

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd December, 1968.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o' clock today.

PRESENT

Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER;

Prayers were said.

MINUTES

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

DOCUMENTS TO BE LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking for the postponement of the laying of Papers and giving of Notices until later in today's sitting.

The Deputy Speaker indicated assent.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

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

WHEREAS there are many pensioners who are in receipt of small Government pensions, and whose small pittance makes it impossible for them to save anything towards their funeral expenses, due to the high cost of the barest necessities of life;

AND WHEREAS their pensions cease at the day of their death;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to authorise the payment of pensions to the end of the month in which such pensioners died to the person or persons responsible for the funeral expenses of such pensioner.

DOCUMENTS TO BE LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries, I beg to lay the Report to the Governments of Barbados and Guyana from Senator Peter G. Morgan, Commissioner General at Expo' 67.

Also Financial Statements of the Barbados Development Board on Barbados/Guyana Participation in Expo' 67 as at 31st March, 1968.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

RESOLUTIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Senior Member for St. John, Acting Minister of Home Affairs, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the abandonment of the acquisition of certain lands at Sand Street, Speightstown, St. Peter.

Also A Resolution to approve the lease to Sun Farms Limited of certain lands and buildings at Codrington, St. Michael.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$2,741 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968 - 69, in Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 44 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$300,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, in Part 11 - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 45 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

BILLS

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the estab-

lishment of a Provident Fund out of which prescribed benefits may be paid to sugar workers and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY

QUESTIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 214, 216, and 259, asked by the hon. junior Member for St. Peter, are ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 227, 250, and 223 are ready, and also to remind the House that at a former meeting I gave notice that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 168 was also ready.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 187, asked by the Senior Member for St. James, is now ready.

Also the reply to Question No. 234, asked by the Senior Member for St. Thomas, is now ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has been given today.

BILL READ THE FIRST TIME

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Provident Fund out of which prescribed benefits may be paid to sugar workers and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto be now read a first time.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 for the remainder of this day's sitting.

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

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

12.25 p. m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 43

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this amount is required to meet the cost of an antenna which arrived after 31st March, 1968, but which was ordered before, and is consequently a revote of funds which lapsed at the end of the last financial year. It is also to meet the cost of erection by the Ministry of Communications and Works of a heavy duty transmission aerial steel tower for the Police Department.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for the sum of \$2,164 is to meet the cost of erection by the Ministry of Communications and Works of a 120 ft. heavy duty transmission aerial steel tower for the Police Department. It is also to pay the cost of an antenna. Now I am sure that the Leader of the House will admit at some later stage that the suppliers of the antenna have already been paid. It is said in the Addendum that this antenna arrived in the Island after 31st March, 1968, and I would be glad if the Leader of the House can tell us exactly on what date it arrived. I have very special reasons, Mr. Chairman, for making such an enquiry at this stage, and I sincerely hope that by the time they are ready to erect this antenna, all the parts thereto will be found. This question involves Police communication. It is known that the Force - or part thereof - is equipped with a fleet of motor vehicles, and in addition there is radio-receiving equipment to connect up Police Headquarters with all the Stations in the Island except Worthing and Black Rock. This to my mind is not good enough in view of the fact that we cannot deny the rise in the crime rate and the type of crime that is being committed today.

You know, Sir, that we have had a high incidence of motor car stealing during the past months, and it is very necessary to my mind to have all the Stations

equipped with wireless-receiving sets so that they can communicate with these vans, wherever they are in the various areas, and be in immediate touch with Police Headquarters. I think that is very essential at this time.

Now there is a tower at Highgate. We understand that the erection of this antenna with this equipment will improve the range of the service that the Highgate Tower can offer, but in addition to that there is also a Repeater Station at Highgate and one at Castle Grant, and what we do know is that the tower at Highgate has been constructed from an old wallaba post that was brought down from Castle Grant, and we are willing to support any such measure for the replacement of it so as to improve the service. You must bear in mind, Sir, with the incidence of organised crime, as it would appear to us, and the means available to offenders to escape justice and go from one place to another, that this can make it more difficult for the Police; but we know that the Police have what is called an inter-force radio which connects up all the Islands - St. Kitts, Dominica, Antigua, St. Vincent and Grenada - with the exception of Montserrat and St. Lucia up to the present moment.

