to say, let him say that the personal reference to the hon. member is improper.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. senior member for St. Peter making a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I was making a speech and the hon. member rose on a point of order. If he rises on a point of order, he has to state it directly and immediately, and not be castigating me as a preamble to making the point of order. This is not a Sunday school organisation. The hon. member has to bear in mind that this is not a matter of whether or not he likes me. I have been elected here like him; I was not rolled here in a wheelbarrow. I have been elected by the people of Barbados and I have the right to come here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I allow the hon. member to speak after the point of order has been made.
1.10 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: He has to establish it immediately. We have to be afraid of this kind of dictatorship too. Nobody is going to browbeat me.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, you should rule what sort of behaviour we should have in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The hon. member has no regard for the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member cannot rise on a point of order like that. I am not like them to get any favours from the Hon. Premier. He has to abide by the Rules of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Peter has to respect the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: If he rises on a point of order, he has to state his point of order. He does not have to refer to me personally.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, you have heard all of this ranting and vituperation which was going on, and the hon. member would not even allow me to establish my point of order. I am talking of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I can answer him, but I will not answer him now. The hon. member is acting as some kind of self-appointed mentor and guide for members of the House.

This is the point of order. What I did say was that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph — not the hon. senior member for St. Joseph — who wastes more time in

this House than anybody else, is always exercising himself in great matters which are too high for him. It was in reference to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and he must not assume that members of the Government defend me. I will deal with the hon. senior member for St. Peter later on.

Mr. WALCOTT: You have to look around there and deal with the people over there. You cannot make that assertion about me. You can deal with people who reduce themselves to going under the counter. I have never gone under a counter yet. I have never been in for those sort of practices. You cannot deal with men who have been in Parliament and know their way about.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member get on with the Resolution?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, when the Hon. Premier was not the Premier, he came in here and made criticisms of the last Government. I say that you cannot expect to make criticisms of a Government when you were in the Opposition, and now that someone makes criticisms of your Government, you make these unfortunate references by telling the hon. member who is making criticisms of your Government that he is dealing with something which he is incapable of dealing with. I say that that can reflect on yourself too.

The Hon. Premier said that he will deal with me later on. I never yet dealt with a man behind his back; I deal with a man before his face and I will deal with him before his face. If you are getting afraid, I am not afraid. I was never afraid of the people, not even when they were doing what they did, and saying what they did. You should be the last man to say that you are going to deal with me. You have to look to members of your own Party and see how they dealt with you. Before this thing is ended, you will see whom they will deal with.

(A VOICE: Question.)

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it is not time yet for the question to be put. You will notice that I had nothing to say on the Resolution. The Hon. Premier was replying to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and referred to me for taking up matters which are too high for me. That would show you that the Hon. Premier wants to fight. I was as quiet as anything could be.

Sir, even from my nasty way of doing things, it did not run my wife to America. I was always honest and upright and I know how to handle my home. My wife did not have to run away from me and that is what I am telling everybody in this House. I did not have to spend the Government's money to bring her back.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is that a matter of interest to what we are debating?

Mr. SMITH: That is my nasty way of talking and doing. The Hon. Premier said that I take up matters which are too high for me. Even if it is nothing which I say, no right-thinking person can accuse me of wasting time in this House. The only person who can do that is the Hon. Premier. Even if I take up matters which are too high for me I have taken a leaf out of his book. The Hon. Premier has undertaken to represent the people in St. John and he has left them out completely. He is killing them with his black box method of doing things. Even if I take up matters which are too high for me, look what he is doing! He has taken up a whole country and is now leading it into chaos.

He is doing these things and leading people in chaos through his black box methods. He is bound to find himself outside. Let him go back to the Courts where he can abuse the Judges and everybody else.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, before we go further, let me get this clearly. Is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph suggesting that my wife left me and went to America and I spent the Government's money to bring her

back? I want to get it clear. I want the hon. member to say if he is making such a statement. One of the unfortunate things emerging from colonialism is that unfortunately we do not have people of the right calibre to come into these institutions to represent people. We still have people of very low intelligence standard. That is unfortunate. If you look at the benches of the Labour Party, you will see exactly what I mean. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is a responsible member and he makes these unfortunate statements. He is casting some kind of aspersions on my character on a matter which is my personal business. I am asking him to make a positive statement. He can ask the same source from which he got it and perhaps they can corroborate him when he gets in a court of law. I would like the hon. member to get up and repeat it.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for the Hon. Premier to involve me. I hope he is not thinking of involving me because I know nothing of the discussion going on in this House at all.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have asked the hon. junior member for St. Joseph a question, and I am waiting for an answer. If you cannot manage to get an answer from the hon. member, then I would have to ask that the hon. member be named for disreputable conduct.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph willing to accede to the Hon. Premier's request?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I do not want to reduce the level of the House to the point to which it seems precipitously near. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph comes here, and, in reply to remarks made by the Hon. Premier, makes allegations which can be termed as personal allegations; so I think in fairness to himself and his own reputation, the hon. member should speak what he knows and not what he thinks; therefore, he should make it clear whether the remarks were generally made or whether the intention of his making them was that they should have some personal reference.
1.20 p.m.

After all, this is Parliament; it is not a rum shop; and the kind of behaviour, aspersions and allegations which you can make in a rum shop corner or on the soap box should not be part and parcel of the behaviour of this House. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is merely generalising and he should be man enough as to say so. We should not have any provocations which would lead to retaliation like that used in Parliament for malicious interventions against hon. members of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would like to agree with the Hon. Leader of the House. As I said at the beginning, I think that we should be able to control ourselves with these personal references; you begin something in one way and it ends up in another way. I say that it is uncharitable and unwarrantable to make any personal remarks to any hon. member. I do not agree with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in any way, whether it is a general remark or whether it is a personal remark, because I regard making personal and extremely personal and delicate remarks to people where any relative of theirs is involved, is uncalled for, ungentlemanly and has no bearing, whether it is on a political platform or in a rum shop unless the remark is made to you in the way in which you would have to repudiate it in the same way. I am not condoning the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in his remark; I feel that he should withdraw those remarks which he made so that they will have no reference to anyone, whether it be directly or generally. But I want to say that some people are aided and abetted by listeners in making personal remarks, and if the Hon. Premier would only avoid being the first person to make personal reference of a derogatory nature to people, then these things would be completely avoided. As I have already said, it is a Barbadian cult. I remember a Premier before the present Premier looking at a member of the Lodge School Board when he became a member of the Board, and making the remark that instead of that member being a member of the Lodge School Board he should be in school. Both of those people are out of the House today. I would say that

if you have had the advantage of getting an education which another person did not have, you should see how fortunate you were. It is a question of economics that one person did not have the advantage which another person had. Socialists do not begin to decry those who did not have opportunities; they do not make any reference to the lack of education of anyone. If everybody had the means of getting education or educational advantages, he would be worthless if he did not get it.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I will submit to you that if a member makes a remark like that which has been made today, the Chair should promptly ask that member or any member to withdraw at any time any remarks which he made in a debate, and you should not allow any other hon. member to continue in that way. It is the prerogative of the Chair to call upon a member to withdraw a remark. But the position is that the Chair looks to see whether he is going to be supported in asking that a member withdraw something or not. It is your duty, Mr. Chairman, to call upon a member to withdraw certain remarks immediately that they are made. We lose our temper; and if we find that we have made an error, we have to be big enough on sober reflection to say: "I am willing to apologise". I think that the hon. member should withdraw those remarks and apologise to the Chair for the reference which he has made. Mr. Chairman, I want you and the Marshal to take a very good look at the gallery too and let me make it clear once and for all that it is some of the attitudes in the gallery which make new members do certain things. People come into this Chamber and feel that they can challenge the position of hon. members in here.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Whatever the hon. member may feel, he cannot draw attention to strangers in this Chamber unless he is asking the Chair to take notice of the fact that they are in the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is what I am doing.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Then you want the gallery cleared?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the day I want the gallery cleared, I will say so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I am not objecting to what the hon. member is saying; I am simply saying that if you draw to the attention of the Chair the presence of strangers in the gallery, then the House has to be cleared. Therefore, he does not need to make any general remarks. I cannot hear the hon. member draw the attention of strangers in the gallery to the Chair because the Marshal would be in duty bound to clear the House then.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas had to draw that to the hon. member's attention in order to let the hon. member be aware that this is Parliament. Some people come into this gallery and they feel that they have more right to be in the gallery than we have a right to be in here. That does not affect me, however, but I know that it has affected some hon. members when they are speaking. I say that it is very discourteous for people in the gallery to act in a way as if they are participating in the debate. I do not want to go over the unpleasant situation which occurred here during the year, and therefore I am just mentioning that *en passant* and I am letting you know what is taking place. I say to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that the reference which he made was an unfortunate one, and therefore he should withdraw it because it was not a reference which was necessary to be made.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, since I have been in this House for five years I have never seen such conduct in here. I remember that when I came to this House I told the Speaker that I was counting myself to be one of the least in here and I would try to help him to maintain decorum and dignity in this House. It shocks my modesty when I see that you, Mr. Chairman, are sitting down there and do not rule as you should; I see for myself that you have not acted as you should have acted, being the Chairman. You should exer-

cise your power and you must exercise it when the time comes for doing that against the Premier, against the Leader of the House, against myself or against anyone else. You will then have honour and dignity maintained as you should.

1.30 p.m.

You give some of the members too much latitude, and then you cannot check them and that is what is causing this worry today. As soon as you sit in that Chair, everyone in here has to respect you. If you do not lead hon. members, it is a matter for you. I am sorry that hon. members' tempers became so frayed, but I hope they will cool down so that honour and dignity can be maintained in this Chamber. I hope, Sir, that you will do your duty and in turn we will do ours so that the dignity of this House is maintained as long as we sit here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph willing to withdraw the sarcastic remarks and inference made to the Hon. Premier?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask what are the sarcastic remarks I used to the Premier. Before we go further, I should like to say that there was a Rule — I do not know if it is in the new Rules — that if a member made any remark about another member which was unparliamentary and objection was made, it should be made the same time and no speeches allowed. I did not hear any person make any objection to my remarks in the way it should have been done, but if objection is made because you are asking me now to withdraw, I will draw your attention that you have allowed about two or three speeches since, which is wrong. You can check with the Clerks on this. If I used remarks that are unparliamentary, objection must be made the same time and no debate allowed on it, but you have allowed three speeches since.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will realise that those two speeches purposed to the same remarks.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph knows quite well what he said, and is fully aware of the precise objection to his remarks. If he is not prepared to do the correct thing and withdraw the remarks or apologise for any seeming personal reference he made, I will have to move that he is completely irresponsible and that the most malicious and wicked remarks which he has no grounds for making be expunged entirely.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, is the hon. member accusing me of being malicious or wicked?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I will repeat, Sir, that if he is going to come here and make a general statement like that and then he cannot justify the statement, what else can you accuse him of than being malicious, wicked and irresponsible?

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, what statement have I made that I cannot justify? I can remember referring to myself and my wife. If that is what he means, I will withdraw the remarks which I made about myself and my wife.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the entire speech of the hon. member be expunged from the records of the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: May I rise on a point of order? The hon. member is Leader of the House, but I am afraid if he does that, he may be depriving me of my right to take civil remedies against the hon. member. I really would not ask for it to be struck from the record, because I will want it on the record. The hon. member is recalcitrant and has treated not only the Leader of the House and myself, but all the members with contempt and disdain, and I would not want these words to be struck from the records. I would want them to remain because not only people in the outside world can see the calibre of members the Barbados Labour Party sent here, but the Courts will have an accurate record of what the hon. member said, and then he can say he was referring to himself and his wife. With all due

deference to the hon. member, I regard his motion as strictly personal, and though this is not any derogation on anything the hon. member may constitutionally have advanced here — he did it with the greatest of sincerity — yet I personally will not be supporting that motion and will vote against it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think this would go like a real burlesque. I think the Hon. Premier would have to admit if he intends to seek his civil rights, he is at liberty to do so, but in a debate he cannot forewarn us of what he wants to do on matters arising in the Chamber. His taking civil action is a matter for him and the Courts to decide, but I would not like the hon. member to have the whole speech expunged, because I do not think the member's whole speech can be expunged. What I think should be done is that the hon. member should be big enough to say, if these references were personal references to anybody, that he did not mean them. I can get as hot as anybody in here, multiplied ten times. The ones who think they get hot, shout loudly; but they really do not get hot. I get hot and say what I mean, and I do not say what I do not mean. What the hon. member has said, however, is a reflection on the whole House; it is not a reflection on any one member, and therefore he should be willing to have these words withdrawn. Words that make reference to your wife should be left out, because while the hon. member said he was speaking about his wife, I regard speaking about one's wife as personal business and should not be brought here, because I would not want to come here and talk about my wife and myself. Sometimes you have to leave your wife. I left my wife today, because I left her home when I was coming here, and sometimes she leaves me. I do not think, therefore, that the hon. member should have used those remarks. When the hon. member went on to say he did not use Government money to bring her back, it would have the inference that when you were making that remark you did not do it because you did not have Government money to use, and that is where I say it is an uncharitable remark to make and he should be big enough to withdraw it. Do not mind any advice. I find people are always willing to give you advice until you get in trouble, and as soon as you get in trouble they say they did not really mean it that way. That is why I like to be my own counsellor. If I say something about somebody that is probably too hot, I am willing to withdraw. 1.40 p.m.

I say the unfortunate remarks ought not to have been made. I want to say quite bluntly and frankly that the only person whom the hon. member could have meant was the Hon. Premier. Do not make those remarks. If people in politics would only play the game in the ring and would not get outside of the ring and say those things! I am not a member of any political party; therefore I do not have to look to any political boss to see if the boss is vexed. You get these gentlemen looking to see how the face of the Hon. Premier looks. You also get the people over here who belong to the party which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition belongs looking to see how the Leader of the Opposition is looking at them. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph the hon. junior member for St. Peter and myself can look into each other's face. The Hon. Leader of the House said something about malice. I do not think malice was the motivating factor. I think some person else was talking, and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should be big enough to withdraw those remarks because from what you have said, you could not want those remarks to be recorded because in some instances they were unprovoked. You were not under provocation to make those statements, and for that reason, I think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should withdraw those remarks.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you have hon. members on the opposite side who would sit in their seats and would listen to the Hon. Premier calling on other members whatever he likes and will not say anything to him. Now, Mr. Chairman, you very well see that the Hon. Leader is quite willing to chop off my head. To prevent him thinking of chopping off my head, I withdraw those remarks. I hope he will chop off their heads soon.

The question that Head 20 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 47 - SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

Head 47 - Subsidies and Grants - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this is a new item for Commonwealth Economic Committee. The sum of \$1,824 is required to meet the Government's contribution to the Commonwealth Economic Committee for the financial year 1963-64. The functions of the Committee are to provide economic and statistical services on subjects affecting Commonwealth production and trade, as well as to examine and report on any economic questions which member Governments refer to it.

The Committee runs a large research and intelligence section which is responsible for the collection and dissemination of information of the subjects mentioned above. In addition, it publishes several monthly bulletins such as the Grain Bulletin (with Rice Supplement) Fruit Intelligence, Wool Intelligence, as well as meat, dairy and many other products. It also publishes annual Commodity Statistics on a number of subjects which summarise world trade, production and consumption. The information is found to be of considerable use to this Government.

The Barbados Government contributed to the Committee for several years before the establishment of the former Federation, but during the life of the Federation the Federal Government assumed responsibility for payments on behalf of the territories comprising the Federation.

I beg to move that Head 47 stand part of the Resolution.

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

The question that Head 47 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

1. ANNEXED ESTIMATES - POST OFFICE

1. Annexed Estimates - Post Office - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, the sum of \$2,544 is required to supplement the Item, Furniture and Equipment. (LOUD SIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like hon. members on that side to know that the Reporter is experiencing much difficulty in hearing the Minister.

(A VOICE: He is a deaf man; he should be examined).

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In the Estimates for last year, we provided \$3,555 for the replacement of scales at the Post Office which had become obsolete. At the end of the last financial year only five of the eleven scales to be replaced had been received; therefore it becomes necessary to re-vote the sum of \$2,544 to supplement the Estimates to cover the cost of the six scales which are expected to arrive this year.

I beg to move that 1. Annexed Estimates, stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I do not know what is in the Five Year Plan of the Government. When I say "I do not know," I mean to say that I do not have any recollection about what is in the Five Year Plan with reference to the Post Office, but I think the time has come when Barbados should aim at an integrated Postal Service. You have people getting stamps and posting letters in the part of this building underneath this Chamber and then you have the Parcel Post Department on the Wharf. Your Postal Department up here is a bit congested because the building is shared between the Post Office and the Government Savings Bank. They are two income-bearing departments, and the general public should have a better service than what they are getting from our postal arrangements.