1235 p.m.

We feel that if something is done about this Repeater Station at Castle Grant, you will find that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, for instance - a place which is equipped with a fleet of ambulances for the transportation of the sick - as well as other institutions in the North and South - Local Government Institutions that are equipped with these mobile units for the conveyance of the sick - they should also be brought into operation, but with their Headquarters for communication purposes being located at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. That could be done, I have been told, through the Castle Grant Repeater Station. You will remember, Sir, that I had an occasion to table some questions in this House arising out of the difficulty experienced by some doctors in getting ambulance services to convey the sick to the Hospital, and while I am not in total agreement with the replies which have been given, I am in a position to say that the ambulance service is not yet nearly anything that can be called satisfactory, either to the sick, the doctors or the Nursing Profession as a whole - the people who have dedicated their lives to the care of these people from time to time. I feel that something should be done, while we are at it, to improve the service and make it possible for a better service generally to be obtained from the operation of the communication system as exists at the moment.

I feel again that something should be done to improve the communications with the Fire Services. The Fire Services ought to be able to connect their various units which we have there, and Fire Services radio should be given some very serious consideration at this particular time. You know the incidence of cane fires, Mr. Chairman, and I understand that we have already had one or two fires during the past month, and each and every one of us would be interested to know that the Fire Services are so equipped as to make it easy for their units to go from one place to another

with a view to protecting the economy of this Island and the life of individuals as well. This question of communications also brings into consideration even our traffic lights which are very important. No one could deny - that the maintenance of our traffic lights system leaves much to be desired. It is very, very poor indeed. There was a time when the Police held the responsibility for the maintenance of these traffic lights, but I understand that the Government Electrical, Inspector's Department now has the responsibility for that. I think it was the hon. senior member for St. Thomas who tabled some questions in this House with respect to the operation of these traffic lights, and what we learnt was that the detector pads in the roads are not really functioning. Many of them have been covered with the pitch, the tar, and many of the lanterns are twisted and the standards bent. That is there for anyone to see. You will find that when these detector pads are not in working order, it creates considerable and unnecessary delay at points where they have been planted, because when traffic should be able on the detector system to move on, it has got to wait because the traffic lights are all now operating on what is known as the fixed time basis. In other words, it is a sort of betrayal of the functions of these traffic lights. Therefore, this whole system of communications ought to be gone into most thoroughly, and we feel that our ambulance service should benefit, and all of the Police Stations, as I have already said, ought to be in communication with their Headquarters and with the mobile units in whatever part of the country they happen to be. It is a disgrace, I must repeat, to find that, in Barbados, where we are now so many mobile units strong in the Force, we still find both Worthing and Black Rock Sub-stations not having any radio communication with the Police Headquarters or with Units on the beat, so to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the Resolution which is before the Committee, but I hope that the Minister will be willing to let us know about the points which I have raised - exactly when the antenna arrived, if it is not true that the suppliers of it have already been paid and if the real cause of this Resolution having to come before this Committee is that no money has been earmarked in the original estimate for the erection of this antenna. In other words, the cost of this antenna has been gone into and arrived at, it was imported and it was found that after it had arrived, there had been no money voted, or rather requested, for its erection. I would like to know if the Hon. Minister can enlighten us on these little points. (After a Pause).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I have asked questions which I think are reasonable questions. If the Addendum to the Resolution states that the antenna arrived in the Island after the 31st March, 1968, and an hon. member has information to the contrary, he has every right to demand a reply from a Minister who has piloted the Resolution through the Committee. I am asking you not to lend your Party support or any sort of support to this kind of behaviour.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not lending any Party support in a matter of this kind.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, you might lend it without knowing that you are doing so. What I am saying is this; the information which I have tried to elicit from the hon. introducer of the Resolution is not information which would send one seeking or searching about in any out-of-the-way place; it is information which the Minister ought to have on his file.

12.45

It is just not good enough to have a Minister sitting down without replying to questions. There is not one point that I have raised that would cause any Minister, who is really familiar with anything that is going on in his Ministry, any difficulty whatsoever in replying.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the hon. Member correctly, I do not think he is contradicting what is said in the Addendum. It says:

"This amount is required to meet the cost of an antenna which was ordered, but arrived after the 31st of March....."

As I understand the hon. Member, he is asking on what day it arrived. I cannot tell him on what day it arrived after the 31st March. I take it that he agrees that it arrived after the 31st March.

Mr. HINDS: I am not saying that it --- (INTERRUPTION.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can hardly hear the hon. Member.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am ready to support the Resolution because I know much more about the antenna than the Minister or any of the Ministers; but this is not the point. This tower is a four-leg type self-supporting tower. Nobody would have anything against this because it is a very good idea. What I want to know is this: are they now sure that they are right? How much of this \$2,164 will be spent on the erection of the tower? In St. Lucia it cost between \$6,000 to \$7,000 to erect one 300 ft. high, but this one is just a 120 ft. This amount of \$2,164 is to pay the cost of the antenna as well as the cost of erecting a 120 ft. steel tower. I would like to hear from the Minister how much the erection of this steel tower would cost, and what would be the cost of the antenna. It is only reasonable to ask whether the Minister can find out whether or not he has given information to this House that is not accurate as regards the date of the arrival of the antenna. These are things which, I think, members of the House are entitled to ask and to receive replies to. I have done nothing whatsoever to embarrass the Minister.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make an appeal to the Leader of the House. Perhaps some of my colleagues will agree with what I am about to say. The Leader of the House is giving the impression, to one or two of us at any

rate, that he is changing the attitude with which this Session began, that is, just ignoring the Opposition. He has gone so far as to give us credit sometimes for making reasonable points. We, on this side of the House, would like to help him in what we know is a difficult position. He is the Leader of the House *vis-a-vis* the Prime Minister; but surely when we make an appeal to him, we would like to keep that good feeling towards him that he is willing to look at the Opposition as part of the system of Government and not to ignore us as being offensive and noisy trouble-makers; therefore, I am appealing to him to reply to the hon. Member who has just made his points.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, no question arises relating to my willingness or unwillingness to accommodate the other side when they ask questions, or try to elicit information. I was hoping that the hon. Member would continue what he was saying until I could get the Box open to find the file which I do not have at the moment. Anyway, the key has just come. If the hon. Member would repeat his point, I may be able to find the information.

Mr. HINDS: I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that by now the Minister has learnt that the antenna was ordered through the Crown Agents. This Resolution seeks the sum of \$2,164 to pay the cost of the antenna, and a portion of it is for the erection of a steel tower for the Police. I have already stated that the suppliers of the antenna have already been paid, and that is an established fact. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like hon. Members to understand Standing Order 29 (6).
12.55 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows as well as ever that the suppliers of the antenna have already been paid, and I thought that the Minister would have been glad to hear me say that it was ordered through the Crown Agents; so if I say that the suppliers have already been paid, any Minister who has any sense would readily assume that they were paid by the Crown Agents, but that the Barbados Government might have received the request for payment to the Crown Agents at a late date; but it is not every Minister who has that mentality to understand these things. I have told them about the old wallaba post at Highgate. We are glad to know that it will be replaced by something that is serviceable, and I also said earlier that I would be glad to see our communications system is such that the communications between the ambulance service and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the institutions in the North and South are so improved as to facilitate to a greater extent the carrying of sick persons from one institution to another, as the case might be.

Now I am asking to be told what was the date of arrival of this antenna, what is the cost of it and what is it estimated that erecting this tower will cost out of this sum of \$2,164. I also said that the antenna has been in the Island for so long that I sincerely hope that all the parts thereto will be found

by the time they are ready to erect it. Is this something that an hon. member in opposition or any other member of this House should not be interested in? Now, Sir, our mobile units that are in use by the Police Department are all fitted with two separate channels, so that it would not be very difficult if a channel that is not in use is assigned to some other purpose; but I want to warn against having the Police units connected up with the ambulance service of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or these institutions in the North and South, because one would appreciate the fact that when the Police are communicating one with the other, the ambulances would also be able to pick up what the Police are relaying one to the other. We would not like to see that at all, but we can see no reason why something cannot be done in the case of Fire Services. I do not think there is anything more I would have to say on this Resolution, except that I am quite willing to vote for it immediately the Minister gives us his little reply which I am sure he would be ready to do by this time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, I think, wanted to know which part of this \$2,164 represented the cost of the steel tower and which part the antenna. The breakdown for that is as follows:- it is \$1,500 for the erection of the tower, and \$664 represent the cost of the antenna. I have no information here available to indicate when the antenna did arrive, but it is possible of course that the Crown Agents may have paid for it on behalf of the Government, to be reimbursed subsequently.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