I think that your Post Office is a first-class advertisement of your country when you talk of developing a tourist trade. I do believe that your Post Office is the first thing which strangers ask for, and it can be a reflection on your

whole Government and your Government Departments. I am satisfied in my mind that Barbados does not have an up-to-date modern Post Office with the necessary facilities, nice counters, courteous staff and all the physical arrangements which are necessary. I feel this matter has been under the ground for many years, and that some attempt should be made in giving the public a better Post Office than we have. When we think in terms that this is the main Post Office of Barbados, it is not a true reflection of the country. 1.50 p.m.

I hope that the Minister concerned, the Minister of Communications and Works, can shed some light on what I would regard as one of the Cinderellas of the Government Departments and give us a Post Office in keeping with modern trends.

The question that Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$10,083 do now pass.

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

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

ADVANCE TO THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST INDIES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is the one of which I gave notice earlier today, a Resolution for the sum of \$81,600 to be advanced from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of advancing funds to the University of the West Indies and to meet the cost of modification of building and other capital costs of establishing a College of Arts and Science in Barbados. In moving the passing of this Resolution, I think it is appropriate to remind the House that in February this year the University Grants Committee gave its final approval to the establishment of a College of Arts and Science in Barbados as a part of the extension of the University of the West Indies. In consequence of that decision, the Barbados Government has made known its desire that the College of Arts and Science should start in Barbados with the teaching of students from October this year. Everything has been done to this end in seeking to establish the College as a functioning body in October. The Advisory Committee has been selected, the Staff has been selected and the Government, in order to make good its promise, has given over for the temporary use of the College, the Trade Fair Site which was occupied last year. It has also made available to the University its own buildings there. In order that the final touch should be put on the preparations which the University has to make for starting in October, it is necessary that the equipping and modification of this site should be set in hand. It is to this end that the approval of the House is being sought for the advance of this \$81,600 to be placed at the disposal for this purpose.

I also wish to remind the House that the building and equipping of the College of Arts and Science on a permanent site will be met from a Colonial Development and Welfare grant, but this money is immediately required by the University of the West Indies for the immediate purpose of the temporary Headquarters. The breakdown of this Resolution is as follows:-

(a) Modification of the buildings to be taken over for administrative offices, laboratories and lecture rooms	\$24,000
(b) Scientific and classroom equipment	14,400
(c) Books	9,600
(d) Additional Equipment	33,600
Making a total of	<u>\$81,600</u>

The University will reimburse the Government of Barbados the funds advanced. I have great pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I want to agree with the Hon. Minister, and we all appreciate his anxiety in bringing this matter to fruition. I think that every breathing soul in this island must be in agreement with the idea of the extension of the University of the West Indies to the College of Arts and Science in Barbados. I have, however, a little twinge of conscience in connection with this matter. I take it that the Minister of Education is thinking of some permanence of this organization. We need have no fear in fact we know that we will run that area as an industrial department and that site cannot be regarded as a suitable one for educational purposes. This is a matter of \$81,600 to be spent for the extension of the University of the West Indies here and we can quite understand the anxiety of the Minister to get ahead with this project; but what I am worried about at the moment is whether we can have some assurance that the Minister is thinking of a home for this part of the University with some degree of permanence. That area will be unsuitable for the establishment of this College of Arts and Science and, in the circumstances, the Minister himself must feel the need of getting this extension operating, and he is probably doing the next best thing to utilise the buildings in this area. It is true that this money will be reimbursed by the University of the West Indies; we are going to have the assistance of Colonial Development and Welfare which is another matter, however you look at it, of the assistance of the taxpayers of England. We want to share the Minister's anxiety in this matter and it would be good to mention our feelings with regard to it, since there is little that we can do when we have spent this money.

At this stage, it being 2 p.m. of the clock, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 2 p.m. of the clock and this sitting is now suspended for half an hour until 2.30 p.m. of the clock.

This sitting now stands suspended.
2.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. WEEKES: 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 obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 95/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Philip is ready.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that several parishioners of the parish of St. Philip have long ago filed applications with the Waterworks Department for the installation of water services in their homes, but so far have received no replies to their applications?

2. Will Government speed up their programme for the installation of such water services so that water may be made available to the said parishioners, if possible, before Christmas 1962?

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

"1. All applications for water services in the parish of St. Philip have been acknowledged in that the applicants were required by letter subsequent to their application to call at the Waterworks Department to give details in the prescribed form.

2. There are no outstanding applications for water services in the parish apart from the applications from residents in the area described as Zone 1 on the Water Protection Map of the Island. This map was referred to in the statement made by me in this Assembly on the 4th December, 1962. From January, 1961, to the 5th February, 1963, two hundred and thirty-seven (237) applications for water services were received. Estimates in respect of two hundred and twenty-three (223) of them were prepared and submitted to the applicants. Of this latter number two hundred and nine (209) deposits were made and these services have been connected. The other fourteen (14) applications which have all been received from residents in the Zone 1 area are being actively considered."

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Private Members' Business was called.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day 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 21st May when Government Business was called at 4.30 p.m., the hon. senior member for St. Michael was speaking.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the last occasion when I was making my contribution to the debate on the Budgetary Proposals, Private Members' Business came to an end before I had concluded. I should like to continue today by saying that the Government's tax of 16 cents on the gallon of Coca Cola and the extra increase of one cent per bottle was absurd. What happens, Sir, when you have cases in which the size of bottles varies? From figures available, one case of small cokes carried a tax of 19 cents, and a case of ginger, the same size as the coke, carried a tax of 21 1/2 cents, while the tax on a case of king size cokes was 30 cents.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the cost of one case of drinks goes up and you have to make a certain percentage of profit for chilling them, obviously the selling price must go up proportionately. Also from figures available, one case of small cokes used to cost \$1.12; today it is \$1.40. One case of king size cokes used to cost \$1.44 and today it is \$1.80. The small cokes that used to be sold for 7 cents hot and 8 cents cold, are sold today for 9 cents hot and 10 cents cold. The king size coke is sold today at 11 cents as compared with 9 cents hot before and 10 cents cold. You will agree with me, Sir, that the price of these soft drinks has created a hardship on men in the lower income group and not those in the higher bracket. I can assure you, Sir, that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not going to raise his child on coke; he is going to use Milo or some other product. It has happened on several occasions when I have been asked for help that I am asked to stop by the nearest shop so that the person can buy a coke for himself and the children, and when I ask why he does not buy a pint of milk, I am told that they cannot wait; so this increase does not create any hardship on those in the higher income group; it is those in the lower income group that will feel it most. 2.40 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, because of this increase, sales have dropped approximately about 75 per cent. (A VOICE: That is not true.) Do not say that I am lying.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member would give way for a moment, I have said to hon. members that if an hon. member hears an uncomplimentary remark or otherwise spoken in reference to him, I expect that hon. member so long as those remarks were not addressed to the Chair,

to continue his remarks to the Chair without taking any notice of those remarks.

Mr. SEALEY: Thank you very much, Sir. I was saying that because of this increase, sales have dropped considerably — approximately 75 per cent — and that means people would be put out of work. The sweet drink companies in this Island employ about 250 persons, and along with that there are hundreds of shopkeepers all over the country whose only existence depends on the sale of soft drinks. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is going to happen with those truck drivers who sell cokes on a percentage basis and who are accustomed to working for \$200.00 per month? What are they going to tell their family now?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to know if "Tiger Malt" is not a carbonated drink like other soft drinks? Why is a consumption tax imposed on soft drinks and there is no tax imposed on "Tiger Malt"? Why should there be this discriminating legislation? The number of persons employed by the manufacturers of "Tiger Malt" is insignificant when you compare the number with those employed by the other soft drink manufacturers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a warning. If an item on which a tax is imposed suffers a decrease in sales, it is obvious that the imposed tax achieves nothing.

As far as local cigarettes are concerned, local cigarettes have gone up as a result of the new tax proposals. The Hon. Premier has spoken of the need to protect local industries. Does this not seem illogical when a tax is not imposed on imported cigarettes? I personally feel a pack of Trumpeter cigarettes is worth no more than ten cents per pack, and you should have not increased your tax on them. There are other means of finding money by Government without hitting the poor man's cigarettes. It is not that the poor man would not like to smoke "Ardath" cigarettes, but it is that he cannot afford to buy them. Leave the poor man's things alone.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I notice when the Hon. Premier was introducing his Budget proposals, he had a microphone of Rediffusion set up in here; and that was also the case when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking on the Resolution agreeing to the Budgetary Proposals of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must also let the Hon. member know that reference to that was made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and an explanation was given, and that matter was regarded and is regarded by the Chair as closed. I would ask the hon. member not to make any inference about that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, while I want to abide by the ruling of the Chair and there are certain rules which I am not challenging, if a member is in order, he should not be ruled out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Inasmuch as an explanation was given to the Chair that same day and it was pronounced by the Chair as being closed, I will ask the hon. member not to refer to it.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, this is what I am going to say. I am not referring to it, but I am saying that it is not for any particular member or anybody to allow a Rediffusion microphone to be brought in here; it is a matter for the entire House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not think the hon. member quite understands what Your Honour has just said, nor do I think he remembers what was said on the previous occasion. Surely whatever comes within the precincts of the House must come with the Speaker's permission; and if Your Honour has given permission for that to be done and Your Honour has indicated that is the end of the matter, that is the end of the matter.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I am to go by what the Hon. Minister has just said, I know that the Speaker or

any Speaker has certain powers; but if the hon. member has suggested that, we may just as well do away with Parliament.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise again on a point of order. If the hon. member were to study the rules of the House, he will realise that whatever powers are vested in the Speaker are vested in the Deputy Speaker in toto.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I have not said that no power was vested in you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At this stage, there can be no debate on the power of the Deputy Speaker, the Speaker or the question of Rediffusion. At this moment, we will revert to this Resolution before us.

Mr. SMITH: I am saying this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Any other time I see it inside here, I am going to pelt it outside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must tell the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that I said no more reference to that, and I mean: "Not another word concerning it". I would expect that the hon. member would have understood me.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: What is the hon. member going to speak on? What can be his point of order?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member has said that any time you bring Rediffusion in here, he will pelt it out. I think I have heard that remark in here already.

Mr. SMITH: That is not a point of order.
2.50 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already said that no more mention must be made of that matter. I am saying that that closes the matter by any hon. member of this House; there is to be no more mention of that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: All I want to say is this....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have ruled on that and I will speak.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Throw it out and we will bring it back in.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope you have heard the behaviour from the Leader of the House. As soon as a person says anything the Leader of the House will get up and chop off his head.

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

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Premier in his Budget Speech carried on, and I have seen him come into the House on the day when he is going to make his Budget Proposals with a black box, not a red one. I always know that when you see red it is a sign of danger. When the Premier came in with his black box he was out for killing, and he began to mourn before he did the actual killing. In that black box there was oppression and death for the working-class man. In the newspaper on the next day I saw that sport was made about the Premier with his black box in which, as I said, there was death for the working-class man. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will prove everything I have said. This is a country which has always carried its own weight and which has always done things within its means; and what it could not do today, it would do tomorrow. A Government must tax the people because you cannot carry on without taxation; but the question is: how are you going to tax, when are you going to tax and whom are you going to tax? Last year was the first year for the present Government in office, and they have levied a tax on certain commodities and have struck those commodities very hard. The majority of those cases consisted of commodities which are largely used by the poorer classes of this community. As you know, Sir, they made it so difficult for Banks that Banks was beginning to fold up; that

is the black-box taxation policy. The Premier saw that he was in danger and in trouble and, comparatively speaking, a few days after making his taxation policy he returned to this House and took off some of the tax. He made a joke of it in saying that he is going to give cheap beer for Christmas. That is how a responsible person in the community has acted; one who has the authority and power to tax people, one who has said: "I have no apology to make for it; I put it on and it must stay." A few days after that, he made a joke of it and spoke of giving cheap beer for Christmas.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I was a little boy I thought that the Government used to make money, but since I have grown up I have found that the Government has not got to make money; it just waits until you work and then it gets some of the money. It is the business of the Government to do so; imagine that you are getting one man who looks like myself and he says that the price is so much per bottle, so much per pint from now on, and it goes on. If he cares to do so, he can come back on the next day and make a laughing-stock of it. This is a serious matter because if the people of this country were to take matters into their own hands they would not allow one man to make laughing stock at them. This sport was made of Banks. It is more than that; it is true that if Banks had to fold up then the Government would also have to fold up. There is no use in taxing people and then you cannot collect the taxation; that is the position. The Hon. Premier has not made any mention of his intention relative to helping the poor, unfortunate businessmen, those who are in the lower bracket. You will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I managed to get a Resolution passed in this House asking the Government to consider the small people and to set up an Authority which would make loans to these people. In making his Budget Proposals the Hon. Premier has made no mention of that whatsoever. You are doing everything to encourage industry, but there are some business people who are in need of help; if this Resolution has been passed by this House, I feel that the time has come when the Government should declare themselves and let the House and the public know what is their intention relative to this matter because it is a serious matter. We want to do everything, I repeat, to encourage industry; there are some business people who would be glad for the necessary help, and it is time that the Government declare their policy in connection with this matter.

3.00 p.m.

This is a serious matter, Sir. As I said when I was trying to convince the House of the necessity for people to be helped by the Government, there are people who have to contribute to the State, and through not having the necessary capital to carry on, they have to remain quiet. They would then have to look for a job, but jobs are not so many today so that a carpenter, joiner or even a shoemaker can drop his tools and go and collect one. But, at the same time, these are men with families who need help. This is of just as much importance to the people of this country as the tourist industry. This would make people believe that the Government is not keen in establishing this particular Board, because the Board should be established already. It is necessary; and by so doing, you would also be able to collect a certain amount of revenue by way of taxation from those concerned. There are people who are inside looking out and some outside looking in, and the one outside looking in would like to get in also. It would not take this Government much to set about establishing a Board of this nature so that these poor people can be helped. I am sure, Sir, that they would be doing this country a good turn.

Now, Sir, we all have to look forward to taxation, but I feel the Government is travelling a little too fast. I do not believe they mean harm; but if you go to a doctor tomorrow, though he means well, and he makes a mistake and gives you the wrong prescription or medicine, you would go the same place as if he did not mean well. This black-box policy of the Premier is the wrong policy, and it would certainly kill, because the colour of the box spells mourning. Why is it that all the year round he can find himself in here with a red box, and when he is going to beat the poor people to smithereens with taxes, he brings in a black one? The people are getting afraid of this black-box policy, because it certainly means death.

Now I will go on, Sir, and deal with the remarks made by the Premier. I will not read everything, but I will deal with the important parts. The Premier said:-

"Perhaps one of the drawbacks has been the relative cheapness of imported commodities. If we are to enter export markets with our products, we must keep down the cost of production, and strive to improve their quality. Because of the larger home markets of the foreign manufacturers who sell us their surplus produce, such manufacturers enjoy advantages over persons who establish industries here. I propose, therefore, that local industries should be protected from unfair competition abroad. I also urge the people of this Island to take pride in buying commodities produced here. In nine cases out of ten, the Barbadian article is better than that imported, be it carrots, beer, handbags or clothing. If the wholesalers and retailers do not soon give preference always to Barbadian products, the Government will take measures to persuade them to do so. At this stage, I simply give a warning. It will be far better if they and the public give me their wholehearted support in a campaign to buy Barbadian goods and produce because they are better. In a short time, I hope to be able to extend the slogan to goods and produce of the group of islands with which Barbados is to be associated. Price controls on local produce will be relaxed immediately."

Now, Sir, these are words coming from the Premier of this country. He is all in favour of local products and he has told us here plainly that if we do not support him by buying local products, he will have to force us to do so by legislation. After hearing these words, what can one say now? What about Buddie's Pasteurised Milk? That is a local industry which has been offered to the public, and I have not heard one person except the Premier say it is not good milk. I did not hear him say it because I was out of the House, but I read where he said that Miller Bros. will get out somehow, but not as long as he is in the Government.

3.10 p.m.

I want to know if this is a local industry manufactured in Barbados or not. The same Premier who is now telling us that if we do not support local industries, he is going to bring in legislation to make us do it — this same Premier has said that the only way the particular firm or place would be able to operate this industry would be if he is out of this House. My words to the particular firm are these "Do not fold up, wait a little."

Imagine, Sir, that is the Premier of this country who is leading the Government, a Government which I would say is a collective one. I mean with the Ministers, not the Premier alone. The Premier did not go to sleep on the eve of the Elections inside here. He had to go about begging the people for a vote just as anybody else, and now the people have had compassion on him through the way he begged for a vote — and Your Honour knows very well that a lawyer begs differently from a layman — now that he has been given their vote, he is signing away everybody here with nothing else but death and oppression. It is sheer death because the figures are inside that box.