THE PUBLIC HOLIDAYS ACT, 1968.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to bank holidays and public holidays.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on 28th February, 1963, a Committee was appointed to enquire into the working of the Shops Act and Bank Holidays Act with the following terms of reference:

"To review in the light of present day conditions the working of the Shops Act, 1945 and Orders made thereunder, and the Bank Holidays Act, 1905, as it affects the opening and closing of shops, and to make recommendations thereunder.

1.05 p.m.

This Committee met and had 13 meetings and to its meetings it invited interested parties, it made advertisements in the local newspaper and canvassed the opinion of interested parties. It also had the assistance of Miss S. A. Ogilvie from the Department of Technical Corporations in London, who ably assisted the Committee in its work. I may say here that hon. members will see that there are two Bills to be dealt with, which have to do with the opening and closing of shops and the conditions of service of shop assistants. I propose Mr. Deputy Speaker, to give this Hon. House an outline of the recommendations of the Committee, and the Report or an outline of the Report which they were asked to present in 1963. This will serve as my second reading Address. I will deal with the entire Report and I will move that the Bills, as they come up, be read a second time; that is to say, I am going to give an outline of the Report and I am to make one speech. The Legislation in respect of the hours for the opening and closing of shops was introduced.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Do I understand the Minister to say that he is going to make one speech in relation to two Bills or in relation to a Bill which is not before the House?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, both of the Bills which we have are here as the result of the Report of a Committee, and I propose making one second reading speech. I can get up and say: "I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time", but out of courtesy for the House, I propose to give hon. members an outline of the Report of this Committee as far as it affects shops and bank holidays. I do not consider it necessary for me to get up here and make one Address in respect of shops and another Address in respect of bank holidays. I am going to give an outline of the Report of the Committee. I prefaced my remarks by saying that this Committee was appointed in 1963, and I gave its terms of reference. This Bill which is before the House plus the Shops Bill emanated from this Report, and I think it is a waste of time for me to make two second reading speeches. I am therefore going to make one speech giving hon. members an outline of the Report of the Committee, and when I get to the Bills, I will move separately that these Bills be read a second time. I do not believe in wasting time.

I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that provision is made by means of the Shops Act, 1908 (1908-11) which amended and consolidated the existing laws - its principal provisions fixed the hours for the opening and closing of all shops as 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. on week days and 10 p.m. on Saturdays. It further provided that all places of business except those specified in an exempting subsection, should be closed on Sundays, Christmas Day and Good Friday,

or other days set apart by public Proclamation for Divine Service. There is a feeling by some hon. members with whom I have had talks on this Bill, that there is no provision in law for declaring Sundays, Christmas Day, Good Friday or other days set aside by Proclamation for Divine Service as closing days - that there is no provision in law for these. I would just like to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that this provision is found in the Shops Act 1908 (1908-11).

In 1925, the Weekly Half-Holiday Act made provision for a weekly half-holiday for all persons employed in shops. In 1937 proprietors of shops were required by the Shops Assistants Act 1937-12, to provide seats for shop assistants. In 1945, an attempt was made to introduce a comprehensive code for the control of working hours in shops and for safety and health requirements. The Acts of 1908, 1925 and 1937 were amended, consolidated and amplified by the Shops Act of 1945. Amendments to this principal Act were made in 1951, 1956 and 1957. These four Acts constitute the legal code for the regulation and control of shops in this country. In 1945, the Shops Act introduced a comprehensive definition of shops from which were excluded a market lawfully held, a bazaar for charitable, religious or public purposes or any part of a building in which a shop is located, if such part is used exclusively for trade or business carried on in the shop. The Shops Order divided shops into two loosely divided geographical categories, that is, the urban category of shops and the Rural category of shops. The Bank holidays Act which is before us now makes provision for, or specifies the days of the year to be observed as bank holidays and provides that, subject to certain exceptions set out in Section 6, no bank, public office, place of business or school may require the attendance of any employee or permit any school to be opened for tuition on any bank holiday. The Shops Act of 1945 further provided that no shop, which is exempted from the operation of the Bank Holidays Act, shall be opened for business in contravention of any of the provisions of the Shops Order. Article 3 of the Shops Order 1957 provided two alternative days for the early closing of Urban shops, that is, the retail shops in the Urban area, green grocers' shops, bakers' shops, butchers' shops, fishmongers' shops, ice vendors' shops, and they were required to close on Thursday, while for all other classes of shops, the early closing day was Saturday. For shops in the Rural area, the early closing day was Thursday. Provision is made that whenever a tourist ship is expected to visit the Island, the proprietors of a shop may, on giving 24 hours' notice in the newspaper, substitute another day of the week as its early closing day. That is as a result of the 1957 Shops Act.