I believe the hon. senior member for St. Peter is going to a funeral later on this evening. I know so by the suit of clothes which he has on. Whenever the Hon. Premier comes in here with a black box, the workers must look out. I hope it will catch afire one day in his hands. Imagine, Sir, he is telling us to support local industries! He says that if we do not support local industries, he is going to bring in legislation to enforce us to buy local products. He has said so: and at a moment's notice, one man had to sell out his cows because they refused to buy this man's products — and that is a man who would actually kill every candidate of the Barbados Labour Party. He has said that he has no use whatsoever for a Barbados Labour Party. The Government refused to give him a contract for the supply of fresh milk, and they are using imported milk. The Hon. Premier, who is the big boss, is walking in here with a black box every now and then and telling us to support local industries. How can we believe him? I am very sorry that he is not in his seat because I hinted to him that I had it for him. This is wicked. Number one, you are going to penalise me, and make me buy local products; but you are

still preventing people from selling their products. You are subsidising the farmer somewhere in New Zealand and you are still telling me to support local industries.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has said that somebody subsidises the farmer in New Zealand and local farmers have had to sell their cows. That is completely incorrect. I would like him to explain what he means.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said that I read in a newspaper. After the Government refused to give a man a contract to supply milk to a school, he had to sell his cows. The Government called for tenders for the supply of fresh milk; and when the people who made a tender got a reply, they were told that they were not considered. Milk is being served at the schools now, but I do not know where it comes from. If we were treated like representatives of the people, we would have known. The members of the Government should have circularised us and told us what they are going to do, so as not to let us listen to what other people say or write. If I were circularised to the effect that I should not believe what was written in the newspapers, and was told that this was done, or that was done, I would not have to say anything.

It is just the same as when the Budget was about to be presented to the House. I heard "Tomorrow the Premier will be presenting his Budget to the House" through a broadcast over the air in the 8 o'clock news bulletin of Rediffusion. I am a member of this House elected by the people, and I knew nothing about it until I heard it over the air. I was not surprised because I have heard it from the Premier's mouth already that his Ministers knew only ten minutes before he brought it down here. Therefore, if I heard it casually over the radio, I suppose they also knew nothing about it at all. I have to believe it because the Ministers themselves sat in their seats and they never denied it. If I were one of his Ministers, and he said that, I would have got up out of my seat and walked out. If that were so, he had no right to disclose it to the public. If he falls, all of them would have to go; therefore they should stand on their feet and speak to him as men and keep him on his toes. I am only saying that it is wicked for the Hon. Premier to say that "The only way you would get that contract to supply milk is after I am out of the Government."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been waiting for an opportunity and listening to the hon. member, but the time has come when he still insists in misrepresenting the facts of the case. There is no record that any reference was made by the Hon. Premier that somebody will not get a contract for milk to supply the schools.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, if it is not to supply the schools, I do not know what it is. This particular individual was supplying the schools with milk; so if you do not give him pioneer status, how can he supply the schools? It is the same thing. He will not be given pioneer status although there is a law on the Statute Book to give him this pioneer status.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not quite sure whether I am hearing the hon. member correctly. He said that some applicant would not get pioneer status although there is a law on the Statute Book to grant pioneer status. Is that what he said?

Mr. SMITH: I did not say that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is talking so disjointedly that it is difficult to follow what he is saying. Therefore, I would like him to repeat what he said. 3.20 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the hon. member should do at Bay Street, he is trying to do down here. He should do what he is doing now at Cabinet meetings. The hon. member wants to know this, he wants to know that and he must have been in the House when the Premier said what he said.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was never in the House when any Premier

said anything about nobody being granted pioneer status. The hon. member should know how pioneer status is granted. If he wants to know why a particular applicant did not get pioneer status I will tell him. The refusal to grant pioneer status to which the hon. member is referring.....

Mr. SMITH: That is not a point of order; the hon. member is making a speech.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member thinks that he is the Speaker of this House. Well, it will be a long time before he gets there, if he ever gets there. The hon. member says that this particular applicant was not granted pioneer status because somebody said it will be granted over his dead body. The refusal to grant pioneer status was nothing to do with any milk contract or supplies of milk to schools or anything like that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can only say what was said in here. I wonder if the hon. member was in here to hear the Premier say that he does not say anything to anybody about the Budget until about one hour before he comes in here. (ASIDES) Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know why the hon. member does not keep himself quiet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member not to allow his sincerity to get away with him.

Mr. SMITH: Why then did they not give the contract to the other people who said that they had to sell out their cows? Why did they call for tenders for the supply of milk and then they did otherwise? What are the school children getting now? Is it the local product or what? The Hon. Premier dealt with the matter at length, and he went so far as to say that if we do not support local industry he would pass legislation to suit, and I agree with that too. I do hope that the Hon. Minister of Trade or the Hon. Minister of Education will tell us before this matter is finished, whether the children are getting this milk, whether it is locally produced or whether it is imported milk. I can only talk about what I have read in the Proposals; but when you get one side of a man's mouth contradicting the other side of it, what can you say? This is wickedness. I will go further. The Hon. Premier in his Financial Statement and Budget Proposals went on to say this:

"Last year the expansion of the tourist trade was greater than in 1961: 44,258 tourists arrived in the Island — an increase of 7,198 as against 1,525 in the previous year. In the first quarter of 1963: 14,161 tourists came here as compared with 12,323 in the same period last year. This is the sector of our economy which can be expanded most rapidly, and the recent intensified activity of the Tourist Board and the Agreement I have signed with Hilton Hotels to build a hotel to be operated by Hilton here indicated how forcefully the Government is pursuing a policy of developing the tourist industry."

The Hon. Premier is thinking about building a Hilton Hotel so as to help speed up the tourist industry. That is a very good thing. I said something on the last occasion and I will say it again; I am wondering what will become of the other hoteliers in this country, those people to whom the Government lent money to expand and build. When the Government builds this Hilton Hotel and the other people do not get any trade so as to repay the bill which is owing to the Government, what is the Government going to do? The Government has lent out a lot of money for this tourist industry; and if they do not have sufficient accommodation for these tourists, I am wondering what will happen. The position is like this; you are lending a man money to do a certain type of business and then you go next door to him to build up the same type of industry and compete with him; how on earth do you expect to get back your money in this way? As to these hotels, I have been told that you will pick a berry in the winter, but in the summer things will be slow. They are building this hotel and they are going to give it to other people to run. In my opinion, that is a big insult to the hoteliers here. I do not know, but the Premier has said that I undertake to do things which I cannot manage. I do not mind that, but I want the Premier to know that I have as much common sense as to try and make a living. If you get one pound from anywhere and you can feed yourself without going around begging, people should take off their hats to

you and do not call you a fool. There are a lot of people who have big things; and where are they?

As I was saying, Sir, the Government is going to build this hotel and furnish it with the taxpayers' money. Even if you borrow money, you have to pay interest on it at least; you are giving Hilton the option of running this Hotel; and if there is any money made, then they will be able to take out the profits from Barbados. I do not know if anybody here will get any income tax from these people.
3.30 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is clear that the hon. member does not understand what he is saying. If he did, he could not say that taxpayers' money will be involved in this venture and that the Hilton authorities will be carrying all the profits out of the country. In the very Resolution which should be before him, he should know that Hilton International operates on a certain basis and that the Agreement with the Government of Barbados is in no respect different from the Agreements which they have made with other people — Puerto Rico or Trinidad or with the United Kingdom or anywhere else.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member says I do not understand, but I understand enough to know that the Government will be building this hotel. In other words, Government will be furnishing the money. If that is not so, the hon. member can get up and deny it and I will sit for good. I understand the Government will pay for the hotel and then turn it over to Hilton who will be running it. Well, Hilton will not be running it for nothing; it must be run on a profit basis. If the hotel makes money, Hilton will get money; but if it loses money, Hilton will lose no money. Now, Sir, I want to know if the hoteliers in this country cannot run a hotel after it is built.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, if the hon. member were fully conversant with the history of Hilton Hotels, he would probably be fully convinced that although we have numerous hotels in this Island, the standard of hotels, generally speaking, on an international scale is not such as to attract tourists of repute; but if we have a Hilton Hotel established here in Barbados, our international trade will be enhanced and people of substance will know we have a hotel of a certain standard in Barbados, and as a result of that, full benefits will redound to the other hotels on the Island, and there will be nothing but benefit and reward. In other words, the whole industry will be built up around that. That is the standard of Hilton hotels which are run on a business-like basis. They are people who know how to run hotels and not like Government who are not conversant with them.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder who is running Sandy Lane. Reputable people go to Sandy Lane. Who is running the Marine Hotel? I believe they are making money. Must I understand that the Government does not want to deal with people who know how to make money? Look at Sandy Lane, the Marine and other hotels in Christ Church. I can talk about the Marine because I go there. What about San Remo? I wonder what the manager of San Remo is thinking! (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Telephone and ask him.) I will have to do that as soon as I finish here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am wondering if all my good Barbadian people cannot run a hotel to make money after all that the Government is offering. I feel that if Hilton who has hotels in Trinidad and all over the world felt, with everything coming his way, that he would make money, he would want to build too. These are hard-headed businessmen. They are not building because they have reasons. They would make more money by doing it this way than if they involved their capital, because there would be interest on it; and if there is any loss, their capital would go. When you build it, and let them run it, if it loses money, it will be you who are losing. I am saying that so long as this Government has to build it, the people in this country should run it. I am nothing to do with Hilton; I am something to do with the people in Barbados and whether there are hotels run here at a profit. You have Sandy Lane, the White House Inn, Fresh Water and other places in Christ

Church like the Blue Waters; and if something looks so pretty and you are telling me that these people cannot run it after you have built it, it is an insult to the hoteliers in this country. I sincerely hope this succeeds because there are a lot of snags in it. I could say something now, but I know the hon. senior member for St. Philip would jump up. I do not want him to get up and I will not say it yet. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You can't say it.) I want to know who is pulling back from whom. Do you think everything comes from in front?

Now, Sir, I will go all the way down to read further from the Premier's speech. He went on to say:

"In the future, with the approach of federation, we must expect increased migration to Barbados from our sister Islands. Such a situation should not be met with fear but with regional planning. We must not treat those Islands as poor relations; we must give them freely the benefits of our knowledge, experience and development. In return this community will reap the benefit of a considerable expansion of its economy."

Now, Sir, federation is coming; let it come. The Hon. Premier tells us that we must not take it with fear, but I am afraid because it will mean more taxation, and the people are howling already. What will become of my working-class people? The Premier went on to say:

"There was again a slight increase in the retail price index, but the rise was even less than in the previous year, only 1.6 points, which is less than 1 1/2%. As other countries continue to follow more and more a wages and incomes policy to combat inflation and to make their costs competitive, we shall have to watch carefully any factors which may increase the cost of production here. Already the cost of Government services is being strictly controlled. If the economy of the Island is to make a leap forward, everyone of us must make some sacrifice.
3.40 p.m.

"Retail prices here compare favourable with those in the other Islands of the group with which we are about to associate, except perhaps in one or two instances where we make the articles ourselves. In Antigua and St. Vincent rice is 17 cents a pound; in Montserrat the price is 19 cents. In Barbados it is sold at 11 cents per pint. The fact is that we, in Barbados, are subsidising the British Guiana producer.

"I have heard one eminent Trade Unionist claim that we are subsidising low wages when we do that, the theory being that whenever you have to subsidise a commodity like rice, then the people are not paid subsistence wages because they cannot buy food out of their own pockets. This is a theory with which I entirely agree and I think this learned gentleman and I are agreed on many other things although not on all.

"Now this subsidy to British Guiana is one of the items in our budget, and we might now have a look at the provisional figures of the Treasury out-turn for the last financial year 1962-63; but before I do so, I should like to allay any fears which the populace has about the rice shortage. As Your Honour knows, there is a general strike in British Guiana, but I am sure that there are supplies of rice available in this Island at least until the end of the month and this is not any shortened period at all. It is quite possible that we will get additional shipments before the end of the month."

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Trade Unionist to whom the Hon. Premier is referring, I hope, is not the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union. You are talking about subsidising the farmer in British Guiana. That is what I am wondering. The way how the Hon. Premier puts it makes one to believe that when the Government subsidises the rice, the grower in British Guiana is getting it. I do not take it so, because the reason for subsidising rice is so that the British Guiana producer can produce it at \$10.00 a bag, and because the Government feels that \$10.00 a bag is too much for the local consumers to pay, the Government is subsidising it by \$1.00 per bag. That is to say, the Govern-

ment is paying the people of British Guiana \$1.00 on every bag and the people here are paying the other \$9.00.

You are not giving the people of British Guiana anything; therefore when the Hon. Premier says that this country is subsidising the people of British Guiana, he is wrong, and he is wrong again. The point is this. If the Government does not subsidise it, the local consumers will have to pay a dollar more.

The last Government had the working-class people at heart. They felt it would be a little too hard on the people to pay so much for rice and they subsidised it. This is a thing which this Government does not think of.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has said something about the last Government having the working-class people at heart, a thing which this present Government has forgotten. The present Government is still subsidising rice to the same extent as it was subsidised by the last Government. The fact is that the British Guiana rice price has increased within the last twelve months; therefore it will call for an increased subsidy over and above the amount normally spent on subsidy.

Furthermore, Sir, when the last Government took the subsidy off flour, salted fish, pickled pork and other items, they were not thinking of the people then.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, that is not a point of order. The Hon. Minister will have his chance to reply. Do not let him get up and make speeches while I am on the floor. The hon. member cannot read me out now because I am in order.

Now, Sir, if that is so, why did the Hon. Premier not put it here on this document? The Hon. Premier did not tell us in his Budget Speech that it was because the price had gone up.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am a member of the House and the hon. member is one too. We feel that he should know what is going on in here. The hon. member was in here when we brought in the new contractual agreement between the Government of British Guiana and the Government of Barbados referring to the increase in the price of rice.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not have the hon. member saying that is not a point of order. That is for me to determine. The point of order by the Hon. Minister is made.

Mr. SMITH: Right, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want any form of advice from hon. members except, maybe, in certain circumstances.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, here it is that I am reading from this copy of the Hon. Premier's speech and the Hon. Premier says that we are subsidising the people of British Guiana. I am saying that is not so, because if the cost of the rice is sold to us at that particular price, we either have to pay them for it or we would not get it. Do not say when you pay \$1 a bag that you are only subsidising it to keep the cost down.

I have quoted a part showing you where it is wicked and I am going to quote this to show where it is foolish.

The Hon. Premier said:

"Now, this subsidy to British Guiana is one of the items in our budget, and we now have a look at the provisional figures of the Treasury out-turn for the last financial year 1962-63; but before I do so, I should like to allay any fears which the populace has about the rice shortage. As Your Honour knows, there is a general strike in British Guiana, but I am sure that there are supplies of rice available in this Island at least until the end of the month and this is not

a shortened period at all. It is quite possible that we will get additional shipments before the end of the month."

The Hon. Premier told us in this House — and I think it was Tuesday gone week or a fortnight ago — that there was no rice shortage. He said that we had as much rice here as would last us until the end of the month. That was on the Tuesday and on the Thursday following most shopkeepers could not get a bag. That is a fact. Let the Hon. Minister of Trade get up and contradict that.

(A VOICE: Not one shopkeeper could get a bag!)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Whatever the hon. member says, he is entitled to be heard. I would be glad if the hon. member would not at every time invite the hon. member to reply. I take it that every hon. member in this Chamber knows his duty. Neither would I have it the other way around. I know the hon. member can appreciate what I say.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise upon a point of order. There could be no rice shortage at that time. Our figures were actually based on a survey conducted by the Comptroller of Supplies who called for a detailed report from every wholesaler of rice as to the extent and amount of rice in the Island. We were satisfied from the report based on the monthly consumption that we had supplies in the Island for at least for a month.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take that as a point of explanation.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Apparently, the hon. member wants to suggest that the Hon. Premier's statement was unfounded. I merely want to state that it was a statement based on an actual survey.
3.50 p.m.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going by this document which I hold in my hand, which is the Financial Statement and Budget Proposals of the Premier. It is quite all right for the Hon. Minister to get up and put on his finishing touches; but he should have shown this to the Premier and let him take out certain things. What the hon. member should have done at Bay Street he is trying to do now, as I said earlier.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I object to that. The difference is that when I am in Bay Street I am dealing with sensible people. The hon. member has said that the Premier made this Statement saying that there was no rice shortage and I say that that statement was based on a survey which was made. That was done in Bay Street — not in Cats Castle or anywhere else like that. What was done at Bay Street was the result of a survey made as to the rice situation; does the hon. member want the rice cooked in Bay Street?

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member can get as hot as he likes; I am a politician. He can say what he likes to say; but I repeat that I am going by this document which I hold in my hand — the Financial Statement and Budget Proposals of the Hon. Premier. Mr. Deputy Speaker, to show you where I am in order and there is the possibility that I may be out of order — if I begin to raise certain points you will rule me out of order, and you will be quite right in doing so; but I have to raise my points from this Financial Statement and Budget Proposals. If this is wrong, the hon. member should be honest enough to get up and say it is wrong.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I said that the supply of rice was enough to last for a month; what is he saying is wrong?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know anything when it comes to shop business; I can teach it. If the Hon. Minister had a survey made and he was told that there was as much rice in the country as would last for a month, why is it that some shops were only given one bag of rice when they were accustomed to getting five bags and some people got none at all? I am submitting that something is wrong somewhere.