This Committee which was appointed on the 28th February, 1963, to look into the working of the Shops Act, although it was of the opinion that the Shops Act and the Shops Orders made under the Act provide a modern code for the control of the working of shops, although a weekly half holiday as a result of the Shop Act is mandatory, the health of shop assistants is safeguarded by the provision relating to the

sanitary conveniences and the number of seats for shop assistants, although powers of inspection have been given to the Labour Commissioner and his officers.

1.15 p.m.

When I say the "Labour Commissioner", of course, he is now substituted by the Chief Labour Officer; The penalties for breaches of the provisions of the Act and Orders have been prescribed; The Shops (Amendment) Act, 1956, prohibits any racial or other form of discrimination in Shops - although the Committee felt that this is reasonable, they discovered that experience in the administration of the Shops Act revealed that there were still certain defects to which attention ought to be paid.

You will notice, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they have also recommended, and it is provided for in the legislation in the Bill before us, that employees in hotels, restaurants and bars who were, under our existing laws, classified as employees of shops, in their recommendations they felt that these should be exempted, and the Bill which I am asking this House to give a Second Reading to makes provision for this. The Committee also felt that there should be some flexibility in respect of hotel, airport, harbour shops, restaurants, inns and taverns, to meet the changing needs and the habits of the community.

It is recommended that the general provisions of the Shops Act should apply to Shops falling within these classifications, and that the Minister be given statutory authority to make Regulations and to vary them from time to time with respect to the days and hours of opening, and the conditions of employment of persons working in shops so classified. The Committee also had a look at the volume of tourist trade in the country, and saw that the tourist industry was increasing considerably and that certain provisions should be made for accommodating the tourists.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these provisions are made in the Act whereby certain permission under the authority of the Minister may be given to shops to open on certain days when tourist ships visit the country, but on certain conditions that employees are paid at overtime rates and that it ought not to be mandatory, or compulsory, for any employee to be compelled to work on the days when he should normally be off. The Act also makes provision that an employee, who refuses to work on a day other than his normal working day, should not be victimised. Any victimisation will be met with a penalty.

Now, this was done to assist the tourist trade, but at the same time the Committee felt that every shop assistant, or every employee, was entitled to time to rest, and this ought not to be denied him if he desires it. The Committee also felt that there should be certain safeguards as far as the health and welfare of shop assistants are concerned, and these recommendations have been accepted by the Government.

It is felt that suitable and sufficient sanitary conveniences ought to be provided and maintained for the use of all persons employed in shops. It is felt that efficient means of egress in cases of fire should be provided and maintained. The Committee also felt that suitable means of ventilation ought to be provided, and that the provisions of a safe means of access to every place in which a shop assistant has to work should be provided; that an adequate supply of fresh and wholesome drinking water should be provided for the employees as well as adequate space so as to prevent injuries to health from overcrowding, and that the provision of a rest room for female assistants should be made where there are no fewer than five people employed.

Then the Committee came to the question of cleaning of shops. It was felt that shops ought not to be cleaned during the time when employees were supposed to be working, and they recommended, and it was accepted by the Government, that half an hour should be given to the shops, that is, that they be permitted to open half an hour earlier, or half an hour later, for cleaning purposes only. That is the recommendation of the Committee, but the Government felt that half an hour was inadequate and provision has been made to give the shops one hour for cleaning and not for selling. If the shop has to be opened at seven, it can open at six for cleaning purposes, but not for selling.