Mr. LOWE: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been sitting here for a long time and I have been hearing the hon. junior member for St. Joseph filibustering and talking what he does not know anything whatsoever about when it comes to shop business and rice. If the rice is to last for a month, you cannot control the merchants and make them sell you six or eight bags of rice. When the merchant says that he is only selling you one bag of rice, you have either to accept that or walk away.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order has been made.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, you have a backbencher to get up and reply. He is saying that if you get one bag of rice you should take it or leave it; he is supporting a Government which has the destiny of the people in its hands. I thought he was telling the Government what can be done, but he is making things worse; he is saying that if the merchant says that you can only get one bag of rice, you must be glad for it. I should like to know what will become of the remainder of the rice when it is expected that the price of rice will be increased. The hon. senior member for St. Philip is bound to create doubts in my mind in some way or other. If his statement is correct, that we have as much rice in the country as will last for a month, according to his survey, how is it that the merchants do not have it?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to have these remarks made without correction. I rise to correct the hon. member's variation of my statement. These surveys are fool-proof because figures are carried forward from week to week. The figures which are obtained from the Controller of Supplies are acted upon and you can check these figures from week to week. The figures are obtained as to deliveries from January, March or April, and deductions are taken all the way down. The delivery is so much, supplies are so much, and the remainder is so much. When you come to making a check, it is not a question of checking the report made in May or April, but you are checking against what you had since January or February. In every single case, the figures supplied from the various districts were checked upon, and they were accurate with the supplies which people had long before this rice crisis began.

Mr. SMITH: I am saying, Sir, that there are some merchants who do not have any rice. It is not to say that a particular merchant is holding up anything. I can only go, as I have already said, by this Financial Statement and Budget Proposals, that the amount of rice was sufficient to last for the month and now we find that we have not got it. I understand that the amount of 1,920 bags of rice came in since this statement was made, and if some merchants do not have one bag, what must I do? Must I go by what the Premier says and do not let this House and the public know what the position is? It seems to me that some of the members of the Government would like me to say "Aye" to everything that they have done; but they never did that when the last Government was in power and they were in the Opposition.
4.00 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Let me say this finally, on a point of explanation. We do not expect the hon. member to vote and say "aye" to everything we do. What we do not expect is for him to come here and challenge the *bona fides* and accuracy of what we do or say. There may well have been instances in which distributors said they did not have rice when they actually had it, because they were waiting until the increased price came into effect in order to get the benefit of the increased price on present stock; but this does not mean at all that the stocks were not accurate.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know when it comes to rice that it is a serious thing; that is the workers' food. I have not eaten it for years because I cannot, but I am only saying that there is something wrong and our people stand to suffer. The hon. member said that if you do not like one thing, you like the other; but I am telling him that what goes up comes down. I am going to prove where the Government is wicked and foolish now. You are about to

increase the price of rice and you let the Island know you are going to do it. Is that a sensible thing to do? Here it is: rice is to be increased by one cent per pint. It is not increased yet, but it was mentioned, I think, three weeks ago. The biggest idiot, one like myself, as they call me.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I must apologise to the House for these continuous interruptions, but one has to interrupt. The price of rice has been increased since 20th May. I do not know if the hon. member was with Cooper in his space ship and did not know what happened here, but the Order bringing into effect the increased price of rice was published to be effective on 20th May; today is the 28th; so he cannot say that the price has not yet been increased.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Premier said that it would be increased, I know at the Thursday that it was not increased and the statement was made on the Tuesday. That was the last time I made an investigation, and I am sure that if on the Thursday it was increased, the hon. member would jump and say so. At the Tuesday night, gasoline was to be increased by five cents, and by next morning it was increased. Through you, Sir, I should like to ask if the price of rice was increased on the Wednesday morning in the same way that gasoline was.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the two questions are not analogous. Gasoline deliveries are made every day almost. The distributors send their trucks out and they fill the tanks at the stations. In the case of rice we had certain supplies available which would have been bought at the old price; so why penalise the public and make them pay an additional cent on something bought at the old price? The idea was that when we got a new shipment and made new deliveries which would cost the distributors more money, then you would make people pay more money. If the price was effective from the Wednesday morning, the hon. member would have liked it, because if he distributes rice himself, it would have meant that he would have got an extra price on stocks which he had bought at the old price.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member said that gasoline is delivered daily. Rice is delivered daily also because every merchant in Bridgetown has his own days for delivery. He delivers on Mondays in certain areas, on Tuesdays in another area and so on, and if a Bank Holiday comes on a Monday, the merchants are in trouble to make up on Tuesday the deliveries which they would have had to make on Monday.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is not the point and the hon. member should know better than that. Now the distributors of rice do not import it. The rice comes in to the Government. The contract is between the Government of Barbados and the British Guiana Government, and the rice is sent to certain importers. They got the present supplies of rice at a price with the subsidy to the full extent, and they had this rice to distribute to the Roebuck wholesalers and rural shopkeepers at the old subsidised price; so therefore to have made the new price effective from the next day would have meant that on stocks of rice in hand, they would have profited but an extra cent when they did not pay the Government an extra cent for it. The price actually only became effective from the date of a new shipment of rice from British Guiana here. When this new shipment came in the importers and distributors had to buy at the price without this additional cent subsidy, and therefore they could sell at that price, but the entire exercise of allowing the prevailing price to remain at 11 cents as long as it did, was that the public would benefit from buying rice at 11 cents because the merchants who stocked that rice had paid for it at a price to charge 11 cents.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is one side of the question. The hon. member does not want the shopkeepers or even the merchants to get an extra cent. He wants them to sell out the old stock before the new stock comes in. Well now, the hon. member was trying to prevent the shopkeepers or the merchants from making an extra cent on a pint of rice which in my opinion would have meant \$2.08 extra on a bag of rice.
4.10 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I should have said a pint of rice.

Mr. SMITH: There are something like 204 pints to a bag; so if there is an extra cent on each pint, that would make roughly about \$2.00 a bag extra. But while they are trying to prevent the wholesaler from making that, the workers are starving and cannot get a pint of rice. I am sure the workers would prefer to pay the cent increase and get it; but, then, they keep it back and the people do not get it.

Rice is the workingman's food, especially during the crop season when workers eat it twice a day. (A VOICE: That is not true.) The majority of workers eat rice twice a day. There are some who tell you that they cannot eat anything else.

The Hon. Premier is trying to prevent the merchants from getting this extra cent. The only way that the Government could have prevented these people from getting this extra cent would have been to summon their inspectors to go into the buildings of the wholesalers the same day that the Premier delivered his Budget Speech. That is to say, the Premier is going to announce it this afternoon at four o'clock and they visit the warehouses and make a check today. Government is saying that they are not going to let the cent increase come into effect until the old stock has been sold out. Is that not the reason why from Thursday after the Premier announced it, nobody had any rice in stock? That is where I say the Hon. Premier was wrong in letting the people know that the price of rice would be increased before the Government was ready for it. Now, the Government did not want them to get the extra cent before the old stock was sold out. Why disclose the price increase before you were ready?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member does not seem to understand the issues at stake. The increase in the price of rice comes in consequence of the withdrawal of subsidy. The very speech from which the hon. member is quoting makes reference that the new price is to be effective on a date to be fixed by the Minister under whose portfolio it comes. If the subsidy is going to be withdrawn, it is obvious that it could not be withdrawn immediately, but on the date when new stocks are made available to the buying public. The gasoline tax was operative the same day because the House amended the Petroleum Act to make it operative from that day. The subsidy is operative at a date to be fixed because that is the circumstances in which it had to be done.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister of Education has said that I do not understand, but it is that he does not understand. This is what I am saying. I was replying to the Hon. Minister of Trade. He is not the Minister of Trade. This matter is not under his portfolio but, of course, he would have some knowledge. I am dealing with the Hon. Minister of Trade. He told us that they did not want the wholesalers to make this extra cent on the price of rice before the new price had come into effect, and that they were waiting until the old stock had been sold out and the new stock had come in. I am saying to him, if that is true, the Hon. Premier should not have announced it then. If the Hon. Premier did not mention anything about it and he had only said that the subsidy would be withdrawn, nobody would have taken it so seriously as to hide the rice. They may not have taken it to mean to hold back their hand. I am not accusing anybody for hiding it. Here it is, I have a bag of rice in stock. I hear a percentage is going to be added on to it. I am not going to keep that 100 bags at me. If you are my friend, I am sending it down to you and you will let it stay in your garage for me.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I must confess that the hon. member is conceding practices which the Government never envisages. The Government acted on the premise that shopkeepers are honest men, and that people like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph are so honest that they would not attempt to rob the people in this dishonest manner. If that is his experience, if that is his conception, all the shopkeepers are

wrong and they are rogues and vagabonds. If a few of them adopt these practices, the majority are honest men and would not seek to exploit the situation over which the Government has no control. It was not through us that the British Guiana Government increased the price of rice.

Mr. SMITH: He felt so sure that everybody was honest and he could do it. Why did he anticipate.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member accused us of folly in announcing beforehand that the price of rice would go up subsequently. In other words, we took the shopkeepers as honest men. If they were honest, they would not have exploited it.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister is all right. He is proving to me how foolish the Government is by putting butter in the way of a cat. The Hon. Minister can talk of all the dishonesty he likes; I have not accused any shopkeeper of being dishonest, but I am sure the Hon. Premier said in here that shopkeepers give 14 ozs. for a pound. (A VOICE: What did he say?) He said that in here and you never said one word. The hon. junior member for St. Philip, the hon. senior member for St. George, and the hon. junior member for St. John never said one word when the Premier said that.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I remember carefully the remarks which the Hon. Premier said on that occasion. He said that some shopkeepers give 14 ozs. for a pound. I was not in that category; therefore I did not have to arrest that statement. If I remember correctly, the Hon. Premier used the term relative to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph never said a word about it. That is an absolute fact. (Laughter).
4.20 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really want to be modest and I will be modest with the hon. senior member for St. George; but if he wants to be on the opposite side, I will get into the ring with him. (LAUGHTER). (Mr. LOWE: Get in!)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There will be no referee in this ring.

Mr. SMITH: It would be an advantage for me to take a sledge hammer to kill a fly. I got up here and replied to the Hon. Premier when he referred to these shopkeepers; I even said that there are members of the Hon. Premier's Party who would not say a word and yet the hon. senior member for St. George gets up in here and says that I did not say a word about that. Lord have mercy!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER knocked the gavel.

Mr. SMITH: I want the hon. senior member for St. George to be modest; for all that they do and say, I am not afraid of them.

The Premier in his Financial Statement and Budget Proposals went on to say this:-

"The principal measures which I propose should be taken to balance our budget are: consumption taxes on aerated and mineral water, 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."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the consumption tax on beverages; that is imposed with effect from tomorrow, but when it comes to rice, it was not with effect from tomorrow. I take it that beverages are soft drinks. Hon. members on the opposite side can put it as they like, but I take it that

50 million bottles of aerated and mineral water are drunk in this island a year and they were never taxed. That is why the Premier saw fit to tax the people's water. When I am speaking I am thinking about the working-class people, because I know them and I know how they live. It may be that the majority of them do not pay water rates, but the Water-works Department has put up the water rate about 300% in the case of one man at least who used to pay a rate of \$3.78 and now he has to pay \$9.80. The working-class people have their children attending the schools and the most of this drink is being consumed by children. What have you done? You have increased the cost of living for these children. I have termed this Government as being wicked and foolish and I will come to the other thing. The Hon. Premier did not only say that the increase will be one cent per bottle, but he went on further and said that the consumption duty would be 16 cents per gallon. If it was merely a cent a bottle it would mean that the fellow who used the small bottle would have to pay an additional cent; but if you are going by the quantity then you will have to pay more money for a King size than you will have to pay for a small size because it is a question of the gallon. If it were not by the gallon and the Premier had said one cent per bottle, the makers could only charge one cent per gallon or half gill. No sooner than you mention this increase per gallon it would mean that increase per gallon; if the amount in a small size bottle merits one cent increase and a family size merits 1 1/4 cents, you will have to say one penny because there are no quarter cents. There again, you could term that part as being foolish.

I was at Holy Innocents in St. Thomas sometime ago and I met a man who was not from St. Thomas; otherwise I would be sure where he would be casting his vote on the next occasion. However, he asked me: "Do you mean to say that you make me pay forty-five cents more a week for my children's drink at school?" He is a policeman and he had to pay forty-five cents on that drink only.

At this stage, it now being 4.30 p.m., of the clock,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m. of the clock, the time when Private Members' Business comes to an end.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the House was considering Government Business on the last occasion, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, MR. BATSON in the Chair.

ADVANCE TO THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST INDIES

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion when the House was in Committee of Supply, we were considering a Resolution for the sum of \$81,600 relative to the advance of funds to the University of the West Indies and to meet the cost of modification of buildings and other capital costs of establishing a College of Arts and Science in Barbados. Does any other hon. member want to contribute to this debate before the Hon. Minister replies? *(After a Pause).*

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. George, as far as I can remember, is always taken care of in the information which has been given in the Addendum to this Resolution. Of this sum of \$81,600 which it is proposed to advance to the University of the West Indies if the House gives its approval to it, the sum of \$24,000 is removable from the temporary to the permanent site when it is ready, and the books which have to be put in for temporary purposes will be taken to the permanent site when it is ready. Therefore, the University has no reason to fear a dead loss or any loss at all with respect to its outlay on our property.
4.30 p.m.

Equipment which is not moveable, of course, is another matter, but the House will appreciate that the University is well versed in these matters, and will therefore so outlay its expenditure, that not only will it purchase and establish what is of more than passing value, but it will establish the sort of equipment which can be used not only on a temporary site, but elsewhere.

One last point, Sir. In as much as the Government of Barbados is being asked, when this Resolution passes, to make this advancement of funds from the Treasury which will be reimbursed to us, it is also a condition which the Government laid down that there will be a sub-Committee appointed consisting of the Financial Secretary, the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Education, and the Director of Public Works, and these three will meet with representatives of the University so that they can satisfy themselves as to the cost of these projects on the temporary site. It is true, as I said, that this money is going to be re-funded to us, but there is no reason because of that for this Government not to see that the expenditures are justified.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN HILTON HOTELS INTERNATIONAL INCORPORATION AND THE BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next item on the Order Paper is to resume debate on a Resolution to approve the Agreement between Hilton Hotels International Incorporated and the Barbados Development Board.

I think, Sir, that so far as I recollect, I have covered all of the sensible points raised by hon. members in discussing this matter, and there is very little more to be said except that I should like to say that prognostications are relatively cheap, and it is an easy matter for one to be unduly optimistic about this or any other matter, but in this respect the Government is being guided by the actual experience of the operation of Hilton Hotels all over the world. The system under which the Barbados Hilton will operate is completely similar to the operation of other Hilton Hotels International. So far as we know, no Hilton Hotel International has been a failure, and furthermore the Hilton people themselves are so jealous about preserving a reputation for operating hotels in a financially successful manner, that they will not dream of entering a contract for operating a hotel unless all the indications are that the venture is going to be successful. We entertain no apprehension actually of the result of the Barbados Hilton like the operation of the other hotels, and this fear expressed by some hon. members as to whether or not already existing hotels will be able to continue operation and repay the Government the money they borrowed from it, is not entertained by us at all.

To the contrary, Sir, we feel that the best way of helping them to repay their loans in the shortest possible time is by the operation of the Hilton, because the effect which the operation of Hilton will have on our tourist trade will be of incalculable assistance to them. This has been the experience of Hilton everywhere and the experience of the Trinidad hotels which I do know did suffer some operational deficiency, financially speaking. In consequence of the entrance into the hotel field, the Hotel Hilton reflected to

some extent the manner in which the Trinidad hotels were operating and the prices they were charging, because they were charging in many cases higher prices than Hilton for inferior service, and therefore it followed as a natural consequence that the visitor would go to a hotel which offered the maximum service at the minimum cost.

Finally, Sir, I can do no more in concluding my remarks than quote from a Puerto Rico publication and a Trinidad publication with reference to the operating of Hilton in these places. I quoted last week a letter from the Management of the Trinidad Hilton in rebuttal of the malicious and completely unwarranted statements in the local Press to the effect that the Trinidad Hilton was losing money.

4.40 p.m.

He said in his statement which was also published in the local newspapers that far from losing money the Trinidad Hilton had averaged for the nine months which it had been in operation over 75 per cent occupancy and that Port of Spain would not have been able to have the group and conventional business already booked unless they had a hotel of the Hilton calibre with convention facilities and banquet rooms; and the forecast for 1963 for the Trinidad Hilton was that the Hotel would generate a minimum of \$1 1/2 million in Trinidad in hard currency. He then said that the Industrial Development Corporation which was running the hotel said that the Trinidad one had realised a profit on its operations month by month.

With regard to the Puerto Rico Hilton, the statement by the Puerto Rico Development Board is to the effect that although they had a hotel there before they had the Hilton Hotel, tourism in Puerto Rico started with the Hilton Hotel. The Government built it for Mr. Conrad Hilton to run and at the time there were some people who thought that it was mere folly. It has been a resounding success ever since. Its reservations for the Christmas season start off during the month of June and they are sold out by July or August. The Puerto Rican authorities say that the tourist trade started with the Hilton from 45,000 visitors in 1949. They now have 362,000 a year and the traffic is so great that they are building new hotel accommodation. Last year, they had 2,000 new hotel rooms added.

Sir, there were two points raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter to which I do not need to reply particularly as he is not here. I should have liked him to be here. The only point which I have not replied to was a statement by somebody over on the other side to the effect that the Development Board has loaned out millions of dollars to local hoteliers. The sum owed by local hoteliers is less than \$400,000 and in almost all instances they are paying it back. While it is true, as has been said by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, at first the impact of the tourist dollar may not be as obvious as that from sugar, yet still it is there. The fact is that the tourist dollar is so diversified and spreads through so many channels of the community, through the taxi drivers, curiosity sellers, your shops in Bridgetown and your restaurants. You could not support the restaurants in the Island without your tourist trade. Tourists come in and have to be fed and they buy clothes and food. All these things reflect in our imports apart, of course, from our direct employment. As a matter of fact, hon. members must have had direct knowledge of the appreciable large number of people who are employed during the tourist season, and after the hotels are empty they do almost nothing until the winter season starts again. However, there is hardly one commodity utilised in the country that the volume would not fall resulting in a decrease in Government's revenue were it not for the fact of this expanding number of people who come to the Island as tourists.

We feel with the construction of the Hotel Hilton, this country would increase in the number of tourists coming here and they would be contributing a proportionate increase to the Colony's income from tourism. There would also be increased employment, and the overall feature is that the economy of the Island must benefit from this venture which the Government has taken up at this time. No

one wants to assume the role of a prophet, neither does one want to be accused of attempting to foresee the future nor to pontificate on what the position is likely to be. Neither the Government nor the Hilton people would have undertaken this venture if they were not convinced of its ultimate success.

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

RESOLUTION TO SANCTION AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVERNOR-IN-EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND B.U.O.C. LTD.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade; to move the passing of a Resolution to sanction an Agreement made on the 19th of October, 1962, between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Barbados Union Oil Co. Ltd.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The next item on the Order Paper is a Resolution to sanction an Agreement made on the 19th October, 1962, between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Barbados Union Oil Co. Ltd.

Now, Sir, I want to begin by repeating what I said last week in presenting another matter in respect to a point made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that the Government signed an Agreement, and the House is now being informed about it. I want to clear the atmosphere at the beginning by saying that although the Agreement has been signed, legally it has no validity at all unless it is ratified by the Legislature. This Agreement was brought to the House almost immediately after it was signed between the two contracting parties, which is a procedure completely unlike what has happened when Esso signed an Agreement with the Government for bunkering at the Deep Water Harbour or the case with the Agreement between the Government and Costain's people for building the Deep Water Harbour.

Now, Sir, the motivating factors which influenced the Government to enter into this Agreement are several. In the first instance, it was a question of employment. The Barbados Union Oil Company now employs about 118 people and those people are now actually employed every other month. Work is not sufficient to keep them in employment every month in the year; and while it is true that we understand that the staff is being paid although it is not working throughout the year, the fact remains that in order to do this the company claims that they are losing money. For the last two years, according to their Balance Sheet, they have lost about three hundred thousand dollars — approximately \$150,000 a year — and instructions were given to wind the company up and eventually to close it down.

Apart from this question of employment, one other motivating factor was the question of savings in our balance of payments.

4.50 p.m.

Obviously, if we import petroleum products which are already refined, we have to spend more money than if we imported the crude petroleum and refined it here. There is no reason why this country which has a population of one quarter of a million people and with its high utilisation of petroleum products should not take advantage of a small refinery and expand it to take care of our requirements. I know that there will be a lot of opposition by Trinidad refiners if we take this step, but Trinidad is doing now what we propose to do. At the moment, we are importing \$2 million a year in petroleum products from Trinidad, and the crude is not indigenous Trinidad crude. As far as I remember, almost 50% of the crude product refined in Trinidad is imported from Venezuela and from the Middle East, and there is no justifiable reason why, with our own economy to expand, we should sit here and allow Trinidad to import the crude product from the Middle East and send it out here as the refined product. In this connection, there has been some talk about Trinidad and the victimisation of Barbadians who work in the Trinidad Oil Fields. The Barbadians who are now working in the Oil Fields in Trinidad have been there before the War or during the War. Under

the Trinidad Constitution a period of two years' residence will entitle you to apply for Trinidadian citizenship. Trinidad has not been recruiting workers from Barbados for a long time and, as a matter of fact, they are chasing out people; but a Barbadian can remain in Trinidad by applying for Trinidad citizenship as long as he has been there for two years.

Another motivating factor in inducing the Government of Barbados to enter into this Agreement is the question of taxation. Right now with consumption as it is, with no expansion, if the Agreement is put into effect, we will collect no less than \$100,000 a year in Income Tax from the British Union Oil Company people; and the forecast is that in less than ten years we should be collecting no less than half a million dollars from the erection of the factory. The profits made out of petroleum products from Trinidad go to swell their taxation coffers and we get nothing. Even Antigua with one quarter of our population and without any semblance of an oil refinery is interested in refining petroleum in the country; why should we not be entitled to do the same thing especially when there is a small operation in our midst? There are countries which exist purely on the basis of refining oil, and one such country is Curacao. Numbers of West Indians have found work in Curacao and this refining gives rise to additional industries. In the case of the local company, when we first started negotiations, we discussed with them — the Hon. Premier and myself — in New York the possibility not only of extending the refinery eventually but of further industrial development. I am satisfied in my mind that the present generation and future generations will have to regard any Government in this country as being purely obscurantist or lacking in vision not to utilise the opportunity which is presenting itself to take advantage of the active existence of a small refinery and expanding it to the point where it can provide nearly all of our petroleum requirements.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the delay in asking the Legislature to ratify this Agreement was due to the fact, as has already been explained by the Hon. Premier on the floor of this House, that the distributing companies, namely Esso, Shell and Texaco who will have to buy the petroleum products from the local company, did not agree with the principle; but this Agreement is almost exactly similar in every respect to the Agreement reached between Jamaica and Esso for the erection of a refinery in Jamaica. The requirements of Jamaica come from Trinidad. The delay in asking the Legislature to ratify this Agreement was due to the fact that we were giving other distributing companies time to reach agreement with Mobil Oil with regard to the conditions under which this Agreement will take place. Most of these companies have distillations here, and their entire operations have been geared on the basis of the importation of their requirements, and this will require some change if the structure of the operation is so fundamentally altered. We have therefore been giving them time to try to get together with Mobil Oil and try to iron out any difficulties which may exist between themselves with regard to the acquisition of their supplies from the domestic company. 5.00 p.m.

Now before I pass on to the actual text of the Agreement itself and a detailed examination of the outstanding points in the Agreement, just let me say in passing, Sir, that arising out of the expansion of the refinery, two additional industries are possible. With an extension in the amount of crude which Mobil would now have to import for refinery purposes to supply all our requirements, it is possible for Barbados to start manufacturing fertilisers. In Trinidad the various fertiliser companies manufacture fertilisers from natural gas. We have not got available supplies from natural gas for that purpose here, but our imports of fertilisers are very high, and I myself have seen in Puerto Rico about four years ago a fertiliser plant operating purely from imported crude. The basis of the operation is the actual saving in transportation costs from importing crude petroleum in bulk as against importing fertilisers in bags. This in one of those clear cases where the economics of bulk transportation can actually give rise to industrial location in the same manner as if you had the raw materials locally produced, because the economies in bulk transportation are so

great that so long as it is possible, you can import your raw material, process it locally and sell at a competitive price which will operate, for instance, in the case of a flour mill where the cost of importing wheat in bulk is one quarter of the price of importing flour in bags. You charter your ship and pump the product into the hold; it is loaded automatically and discharged automatically with a resultant considerable reduction in transportation costs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to get back to this, I said that imports of crude petroleum will reach a volume where we can with ease increase the amount to bring in enough to produce at least sulphate of ammonia here from the imported crude; and therefore if Trinidad wants to get annoyed because she is going to lose her fertiliser trade in Barbados which she has enjoyed for the last few years, that is her affair, and we should be completely lacking in occupying the position we occupy if we allowed the feelings of an outside independent territory under given circumstances to prevent us from taking all the steps we can to expand our own economy.

The other industry, Sir, is the question of utilising our bagasse for the manufacture of hard board. I am not talking now about the proposed industry of Mr. Cottrell in which the manufacture of roofing tiles is projected from bagasse. Even Mr. Cottrell's proposed industry could only utilise about one-tenth of our available bagasse supplies. At the moment we produce about 220,000 tons of bagasse a year and the factories utilise about 160,000 tons now for fuel. Early last year I had discussions with a number of factories on this, and they too agreed they much preferred to use oil to fuel and would be willing to convert from bagasse to oil as fuel provided they got a market for the bagasse. Well, we have been fortunate enough to have been able to run up against an operation at present working in one of the Central American territories converting bagasse into hard board in which a new system is in operation, and in which the expenditure involved for producing an economic plant is by no means beyond the resources from local capital. It is a new enterprise, and there are certain local sugar factories now interested in acquiring the equipment. The main difficulty is in getting a market for the hard board we will produce, because the minimum output from this plant would be more than what the Island can absorb. We are working now in an endeavour to find markets for the production, because if we can do this, it means we can start production almost immediately. There is a big market in the United States which Cuba used to supply. Of course Cuba is not supplying now, but the Americans themselves, in Florida where they have expanded sugar cultivation, manufacture hard board from bagasse for the local market.

I just mentioned that in passing because this matter of a refinery and industrial development of this sort introduces a sort of chain reaction, and when you start on an enterprise like this, it means that you are presented with opportunities for industrial expansion which normally you would not be presented with in the ordinary course of industrial development with industries of an entirely different nature. Oil being the basic thing that it is, and the important commodity which it is, a considerable expansion is possible.

Now to get to the text of the Agreement itself, Sir, the first article refers to the grant of authority, the second to the importation of machinery and equipment, because the company has the right to import machinery and equipment for the refinery under specified conditions. These will be free of customs duties, taxes and other charges, except charges under the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960. Article 3 deals with importation and exportation of crude petroleum and petroleum products, and Article 4 deals with the marketing. Under Article 4, Sir, a company is obligated to supply full requirements for petroleum and petroleum products of the Island from the refinery, and the products listed here are gasoline, kerosine, distillates, fuel oils, asphalt and asphalt products. 5.10 p.m.

You will notice that the lists of products makes no reference to Bunker C fuel which is needed for ships coming to

bunker here for the reason that bunkering oil fuel is already imported under the Agreement by Esso Standard Oil who have the contract for bunkering ships at the Deep Water Harbour. Then there is the question of a certain type of aviation fuel which the Barbados Union Oil Company would not be able to supply at the beginning, and which we will continue to import. This Article also imposes penalties for failure of the company to meet the colony's requirements in the asphalt products.

Article Five deals with the Refinery Incentive. You will notice in paragraph (A) that the Government agrees to provide certain incentives to the Company in the form of application of a fiscal system which encourages the purchase by all marketing companies in Barbados of their requirements for petroleum products in Barbados from the Refinery.

It also deals with the imposition of a consumption tax of not less than six cents (Eastern Caribbean Currency) per wine gallon to be levied by the Government on gasolene, kerosene, distillates, fuel oils, asphalts and asphalt products entered for consumption in Barbados which rate is to be the same whether the petroleum products are imported into Barbados or purchased from the Company. In the case of products purchased from the Company. The Company shall discharge the obligation for such consumption tax, and, in the case of petroleum products imported, such consumption tax shall be paid by the importer of such petroleum products.

You will also see in paragraphs (3) and (4) the manner in which the Company with which the Government is a party in this Agreement is exempted from the consumption tax obligations in the manner provided in the paragraph preceding.

Now, Sir, Article Six deals with Restrictions and Limitations of the Company. At paragraph (B) it is stated that the Company shall keep such accounts in respect of its operation under this Agreement as the Comptroller of Customs of Barbados shall prescribe. At (C) it is stated that the Company shall pay such fees or other charges for supplying marine fuel to vessels as may be prescribed by law. At (D) it is stated that the Company shall file with the Government monthly returns within fifteen days following the end of each month showing the amounts of marine fuel sold and delivered to vessels as ships bunkered during the preceding month. At (E) The Company shall permit Government through its duly authorised and properly identified agents or representatives to enter and inspect the refinery installations at reasonable intervals during ordinary business hours.

Now, it is also agreed to that 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.

Now, this paragraph is very important. It is paragraph (1). The Company is compelled to give preference to Barbadians in the staffing of a 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. In this connection the Company undertakes to provide training for such Barbadian labour as in its judgment is adequate to carry out the objectives of the use of such labour as stated above.

In other words, included in the Agreement is a compulsion to require the Company to accord priority of employment to Barbadians for all the refinery operations and

also to provide wages and the necessary training for them to efficiently carry out the Company's operations.

Article Seven deals with the Ancillary Rights of the Company.

Article Eight deals with Right of Transfer and the vesting of liabilities and so on in the person, or the Company to whom the Company is transferring its rights.

Article Nine spells out the effective date and term of the Agreement. This Agreement shall be effective from the date on which the British Union Oil Company Oil Station Act, 1919, is repealed and legislation has been finally passed and approved implementing the terms and provisions of this Agreement. Initially, the Agreement will last for 25 years, provided however that at any time prior to twelve months before the termination of such initial period, the Company shall have the right to apply to the Government to renew the Agreement for a period of not less than ten years.

Article 10 refers to the penalty by a party to the Agreement if they fail to carry out the terms of the Agreement.

Article 11 deals with Arbitration and Article 12 flows from there. Article 13 deals with the Applicable Law and Article 14 deals with a matter which I referred to earlier as regards the purchase of fuel oils as are used for bunkering vessels.

As I have said, not so long ago, an Agreement had been signed with Esso giving them the right for bunkering at the Deep Water Harbour.

Now, Sir, the Addendum explains in detail all of the basic provisions of the Agreement, and I shall like to draw attention to paragraph six where it is stated that revenue-wise the Government will incur no loss. In fact, it is estimated, on the basis of the 1961 import statistics, that the payments to be made by the Company under Article 4, paragraph H, will yield approximately \$17,000 more than the revenue derived from import duties on crude petroleum, petroleum products and ingredients used in refinery operations.

In other words, what this means is that normally petroleum products imported pay a certain amount of duty, and when this Agreement starts to operate, naturally, there will be no further importation and no customs duties to be collected. That is why we are levying a consumption tax. But under the new system of collecting revenue from the local operation, although we are going to lose all the import duties which we formerly got, we actually are going to collect \$17,000 more, which means that if the existing position were to remain, we would lose this amount per year which we would collect when we put this new Agreement into effect.

Paragraph 7 of the Addendum sets out that expansion of the existing refinery facilities will be necessary. That will provide steady year-round employment for the existing employees of the refinery and will also create new jobs.

Sir, you will recall that I said that the employees are not now steadily employed.
5.20 p.m.

That has been the position for the last two years; they are employing people when they do nothing. Probably the hon. senior member for St. Peter will be able to substantiate this because I think that all the employees there are members of the Barbados Workers' Union. I hope that the hon. member will return to his seat before the consideration of this Resolution is concluded. None of us could be so fatuous as to imagine that this situation would have continued for any appreciable length of time, where a company would employ people and pay them for doing nothing. I may say that the situation is only continuing because the Company has been assured that the Government had this Agreement under consideration and would put it into effect as soon as we thought we had given the Company and the other distributing companies time to get together and resolve all of their distribution problems.

As to the Agreement, we will ensure that there will be no repercussions from any applications under G.A.T.T.

Paragraph 9 of the Addendum to the Resolution summarizes the main provisions of the Agreement and states them generally. I do not think I need say anything more at this stage except with regard to the prices. The Company is required to make available the products to which I have referred in bulk quantities to the marketing companies in Barbados at prices corresponding to the prices for similar imported products. In other words, the fact that Shell, Esso and Texaco will have to buy their stocks of petroleum from the local Company, would not put them at any disadvantage since the local Company is obligated to sell them at prices at which they could obtain these products elsewhere. The oil industry issues monthly a publication which fixes the world price for petroleum products, petroleum diesel and that sort of thing, and the local Company is tied by the price which is fixed at this international standard so that the local distributing companies are not placed at any disadvantage with regard to the price at which they will get their supplies from the local refinery. Although the Agreement is for an initial period of twenty-five years, there is provision for renewal for an additional period of ten years. The Agreement also covers the point ensuring the quality of the locally-refined products.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that that is all I need say on this Resolution at this stage. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened most carefully to the reasons which inspired the Government to make this Agreement with the Barbados Union Oil Company as set out by the Hon. Minister, and in some respects the matter needed to be investigated most carefully, considering that we are embarking on giving assistance wherever possible to industry or industries which set up their place of operation in this island. We do not agree that that state of affairs should obtain for one industry and not for the other. We welcome them all, but we must look forward to see if we are not bending over backwards to give assistance to other industries to the eventual detriment of us all. Oil is a most important commodity at all times in our lives and it is the more so in War time; but for industrial expansion you do need an adequate supply of fuel of whatever nature it may be, and at very competitive prices. That is what we should keep in mind at all times in assisting an industry because it is established in Barbados and because it gives employment to many people; and while something should be done to prevent us from losing \$17,000 a year, we must examine very closely to see that in the long run we are not the ultimate losers.

We are embarking on a programme of industrialisation; we are bringing to our shores experts who are trained in that line and who will eventually advise the Government and these industrialists as to the types of industries which can economically be established in Barbados. One of these industries comes to our mind and it has for a long time engaged the attention of Barbados; that is, the turning of bagasse into hardboard. We have bagasse here and we use 160,000 tons out of 200,000 tons of it. When these sugar factories are converted to the use of oil and we have available the raw material in the form of bagasse, that item can play its part in developing a new industry of which we have all heard so much.

5.30 p.m.

We have heard of the economics of that, and I do hope, if not this year, or in a few years, eventually we would find an answer to that and therefore have uses for that bagasse in something other than fuel, because it would be adding another industry to the island whereby the economy would be built up. Before we can do that, we have to be assured that the price for oil in Barbados would be at an economic level. When you eliminate competition, and that is what I fear, there is a habit of prices rising; and no matter how careful the Government may look into the matter, they have no means of controlling or bringing the prices to what they should be. It is not more than four years ago that this same oil company was the sole supplier of heavy oil for industry. Today it supplies oil to the Electric Company, to the

refineries and to any big user of heavy-type oil, and when they were the only marketers of that oil, the price was extremely high; but as soon as Esso came in and put up an installation for that same type of oil, the price dropped and has remained down. The oil companies may argue that that was because of world conditions, but that has been brought about by competition. If you give any single organisation or businessman the free run of a market, he just cannot help himself, and the inefficiencies that he would develop by not having competition will be passed on to the consumer. Competition is a nice thing in a market, and I do agree that some form of assistance should be given to a local industry. I am not concerned about Trinidad and having to buy their products.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Trinidad had a wonderful opportunity of keeping these markets for herself if she had remained in the Federation, but she elected to go out; so I am not thinking of the Government of Trinidad or any other oil company. I do say, however, that we should preserve competition especially for a commodity as precious as oil. By these arrangements the other three oil companies that are now marketing petroleum products in Barbados will have to go and buy from this oil company, the Barbados Union Oil Company. They will be compelled to do so because there are clauses in this that if they continue to import, a tax will be placed on them, and if that is inadequate, Government can step it up again until they are brought to their knees and compelled to buy from the oil company that we have in this island.

The Hon. Minister of Trade stated that this Agreement is identical with the Agreement of the Jamaica Government which was signed with Esso in Jamaica. In one very important respect it is not so, and it is that the Jamaica Agreement leaves the door open for another refinery if the possibility should arise. It is not left exclusively to one oil company, but the door has been left open, in the event the Jamaica Government wanted to establish a refinery themselves or in partnership with someone else. That might have been the very reason why I said you should not tie yourself entirely to one horse. If they found that Esso in Jamaica was abusing their rights, and through the price structure were eliminating competition with the other marketing organisations maybe at great expense to themselves, the door was left open for them to join with another oil company, maybe, in another name, to bring competition back into Jamaica. That is a very important clause that was left out of the Barbados Agreement. You have not left the door open that much. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What is the number of that clause?) It is not in the Barbados Agreement but it is in the Jamaica Agreement.

Now when we learn that the Barbados Union Oil Company employs 118 people in the island, though we are in sympathy with them in having to pay a year's wages for six months' work in many cases which results in this great loss they are suffering - and they have my sympathy for that let us remember that the other three marketing organisations in Barbados do employ labour; and if by chance the other three should disappear in this struggle, it would mean a consolidation into one company and the loss of labour as a result in the island, because if four people were doing business for X persons and you centralised the businesses into one, it would be a very foolish company that certainly could not cut back its overhead.

5.40 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I hate to interrupt the hon. member but I wish he would explain because I do not follow it. At the moment, the only operations here of the other companies are distributing stations. That is all. The fact that Mobil will have exclusive refining rights and will not give this Company exclusive distributing rights, and if it takes 100 or 10 to distribute petroleum, they will still need these petroleum distributing stations. I cannot for a moment see how the centralization of refining can have any adverse effect on the distributing employment. You will have the same gasoline stations employing the same people still.

Mr. GODDARD: In my remarks, I talked about marketing. I was going on to that. As regards the method of fixing

the price for the three marketing organisations, you said it was going to be absolutely fair.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I said that under the Agreement the Company has to supply the petroleum products to the three other marketing companies at prices similar to what they sell them, so they are not at a disadvantage. The local company cannot charge one half-penny more than what they can import the product for.

Mr. GODDARD: The price, I presume, would be based on the point of delivery. The Esso people have their Bulk Installation at Black Rock; similarly, Shell and Texaco. The B.U.O.C. has theirs at the Garrison. What price will they charge Esso, Shell and Texaco for oil delivered to their bulk installation? Will those three companies have to go and take it from the Garrison? That is the point which I am making. The manufacturers naturally would be at an advantage in having their bulk installation there. I am not saying that there is anything wrong with that, but I am saying if the charges for delivery of oil are such that it would cost them more in their bulk installation as against the bulk installation at the Garrison, then B.U.O.C. definitely will be at an initial advantage in price. Do you admit that? (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: No.) Somebody is going to absorb the cost of delivery, unless you are going to pump it down there.

The point which I am making is this. With these discrepancies I do hope that arrangements between the Marketing Organisation would be so hammered out as not to disrupt our present marketing arrangements in the Island, because if the other three oil companies are not given a square deal by this Agreement, they are likely to say that the basis of profit is too slight for them and they will not be able to continue and then it will only be the one oil Company operating.

If the arrangement can be made where the marketing can be done efficiently at the same price, I have no doubt that these three oil companies will be remaining; but there are certain advantages which this Company would have over the other three; for instance, the B.U.O.C. pays no duty; and another thing is that the Agreement does not say that any of the additives would be free of duty. Would you say that or would they have to pay duty on it? I say that because the other oil companies have their own formulae, and would not allow any oil company to do the additions for themselves. Additives are done individually; and if one oil company is permitted to bring in its own additives free of duty and the other three companies are not permitted that same facility, it would send their cost up.

All of these are small instances, but they will all build up so as to create such conditions for the other marketing organizations that they may throw in the sponge, and then we will have no competition and we can never hope to industrialize Barbados without the competition that is needed for our basic fuel, which is oil. I know of what I speak. Before the Esso Bulk Installation came in, the price of fuel oil to the Electric Company which is a public utility, and to the rum refineries and the other users of heavy oil was far in excess of what we should be paying. The price came down afterwards because they were faced with competition. I do not wish to see your Government or any Government put the Island of Barbados in that position. You will be putting us in that position for all time because when you are dealing with oil, oil is big money, and it takes a lot of money to establish a refinery and to come in and put up installations.

All this springs from a row between the oil companies in Trinidad. We are getting the backwash from it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When the hon. member says that it all springs from a row, what precisely does he mean?

Mr. GODDARD: These three oil companies, Shell, Texaco and Esso, are the three distributors in Trinidad, but Mobil Oil is not in Trinidad.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: When did they have the row?

Mr. GODDARD: I am coming to that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hear the Hon. member answering some other hon. member. You are addressing the Chair.

Mr. GODDARD: I am aware of that, Sir. Mobil Oil has not yet been able to get a foothold in the marketing of their products in Trinidad. That may be news to you, but they have been striving. This row is between the oil companies in Trinidad; it is not between the oil companies of Barbados, and they are using some outside influence to make a barter. They want to make a barter to the oil companies established in Trinidad so that they can divide up the market, and so that they can have entrance into the Trinidad market. I understand that they would make certain concessions. These are things which I know of. I am pointing out the dangers of this Agreement.

5.50 p.m.

In recent weeks we have been talking about the industrialisation of Needham's Point. Last week we were considering and even today we have just finished considering the Agreement whereby the Hilton Hotel will be built at the promontory of Needham's Point and we are now talking about the expansion and development of the Barbados Union Oil Company within a matter of 100 yards from the site which has been selected for the erection of the Hilton Hotel. It is a matter for Hilton to make sure that the selection of that site which is so close to the Barbados Union Oil Company will not affect them in any manner. It may not affect them today, but after this Agreement is signed, the expansion that the Government envisages for the development of the oil industry on that site can easily overthrow, and become a nuisance to, an investment of the people of Barbados of the sum of \$4 million to \$5 million. Hilton themselves will not have one penny of this expenditure. They can take out their liquor, their food stores and their meat and pull out from Barbados, but the Barbados Government will be saddled with an expensive hotel at a site which might be most unsuitable or undesirable for such a hotel as the result of the expansion of the oil refinery.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do hope that when the Hon. Minister replies he will be able to allay our fears somewhat as to what he thinks along those lines. Are both parties happy to find that they are restricted to an area and they are restricted from going across the road because of a very valuable investment to the Barbados Government and they dare not request any such extension? If what we hear as a result of the importation of crude oil in a large way is correct, it is possible that we will have a fertilizer plant as well in Barbados, and will the Hon. Minister say whether it is also contemplated to have this fertilizer plant anywhere near the oil company or in conjunction with the oil company or anywhere near to the site of the hotel? These are things which will be engaging the attention of everyone in Barbados because \$5 million is quite a lot of money to put into one's hand to establish an industry and then to have it endangered from fumes or soot. The entrance of fumes into the hotel may well start a stampede of guests from Barbados by next plane.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I promised the Minister that I would find that particular Clause of the Jamaica Agreement. I have it here and it 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 our 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."

That is Clause 9 of the Jamaica Agreement. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Agreement here has been exercising

our attention over the past six months. We have gone very carefully into it, and although the Barbados Union Oil Company has our sympathy and it needs some measure of protection, this Agreement, as it is, gives so much protection to other parties that we find that we, as a party, cannot vote for this Resolution today because we envisage and we see certain dangers that can accrue to the island as a whole. We do not mean that the Government should not have made an Agreement with the Barbados Union Oil Company to give it certain directions, but they should have a more amicable arrangement for marketing worked out. The Premier has said that he has given these parties an opportunity of getting together and they have not got together. I am not concerned with any oil company; I am concerned about Barbados. I hope that we will not see the possibility of the removal of competition from Barbados in such a vital commodity as oil. Yesterday every one was cooking by means of wood and coals, but hardly anybody is using wood and coals for fuel today, and industries will look forward to oil as a cheap source of fuel supply. When the Barbados Potteries were established years ago, they went to Apes Hill because they thought that in that district there was the cheapest source of fuel which they could get. Other potteries came in years after and they realised that oil could be moved easily. Consequently they went next to the source of supply of the raw product and established a plant and they are using fuel more economically than any one could operate with, and that is with the use of natural gas.

6.00 p.m.

Natural gas in this island is a luxury, but we are also paying a luxurious price by comparison, and that is why I wish you could keep the door open. I cannot agree with this Resolution because I see the dangers from closing the door and excluding competition.

Mr. BOXHILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want it made crystal clear that I am not against this Company or any other company for that matter, but there are some things in this Agreement that I must enquire about from the Minister, and let him know how I feel about them. I do agree that in trying to be a nation, we have to offer incentives in order to get industries into the island, but I am wondering whether in doing so we have not been a bit over-zealous in some of our offerings. I know that no company is going to come here and operate just for the beauty of operating here. Any company which sets up its offices and workshop is doing so because it wants to make money. There is a lot of competition in the West Indies, and as you know, one thing which the West Indian Islands have in common is poverty; and since Barbados' population is growing, we do have to offer some incentive to some of these companies to get them to operate here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, paragraph A of Article 2 reads as follows:-

"The Company shall have the right to import machinery materials, equipment, both water and land (excluding land transportation equipment), spare parts and replacement parts necessary for or attendant to the construction and operation of the Refinery and any expansion or repair thereof. The Government shall, upon request of the Company, extend to contractors and sub-contractors of the Company any and all of the importation rights referred to above."

It goes on in paragraph B to read as follows:-

"The importation of the machinery and equipment and other materials referred to in Paragraph A above shall be free of any customs duties, taxes or other charges, except charges under the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960."

I am wondering, Sir, since the company is going to be here with us a long time if we are doing the right thing. What I am afraid of is that if we offer this sort of inducement to this company, it means that another company coming to operate would have to be offered similar inducement and there is no law binding.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, just let me say at once that this is no new concession we are giving the company at all. If the hon. member had asked me so, I would have told him long ago. Under the 1921 Customs Tariff Act, the company is entitled now to import free of duty machinery and equipment for use in the Refinery. This is legislation 42 years old and nothing new we are giving.

Mr. BOXILL: I thank the Hon. Minister, but I did not say it is anything new. I am expressing my feelings. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is the law.) But we make laws in here, and I am of the opinion that in these tax-free inducements which we are giving a lot of companies coming here, we are going too far.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: We are not giving any tax-free system; they have been entitled to a tax-free system for 42 years. This is not a pioneer industry. Under the 1921 Act this is a provision they were entitled to all along.

Mr. BOXILL: The Minister seems to think I am a moron and cannot understand. I understand what the Minister said, but I am entitled to say what I am saying. I am an elected member here, and I am saying that I do not feel we should be offering all these inducements to new companies that come in. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is in the Act.) Well, let us change the Act. If there was an Act to cut off a man's hand because he pushed it in his right pocket, would we go on with it? You cannot go on with that kind of thing. The fact that something was law from 1921 or whenever it was is no reason why I should not object to it. I was not here in 1921, but I am here now. I have nothing against the Barbados Union Oil Company because I do know that as against the Electric Company which I believe is operating on a greater income than the Oil Company, they pay better wages to their workers than the Electric Company. I want it to be made crystal clear that I am not against the Oil Company, but against some of the things I see here. I believe I know more about the Oil Company than any other member in this House; so I do not know what the Minister is getting off at. I am entitled to agree or disagree with something, and because my Government brings it does not necessarily mean I have to agree with it. What do you think I am; a puppet?

Paragraph B of Article 7 says that the Government agrees that the Company shall for the life of this Agreement have the right to repatriate to its stockholders any and all profits after income taxes realised from its operations under this Agreement. I do feel that when people decide to invest money in Barbados the Government should have it laid down that they should leave a certain amount of the money in the island. It is just like some of these insurance companies who come here and drain the economy of the island. Some should remain in the island to be invested for the sake of the economy of the island because it has been made here; so that is another part with which I do not agree.

6.10 p.m.

Now, the Company agrees to expand, and the hon. junior member for Christ Church is worried somewhat about the proposed Hotel Hilton site with the Company expanding probably on the rest of the land there. I do not know which comes first, whether it is the Oil Company or the proposed Hilton Hotel. But I know this. I do feel that instead of the Government renting out the land at the Deep Water Harbour at a pepper corn price, we should try to induce the Electric Company to remove to that site, even if it meant that we give them some percentage to cover overall expense, or even if it meant helping them otherwise. I am not seeing into the next five or six years; I am seeing into the next fifty or sixty years ahead.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas that none of the land at the Deep Water Harbour is rented out at a peppercorn price. What is rented at a peppercorn rent is rented to the Development Board, but the people who are actually using it do not pay a peppercorn rent.

Mr. BOXILL: I still say that I feel the Electric Company should be induced to remove to that site where we had the Trade Fair.

What I am saying needs an intelligent brain to absorb. I have been to the Electric Company and they have ten diesel engines and two turbines. I think they work as many as five diesel engines at a time depending on the load, and the load throws off the exhaust. I think with that same exhaust the Government or the Company can build a giant-sized evaporator, and with the exhaust coming from these diesel engines we would be able to evaporate sea water into fresh water which would prevent an eventual shortage of water coming about later. What I am saying may seem far fetched. (A VOICE: Are you a scientist?) I am no scientist.

At present they do not utilise the waste heat; and if the Electric Company can be induced to go on that site it would be more convenient and then we may be able to put down some giant generator to evaporate sea water into fresh water. There is where we would be saving a lot because we would be killing two birds with one stone. We would be generating current and at the same time producing water for domestic purposes.

As lawmakers, I think that we should govern and not be governed. I do not see what the Minister is telling me about any law in existence in 1921 and that because it is law we cannot change it, because it would be detrimental to the Island. I do not think by amending the law we will be doing any hardship because we will be getting a little extra cash which we really need and which we can use.

On page three, Article three, it is stated:-

"The Company is hereby expressly authorized to import all grades of marine fuels and to store such fuel in its tanks and warehouses as bonded stores and to redeliver same as ships' bunkers and ships' supplies to vessels in Carlisle Bay or any other location on the Island with the exception of the Deep Water Harbour."

Now, Sir, if I know anything of ordering stores, I think stores can come in for refueling ships. I am wondering what measure we have in ascertaining that these bonded stores will be used only as bonded stores. I would like the Hon. Minister to make that clear to me.

On page 4, Article C reads as follows:-

"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 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."

There is where again I have to disagree with this Agreement. I do feel if through their fault they have to import we should be getting something off them. It is all right to offer incentives, but we have to look at the overall thing. It is true the Minister said that we will gain \$17,000 more, but if we were to be getting a little extra thing from here, it would add to the coffers of Government, and we are badly in need of money. Here is where I feel we should do something about these things. We are bending over a little too far backwards to please these people.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there comes a time when hon. members on the other side must appreciate our position on this side of the Table. The hon. junior member for Christ Church, I believe, has expressed the way in which this part of the Opposition will cast their vote in this respect. As a matter of fact, we see nothing wrong with the Government entering an Agreement with the British Union

Oil Company Limited and giving them certain concessions. Had we seen anything wrong with that, we would not have advocated the assisting and bringing about of new industries in this Island.
6.20 p.m.

What we are afraid of is this; although it can be said, and I suppose with accuracy and justification, that the philosophy which we have followed is one which gave monopolies in this country, yet as I have so often said in this Chamber, times have changed. The political philosophies and views of people have changed, and therefore there is no point in thinking that because your grandfather did something some years ago, it is good enough for you to do the same thing now. I want to make it clear that we would imply no improper motives to this Government in suggesting that the Government did not give the fullest consideration to this matter by going into it; however, looking at the matter dispassionately and after discussing it with ourselves and members of our Party, we feel that we cannot do justice to ourselves by giving our support to this Resolution which is asking us to ratify this Agreement. I say that at the outset.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not hear the remarks of the hon. introducer of this Resolution, but the history of this Company which is known as the Barbados Union Oil Company, started in this Island many years ago immediately after the last War. After that, there is no point in my trying to remind this House that at that time the House was dominated by a Conservative Party. I may say that the Socialist Party has adopted many of these things which the Conservative Party did and they gave certain concessions to this Oil Company. This Company did not pay its way and it was sold out to a gentleman who came in here. I am not saying whether it was a single individual or a company, but the company found that they could not do the business at the time and the company which now owns this concern is a company of great affluence. Few people, even the economists, realise where oil companies begin and where they end. You have a pioneer company doing business in Venezuela under three different branches.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we agree that the Government must give certain concessions in an Agreement. These concessions are not new; but what we do know is that they were objected to very strongly as creating what we consider would appear to be a monopoly. As I have already said, we on this side are not inferring any improper motives to the Government at all; we believe that the Government has done everything in good faith. We do not agree in granting monopolies and we can quote facts to this Government if those facts are worth anything. When we dealt with fuel oil only we had competition. The price in 1957 was something like \$49 a ton and we went from \$57 to \$60. As soon as competition came in, it went down to \$37, to \$34 and then to \$30 per ton; that was as the result of competition. It is not that we are against any company being given pioneer or any other status, but we are afraid of monopolies. Somebody may ask: "How are you going to have a monopoly with this concern which is of such magnitude? This company will import oil from the vein which runs through Venezuela, but no geologist has ever given us the real facts about this matter because we have never paid any of them to give us these facts. Like other businesses, they will operate under one source and under one name.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is also worrying me is this: you are going to supply all the gas stations in this Island from this one particular spot, and all of it is moving off at one particular time in the day. These are things at which we must look. I believe that, in the circumstances, with all these concerns in this particular area, the Hilton Hotel, the Barbados Light and Power Company, with the traffic on Bay Street and with the new oil company which will be there and which cannot be described as an absolute monopoly — with all of these things it must be considered that every bit of traffic connected with this oil company will be moving out from this point. I see an absolute danger in the not distant future to very keen businessmen. I repeat that we, on this side of the House, are not imputing any improper motives to the Government in bringing forward this

Resolution asking us to approve this Agreement, but this Agreement will create a monopoly and we do not feel that we can do justice to ourselves if we give our sanction to and vote for this Resolution as it stands.

My colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, went into the details of this matter and I therefore do not propose to go into any details. I do not want to touch on all of these Clauses of the Agreement because they are all taken from existing legislation. But those of us who are acquainted with the facts know that we tried to secure a footing in Trinidad and was unable to do so. I understand, I do not know if it is correct, because one does not know what went on behind the scenes in the last Government; but I understand that advances were made to the last Government to secure this Agreement and they were not successful.

6.30 p.m.

I understand that the Minister has said that we will receive something like \$100,000 a year more than what we are receiving from the Company, and I can quite see that if a Government can see a business in which they can receive more revenue than they are getting at present and which would employ more people than at present, they would succumb to these circumstances. I too have had discussions on this business, and I am not convinced about the argument of employing so many more people. As a matter of fact, what has been mooted around here two weeks ago was that if this did not go through a lot of people would lose their work. That did not move me, because it did not come from Government circles. Few agreements or bits of legislation have caused us more concern within the last six or eight weeks than this, and we find after careful consideration that we cannot offer it support. If this concession would create a great deal more employment for people in Barbados, the terms and conditions of the Agreement would make no difference because we realise that people must be employed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I fear — and my colleague who is in the trade knows much more about it than I do — is that after a while it is just going to be a question of name, and as has happened, after a while instead of having all these various agents, you will find one manufacturing company may also be a sales company selling directly, and with the absence of competition, God knows what the price of gas would be. I do not like monopolies despite the fact that it may be thrown at me from the other side that I belong to a Party which created monopolies. Like the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, I was not here in 1921 when monopolies were given. It is true in those days you had to give monopolies if you want to get investment in the West Indies. You have to create such a climate to make people feel they were doubly safe by giving monopolies. I am thinking of things like the Electric Company and the Gas Company in the old days when people in Britain who had money or even Governments were only interested in these colonies through what they could get out of them, and in those days you possibly had to create monopolies to get money. In these days we as a Party cannot be expected to support this, because under the circumstances we are satisfied that this Agreement will in future create a monopoly which will not.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I have to correct the hon. member at this stage because the hon. junior member for Christ Church made the same point. Nowhere in this Agreement has any monopoly been created.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect to the hon. member, he certainly has not been listening to me. He cannot prevent me from having something in my mind. I have not said.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to make it clear that I am going to keep a very careful check on statements made by hon. members. What the public is concerned about is the marketing companies. They are not concerned with what the hon. member chooses to say in his mind, but what is in the Agreement. What is in his mind is one thing, but what may be in the mind of the Court is another thing altogether. We have to make a liberal agreement, and not what the hon. member chooses to call the hon. member's mind.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is all well and good. I have read the Agreement, and you must not blame me if I plead ignorance in not understanding it as well as you gentlemen; but what I can interpret and use commonsense enough to know is that they can circumvent this Agreement and call it a monopoly. We fear the danger of this eventually becoming a monopoly. We have criticised this with the highest possible motives; we do not accuse anybody; but we fear eventually this may become a monopoly. If that fear existed and we felt that so many people would benefit from employment from the company, we would brush aside that fear; but taking the figures which I have got and taking all these things into consideration, we say in the circumstances that we cannot support this agreement, because although the hon. member said that they would get \$100,000 more.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What I said, Sir, was that immediately after operation we would get \$100,000 a year in income tax, and then in about ten years we would get \$1/4 million in income tax. Right now we are getting nothing. \$17,000 is the difference we are going to get from the Consumption Tax as compared with what we now collect in duty on imported petroleum products.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I quite understand the hon. member, but as I said, as far as we are concerned, though in future you will collect \$200,000 or more, we still feel, when you take into consideration the business which is being done by the trade, with the opportunity of its becoming a monopoly staring us in the face, that we really cannot support the Agreement, and therefore will have to vote against it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems as if the Opposition and the Government did not have enough consultation on this matter. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What do we need consultation for?) You usually have consultation on other matters.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not fair. I do not know why my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, must make these references and infer that we have consultation on these matters. The hon. member knows better than anybody else that if there are two rebels in the House, he can count me as the second if he is one. (Mr. SMITH: You aren't a thing at all.) I am not anything because I am not prepared to curse people for your Party, but I will accept that from you. I will also treat what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said in the Press too with the contempt it deserves, because you said I am supposed to be running the Government, am a friend of the Government and everything.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the now Speaker of the House was Leader of the Opposition, the hon. senior member for St. Peter took objection all the time.....

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is very unkind for the hon. senior member for St. Peter to get up and say that the Government and the Opposition seem not to have had enough consultation.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we cannot allow the hon. member to comment on a point of order. He says that he objects to that. I must continue to speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am sure you are not going to let any hon. member rule from his seat. It is for you to rule.

Mr. WALCOTT: Is that a point of order? The hon. member has been there nearly five minutes.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me hear the point of order of the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As a matter of fact, when the hon. member made the point of the Government not consulting members of the Opposition, where the hon. member infers that they have not consulted the Opposition in getting together on a matter of policy, I do not think it is kind in him to say that; it is unkind for him to say that.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is a very simple statement which I have made. Is it untrue to say that you have not been consulted? I said apparently the Opposition has not been consulted on this measure. The Government can consult the Opposition on any measure; there is nothing seriously wrong about that. I have not made any speech. It is only for the Government to say what matter they are going to consult anybody about. There is nothing to prevent any Government from consulting the Opposition.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I object to the inference that the Government Party at any time is in the habit of consulting the Opposition on any matter. We do not.

Mr. WALCOTT: This thing is becoming burlesque. The Hon. Minister can rise in reply to anything I have said. If you read the records, you will see that they want to anticipate me too much.

I am not saying that the Government is in a habit of doing anything. What I am saying is that from the speech which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition made on the question of the Oil Company, it does seem that they did not seem to have been consulted. The hon. senior member for the City says because you have not been consulted, you are opposed to it. I take a different view. I have heard what the Hon. Leader of the House said on this matter. I do not have any objection to having an oil refinery not even within the context of the economy of Barbados. People play around with words when they talk of monopoly. A monopoly has to connote something against the interest of the community which it is serving. If Barbados has a small domestic market for certain products, there is no playing around the bush; you cannot have a number of companies competing for the sale of those products.

The Hon. Leader of the House said that he was not imputing improper motives. I do not go for these vulgarisms of what members of the House do to each other when they are in opposing camps. One of the vulgarisms in Barbados which has become current, and it reaches down to the lowest level in the community, is that whenever you are faced with authority and you have to do something, you are doing something with your hands in your pocket. Therefore, it may not be members of the Government, but members of that Party, who have been accusing other Parties for this type of behaviour. Of course, it has become part of the stock-in-trade where people think that they must accuse Government of taking bribes. However, I am the type of fellow who, if I know it is a fact, am going to say it. If I know a man is receiving bribes, I will go as far as to say it on a platform where you can call someone to witness. However, I do not go in for that kind of thing. Sometimes, the same thing you throw at people, a little bit comes back at you. I am not concerned with that especially. None of the oil dollars has come to me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard some people in this trade talking about this matter, when I was talking with them about other matters. Nobody has insulted me by coming to me and saying that "I am going to give you something if you do so-and-so." I am in favour of the Agreement because I believe that if you are going to get a Company to refine oil in Barbados and you are refining it and selling it on the market, I see nothing wrong in your doing so because by doing so you are providing employment for the people. If you have the techniques for refining it in Barbados and the old distributors who were distributing gasoline are going to become the distributors of these things for the Company, what is wrong with that? You do not need any oil expert to tell you, if you can do something which you have to pay somebody else to do, that you should do it yourself. It is just this: your wife can bake nice cakes, why pay for some of the stupidity which other people bake?

Oil has a lot of ramifications. This is what you will usually get. Those people who are opposed to the Barbados Union Oil Company getting this Agreement would go to members of the Opposition and tell them their side of the story because people dealing in oil can spend money in making their case known to anybody. The oil companies had

more power in the Middle East than the Governments of those countries. One of the reasons why you had a dictatorship regime in Venezuela was because at one time Jimenez was more willing to play the part, and the Rockfellers were not prepared to keep Jimenez just playing the part.

Sir, I see nothing wrong in giving the B.U.O.C. the right to refine oil in Barbados. Moreover, Trinidad is refining oil from crude oil which they buy from Venezuela. If you are going to say in one breath, "yes, bring in industries and give them the right to operate" you cannot say in another breath that you cannot give B.U.O.C. the right to refine oil here. I spoke about beer already. I said that I did not agree with what the Hon. Premier said about Banks Brewery. I said that if people can get drunk from drinking foreign beer, Barbadians can get drunk from drinking beer brewed in Barbados.
6.50 p.m.

Similarly, if we have to break the ground in refining oil and a company is willing to do that, I do not see anything wrong in the Government entering an Agreement with them to do so. I am not saying that this is not above board because if it is not above board I would say so; I would say that there is something sinister about it. If the operations which led the Government to enter this Agreement were improper, I would say so. I say that, in principle, I agree with the necessary safeguards which a community like Barbados must have, the right about turn in its own industrial and economic development, and you should not stop short of giving encouragement to people who are going to do something like this. For Barbados I would say that we are making a great mistake if we become only the consumers of products which are manufactured somewhere else; and if somebody is willing to take the risk which is involved in carrying out this project, you are projecting all the hypotheses which the manipulations in oil are apt to use in getting a monopoly; but if we can have the refined product, should we not have it? I have no project at stake, neither Esso, B.U.O.C. or any kind of O.C.'s; they have nothing to do with me. I buy oil; I have no oil interest.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I do not agree with in this Agreement is that the Government is agreeing to wage rates which are obnoxious to us. They have written in a Clause here — and I will say that it is all right for you to write in a Clause like this, as if you are dealing with potatoes or yams which you are not sure about. You have written in a Clause here as if this is 1920 and this Clause is not in consonance with a Fair Wages clause. This is not a contract in which people are going to do something for you. I am going to read this Clause, on page 7 of this Agreement, to which I am objecting vehemently. 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,....."

What 'like job requirements,' I would like to ask, you are going to find within a refinery so that you can say that this is a job requirement here? We have a contract with these people as a Trade Union. You are going to write this Clause in here and you go on further to say this:

"..... such prevailing wages to be determined by the Company who will make actual surveys of the labour market from time to time."

You are crazy. We have an agreement with the Oil Company for wages and they have to pay negotiated wages. You are dealing with employers who give people \$2 or \$3 a day; and you will have man to do these odd jobs. Therefore where you have a Clause like this and there is an Agreement with the Trade Union, my submission and

answer is that these wages should be wages agreed to with the company and the Trade Union. But this is what you have stated here:

".....such prevailing wages to be determined by the Company who will make actual surveys of the labour market from time to time."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member agrees with the Agreement in principle, but he is looking for something to criticise.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not a point of order; that is a point of impertinence. He cannot say that I agree with this in principle and I am looking for something to criticise.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, will you ask the hon. member to sit down?

Mr. WALCOTT: He has to agree with these remarks. You cannot have an hon. member rising on a point of order and saying that another hon. member agrees with something in principle but is looking for something to criticise.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. If the hon. member were to read Article 6 he will see that the Government has to ensure that the Company employs Barbadians; they cannot tell us that they cannot get Barbadians to do the job. We say that the Company has to train Barbadians and employ them. The stipulation that you should put in a fair wages clause.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, how is it that you are allowing the hon. member to cross me when I am making my point?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order. As I was explaining - and if the hon. member does not want the explanation it is a matter for him - what I am saying is that this is a normal clause which has been inserted.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am saying that that is not a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is not correct for him to say what he has said; it is misleading for him to say that that is not known in his Trade Union.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You do not want this to come out.

Mr. WALCOTT: When I am finished pointing this out, you can rise again.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is misleading for the hon. member to say what he said.

Mr. WALCOTT: He cannot say that what I am saying is misleading.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I say it is misleading; it is a deliberate attempt to mislead the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, those words must be withdrawn. I am submitting that the words used that I am making a deliberate attempt to mislead the House will have to be withdrawn. We will have to take note of that.

At this stage, it now being 7 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 7 p.m. of the clock and this sitting is suspended until 7.45 p.m. of the clock.

This sitting now stands suspended.
7.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. WALCOTT: 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 obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention that a motion that words be withdrawn takes precedent over any other matter, and I want to draw to your attention Standing Order No. 26, sub-clause 5. The words I am complaining of which were used by the Premier and which I asked to be taken down are that I made "a deliberate attempt to mislead the House and the public" in my speech. I draw to Your Honour's attention to sub-clause 5 of Standing Order No. 26 which reads as follows:-

"It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House."

I regard the words used - "a deliberate attempt to mislead the House and the public" - as offensive. Further sub-clause 7 says:-

"No member shall impute improper motives to another Member."

I again submit that the words "a deliberate attempt to mislead the House and the public" impute improper motives to me in my speech. Moreover I want to draw to Your Honour's attention to May's Parliamentary Practice, Fifteenth Edition, pages 438, 439 and 440. On page 438 under the caption "Allegations against Members", it reads as follows:-

"Good temper and moderation are the characteristics of Parliamentary language. Parliamentary language is never more desirable than when a Member is canvassing the opinions and conduct of his opponents in debate.

The same right to claim courteous treatment in debate is due alike between both Houses of Parliament; and abusive language and imputations of falsehood, uttered by Members of the House of Commons against Members of the House of Lords have been met by the immediate intervention of the Chair to compel the withdrawal of the offensive words or, in default, by the punishment of suspension.

It will also be useful to give examples here of expressions which are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference. These may be classified as follows:- the imputation of false or unavowed motives; charges of uttering a deliberate falsehood, etc."

There is sufficient evidence in our own Rules and in May's Parliamentary procedure for me to object to these words. You will remember that earlier today the same hon. member made objection to words used against him. Now, unprovoked, on a point of order on which the Rules state precisely that a member should rise and state what it is, he has made these imputations which are not only unparliamentary, but was done deliberately to make an offensive remark, and he could only be using the Rules of the House on a point of order to do so. I am objecting to those words.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is not in his place and I am asking that those words be taken down unless Your Honour rules against it, and I am going to ask that the hon. member withdraw those words when he appears in the House. I want to say that the hon. member with words taken down like this cannot take part in the debate before that becomes the first Order of the Day. I am moving therefore that those words be taken down. I have cited enough evidence for you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in sub-clauses 5 and 7 of Standing Order No. 26 and May's Parliamentary Procedure. It is for Your Honour to Rule if those words used were improper words and if they should be withdrawn. The hon. member has not returned to the House, but I am still exercising my right to make a motion that the words used

be taken down. Unless Your Honour rules those words are Parliamentary or otherwise, I will have to make a substantive motion that the words be taken down. The hon. member is not here and it is for Your Honour to rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter has made objection to words used, and I wonder if that member wants a ruling now in the absence of the Hon. Premier to whom he was referring.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is a matter for Your Honour. If Your Honour wants to suspend your ruling until the member presents himself in the House, it is purely your prerogative.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would prefer to give my ruling in the hearing of both hon. members so that my ruling will be known to both hon. members.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNOR-IN-EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE BARBADOS OIL COMPANY LIMITED

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in view of Your Honour's ruling, I will not even allude to any remarks made by the Hon. Premier bearing on what I was saying on this matter. You will remember, Sir, that I was at pains to point out that in principle I agree with any encouragement given to any industry to develop in Barbados, and I said that I was in favour with the Agreement between the Barbados Oil Company and the Government to have a refinery here. My reasons were that if oil was refined in Barbados, it would offer this community another aspect of industrial development in refining crude oil, and so far as scientific statements about the quality of oil are concerned, I will say that that is the subject for persons who are more knowledgeable about them than I am. I was, however, dealing with the point of having an industry in Barbados with which I said I agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I went on to point out what was said in sub-clause 1 of Article 6 which I will again read. 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 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, 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. In this connection the Company undertakes to provide training for such Barbadian labour as in its judgement is adequate to carry out the objectives of the use of such labour as stated above."

7.55 p.m.

The Hon. Minister of Trade has not raised any question with respect to Article seven, Ancillary rights of The Company, neither has that clause anything to do with the question of Labour Rights.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, anybody who has any acquaintance about Fair Wages clauses knows that you write a Fair Wage clause in when there is not Trade Union. When there is a Trade Union, you do not write in a Fair Wage clause in an Agreement spelling out the wages when the company knows that these things will have to be dealt with between the proper organization and itself.

There will be one refinery in Barbados. I will not use the argument like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition about a monopoly. But here it is where you have a company which already has an Agreement with the Trade Union in Barbados, you are giving them the right to spell out what the wages of workers should be. You are doing what the old Government did during the war when the Americans were paying wages to people here. The Americans were willing to pay

more wages to the people, but they were told to pay the same wages rates of the local wage market. Therefore, the position was that you got a lot of these air bases built for little or nothing. I can well remember when the oceanographic people went to St. Lucia and started to put things there, members of the present Government who were in the Opposition at the time made protestations against the Americans putting up buildings there and the question of wages arose too. This is worse. This states that "The Company 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".

Here it is, you have a Trade Union in Barbados and I say it is not an insignificant Trade Union; it is not a Trade Union in name, but it is a functioning organization; and the Government of Barbados in this year of grace is writing into a contract with the Company, when the Government knows that this same company has a contract with the Barbados Workers Trade Union, "such prevailing wages to be determined by the Company who will make actual surveys of the labour market from time to time". Can anybody expect in this year of 1963 a thing like this to happen? If you did not have a functioning organization like the Barbados Workers' Union, you would have to write that in for yourself. Can you imagine that you have labourers here, and the Company bringing in labourers from outside? Why state that you are giving the right to the Company to determine wages? Why have you written this clause in?

The oil refineries in Trinidad pay higher wages than any wage which exists in Trinidad in the other industries. The minimum wage which a man gets in the oil industry in Trinidad is ninety cents an hour. The type of wages which the oil companies in Trinidad pay does not exist in the City Council. Why are you giving the right to this Company to pay wages "commensurate with prevailing wages paid by other employers of Barbadian labour for like job requirements and such prevailing wages to be determined by the Company who will make actual surveys of the Labour Market from time to time"? That is to say, if you have an ordinary unskilled man working in the oil refinery and Government pays a man in a similar category \$20.00 a week, you are saying that this Company need not pay that man more than \$20.00 a week. What sort of inducement are you giving for better wages to be paid? This is an unnecessary clause. You write that in an Agreement between yourself and a Company which already has an Agreement with the Barbados Workers' Union. Must I not conclude that this has nothing to do with the protection of Barbadian labour? You can write in a clause dealing with training. There is precedent for it all over the world. Wherever you have a functioning organization, you do not write Fair Wages clauses spelling out the wages which the Company is going to pay. A Fair Wages Clause has to be determined by a competent authority, that is to say, the Labour Department, not the employer. There cannot be a Fair Wages clause if it is going to be determined by the employer.

8.05 p.m.

This Clause goes on to say:

".....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 employees 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."

Therefore the Company will go around Barbados and find out what wages are being paid and then they will come back and say: "These are the wages which we are going to pay". I cannot see how you could write that in any agreement in 1963 nor can I see any member of the Government allowing a clause like this to remain in this Agreement.

There are members of the Government who have had considerable experience with Fair Wages clauses; the Hon. Minister of Agriculture himself is one of those members. They can read about Fair Wages clauses in the United Kingdom. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has had a bitter experience during the War. When the United States came along with their work there was no Trade Union, and the Barbados workers who were working for the Americans got comparatively less than what was paid to any other employee in other places because in those places there were Trade Unions. Where the Government is the employer, the Government will write a Fair Wages contract for the people who, for instance, are delivering mails at the Post Office. They will write a Fair Wages clause which is written as a Resolution which was passed as a document.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am wondering if the Hon. Leader of the House would say what this clause means. The Hon. Premier got up to explain, but the Hon. Leader of the House is the person who has introduced this measure. Why is it that the Company must have the right to determine wages for these employees when, at the present time, they do not determine the wages? What job requirement is there in Barbados for anybody to go and have the relevant job requirement? This is something to be negotiated where you do not have a Trade Union; this is not to be negotiated in this way when you have a Trade Union. What you should write in here is that these wages are to be determined by the Trade Union. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have had to postpone negotiations with this very company pending the introduction of this Agreement in this House. We said that in view of the fact that the Company is embarking on a new scheme, we would not proceed to deal with the question of a new contract because there is no point in dealing with a new contract with people when they are in the process of a completely new operation.

I will not worry to deal with the remark which has been used, but could anyone suggest in connection with what I have said, that there is the slightest idea of saying something which is not factual? I am not placing any interpretation on anything; I will draw this matter to the attention of any reasonable person and I will ask him: "What do you take this to mean?" Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is bound to mean that you are giving the Company too much leeway in this matter of determining wages. This is an Agreement which you would give to King Saud. You have an agreement in the Middle East and oil is a very important thing. They will pay expatriates wages and salaries and they will provide them with a house allowance; but because these wages are not to be determined by the Trade Union, our workers will be subsidising wages which every employer pays. I am saying that wages which are paid outside the Trade Union are miserably low. You examine these wages which are paid outside the Trade Union and compare them with those which are determined by the Trade Union. The Government has just sent down a minimum wage for persons who are working in stores, and all they can arrive at is the amount of \$18 per week for these employees and the minimum becomes the maximum in a sector like that; but we have an agreement for messengers and porters where these employees get as much as \$25 a week and in some cases 50% more.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in reference to the wages fixed for shop assistants, I should like to point out that the Committee which fixed these wages has on it a representative of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member does not seem to understand what I am saying. By virtue of the structure of the Wages Councils, there are three representatives of employer, three representatives of the Barbados Workers' Union and three independent persons, so that the representatives of the Barbados Workers' Union sit with six other persons in order to deal with wages. Outside the Wages Councils, there are people who are working for lower wages still, wages which are not negotiated. You cannot open up the company to places where wages are negotiated and why should people not negotiate for wages where a valuable thing like oil is concerned?

A clause like this is obnoxious to any decent-minded Trade Unionist. One would think that when a matter is drawn to your attention you would see the weakness of it. If you mean that the Trade Union can fight against the Company then you should not put in that clause. This means something which will militate against the workers themselves, because you are allowing another oil company to come in here and bargain in the cheapest labour market. I am submitting that it should not be a question of wages "to be determined by the Company, who will make actual surveys of the labour market from time to time", but it should be wages which are determined by the Workers' Organization and the Company. In an ordinary Fair Wages clause it could not read as it reads here: "Wages to be determined by the Company." A Fair Wages clause never allows any person who is carrying on a business to determine wages. 8.15 p.m.

I cannot deal with Article 12 — Force Majeure, since the person responsible for it has left the House. I presume I will talk until 8.30 p.m., and therefore will come back next Tuesday; but apart from the difficulties with which we have to deal in a matter like this, and for which the person has absented himself, I will still proceed to show what I mean. The Article reads as follows:—

"No failure or omission to carry out or to observe any of the terms, provisions or conditions of this Agreement should 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, act of enemies of the United States or the British Commonwealth or of belligerents, sabotage, blockade, revolution, insurrection, riot or disorder; arrest or restraint of rulers or peoples, expropriation, requisition, confiscation, or nationalisation; embargoes or export or import restrictions; compliance with any order or request of any governmental authority or person or body administrative or judicial or otherwise, purporting to act for a Government; interference by, or restrictions or currency regulations or other onerous regulations imposed by civil or military authorities, whether legal or *de facto* and whether purporting to act under some constitution, decree, law or otherwise; Act of God, fire, frost, earthquake, storm, lightning, tide, tidal wave or perils of the sea, accidents of navigation or breakdown or injury of vessels, loss of tanker tonnage due to sinking by belligerents or to governmental taking whether or not by formal requisition; accidents to or closing of harbour, docks, canals, or other assistance to or adjuncts of shipping or navigation; epidemic, quarantine, strikes or combination of workmen, lockouts or other labour disturbances."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there will be no obligation in these days to do these things, but higher up in this Agreement I want to know what is the intention of the Company. It states in Article 4 C:

"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 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."

I would like to draw to the Minister's attention that this clause can be a very dangerous one. He will note that in Article 12 mention is made that if there is strike, lockout or these labour disturbances, you are now giving this Company the right to circumvent these measures. The reason why I say that is because a clause like this in here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is very dangerous for my Trade Union and the workers concerned. With this as it stands, if we call a strike and the oil people say they are not delivering, we will find it difficult, and that is why I had to read these things together. You are giving this Company the right to

come here and pay wages on a loose basis to be determined by them. At the same time, you are giving them the right of saying they can meet the Union but they do not have to care what the Union says. If they pay these wages, because if anything happens, they still have the right to bring in the oil and are going to see to it that they get in the oil; so the Company — and this is where the dangers of the opposition can arise — has two things at its disposal. They can refine at rates to be determined by the Company, and if there is a dispute between the Company and the workers about rates of pay, they have the right to import oil for the refinery less consumption tax in order that they can go on functioning as an organization against any other request we would make. What rights are you putting in here for workers? All these rights are on behalf of the Company.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I need not remind members of the House that there has not been a place in the world where oil refineries have been set up in free democratic countries where you do not have labour disputes. You will remember only last year there was a long oil strike in Trinidad in which the Oilfield Workers Union of Trinidad and all the oil Companies were locked. I am not submitting this from the point of view of projecting a strike in this community, because I would say that Barbados has lost less man days in labour dislocation than any other territory in the Caribbean with a Trade Union of our size and power. We do not strike like a romantic affair; we strike when there is a real need, and I would say in a general way that the days for striking in Barbados are gradually diminishing because happily the majority of employers have exhibited a greater sense of industrial relations, and they are more willing to sit down around a table, no matter how difficult the task may be, and hammer out these things. Only this morning we finalised our negotiations in the Port of Bridgetown and the Harbour, and I can say that substantial increases have been paid to the workers without there being any dislocation, or without there being any attitude to the Union of imposing higher living standards on the people. These increases have been made without any suggestion that the landing charges should be increased in order to give the workers more money, because the Union has taken the responsible view that we do not think it is right in every case to impose an additional charge for a comparatively narrow section of workers to receive an increase if the proportionate increase on the whole community does not justify it. We were satisfied that the landing charges paid and the returns for landing charges made were adequate to give increases without increasing the landing charges, and we have been able to impress the employers and, I believe, in an indirect way, the Government that this is not necessary. 8.25 p.m.

I am not suggesting that we are looking for a clause in the Agreement to call for a strike, because that might be a memory, but this clause precludes to a large extent the effect operation of the marketing company paying wages through negotiations with a competent organization because there is this escape clause through which the Company can import its fuel.

I think the Government has as much right not only to appear as if they are protecting the workers but to do so in actual writing, and it is in these two clauses, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I think I should make an amendment. I do not know if I am in order, but it is not a money Bill. I should say that Article six, paragraph 1, should read 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 judgement, have the qualifications and skills necessary to perform efficiently the duties and discharge the responsibilities of the positions involved."

The 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 the Company who will make actual surveys of the labour

market from time to time." should be deleted. We should not write in a clause in an Agreement something which gives the Company the right to determine wages based on whatever Barbadian workers are paid.

This is an oil company with which we are dealing and I am a bit shocked to find that a Minister of Labour who, if I may say so, prior to his becoming a Minister was one of the staunchest objectors in Barbados to a clause such as this, is agreeing to it. I would like to know who was his advisor. I would like to know who advised him to put this in. I would like to know if Mobil Oil can show you another Agreement of their Company with another Government with this clause in. I do not know if that is a clause drawn from an oil company which has an Agreement with the Government of Aruba or Curacao. Those of us who have experience of what happened in Aruba and Curacao know that workers were not allowed to join a Trade Union outside of the Company's Union with which they were working. I think the hon. senior member for St. George has had experience with an oil company there and he can tell what is the situation there.

Not only is this clause offensive to the I.L.O. Convention, but the I.L.O. Convention repudiates a clause like this.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 8.30 p.m. and according to the Rules of this House, it is the moment of interruption.

Is this matter with which we are dealing a matter of a controversial nature?

VOICES: Yes, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: According to the rules, if there is any other matter which is uncontroversial, it may be proceeded with until 9 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only items on the Order Paper which might be proceeded with at this stage would be Order No. 5 which is an amendment to Married Woman's (Separation and Maintenance) Act, 1950, and Order No. 7, Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee of 900 square feet of land in the Port Area to Messrs. Booth Steamship Company (Barbados) Ltd.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, both matters are controversial.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am surprised to hear that Order No. 7 is regarded as controversial. It is a very simple Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You cannot give way if a matter is controversial. If a member says that it is controversial, that is the end of it. It is not a question of the Hon. Minister's opinion.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am not asking you or the hon. senior member for St. Peter for advice. All that I am saying is in passing. I said that I am surprised to know that Order No. 7 is controversial.

Mr. WALCOTT: But that is nothing to comment on.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I comment on what I feel I should comment on.

Mr. WALCOTT: But it is against the Rules.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Only one honourable member should address the Chair.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am not addressing the Chair at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is worse; you are standing.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Now, Sir, that brings Government business to an end for today.
8.35 p.m.

The remaining items on the Order Paper will remain in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper today. Then there will follow items of which notice was given earlier today.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next the 4th June, 1963, at 12 o'clock Noon.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you put the question for the adjournment of the House, I should just

like to say this. Your Honour is well aware that the University of the West Indies has requested of Your Honour the use of this Chamber over the next week end starting from Saturday, 1st June, until Monday, 3rd June, for the purpose of holding the third meeting of the Appraisals Committee of the University. The first meeting was held in Jamaica, the second was held in Trinidad and the third meeting is to be held here. As the territorial member of the University Council it is announced that this is being done in case that any hon. member should wonder why the precincts of this House are being used for three days by a foreign body.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 4th June, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.40 p.m.