The Committee also felt special considerations applied to the week preceding Christmas, and recommended that the hours of closing on ordinary closing days be extended to 6 p.m., and on all other days of the week preceding Christmas, except on Christmas Eve on which day all shops shall be required to close at 4 p.m. Now the provisions of Section 3 of the Shops (Amendment) Act, 1951, they also decided should be retained in the new Shops Act. As I said before, overtime should be paid to all shop assistants in respect of all extended hours during this period and at the rate of one-and-a-half times the normal rate of pay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have more or less summarised the provisions of the Report. There is only one thing I have omitted, and it is the question of making public holidays on Mondays so that workers would have a long weekend.
1.25 p.m.

The Committee recommended that public holidays should be held on Mondays. The first day of May is regarded as May Day and people have guarded this right, but the Committee felt that May Day should not be the 1st May as such, but should be on the first Monday in May. This was not accepted because people thought they should guard the right which they had, and the only provision is that if 1st May fell on a Sunday, the Monday would be the bank holiday. It is also felt that we should not change the date of our Independence holiday. We feel that the only time there should be a change from 30th November as a bank holiday is if the date fell on a Sunday. This was where we varied from the recommendations of the Committee.

Mr. Deputy, I think I have given hon. members a full breakdown of the Report of the Committee, and I therefore beg to move that this Bill to consolidate the Acts relating to bank holidays and public holidays be now read a second time.

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

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, after many years the Act which was drafted a number of years ago by Mr. Williams, now Mr. Justice Williams as a matter then of urgency has at long last come before the House. As the Minister said, the Committee was operating as long as February, 1963, and five years after the mountain has brought forth this little mouse which the Minister has introduced at such length relating to shops. Of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the main part of the burden of the Shops Act is going to be carried by Shops Orders to be made by the Minister from time to time, and although the Minister has said what the Committee recommended, he has not said exactly what attitude over and above what is contained in the Bill the Government is going to have to specified complaints and specified areas of shops opening. For example, the Minister may be aware that certain grocery businesses, for example, in Broad Street object to having to close on a Thursday afternoon when the rest of Broad Street is open. Nothing has been said on things such as this where you get variations between opening times in the same district based upon variations of the sort of business carried on, but not warranted by the type of custom which the particular shops expect to attract at a particular time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would also deal with section 8 of the Act, although perhaps in Committee this can be commenced on. Hotels and boarding houses are being excluded from the definition of "Shop". This is the first note in the Objects and Reasons of the Bill, which means in effect that there will be nothing in the Act to prevent discrimination on the grounds of race, colour or creed being practiced in hotels and boarding houses in Barbados. I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it would have been quite easy to add to section 8 that "this section shall apply to hotels and boarding houses as defined by the Hotels Aid Act" or some such subsection which would give complete protection to persons who seek service from a hotel just as they seek service from a rum shop, for a liquor shop, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as we can see, is subject to Section 8 of the Act. In other words, if a rum shop keeper chooses to keep out somebody on the grounds of his colour, he can be prosecuted; but if a hotel owner chooses to do the same thing, he cannot be prosecuted. That is my reading of the Act, and I am not at all sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is rum shop keepers who in Barbados are likely to be guilty of discrimination on the grounds of race, colour or creed. It is far less likely that a country shop keeper with a few tins of groceries on his shelves and a few bottles of rum is going to tell a man that he cannot come in because of his colour or his belief than at one of the hotels which cater for the American trade paying \$50 a day.

It is difficult to understand if you have an anti-discrimination section, if it was ever found necessary, why you did not aim it at the targets where it is likely to find some necessity. Nobody really believes that if discrimination on the grounds of colour is still a potent factor in Barbados today in public places that those public places are other than the hotels. I am not saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that any given hotel discriminates on the grounds of race, although we have had examples of hotels telephoning the Hometown Police Station to ask them to send a policeman, because there were people on the beach annoying the hotel's guests in the sea, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, I remember I once drew to certain people's attention that a policeman, I understand, did attend in a bathing suit, and the hotel proprietor then rang Hometown Police Station to say that nobody had come but they had more of them down there making trouble. That story, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has Mr. Speaker's warrant for it; so I cannot say it is possibly apocryphal; but perhaps it gives an indication, if true, of what may still be expected today in Barbados.

Another thing I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you are dealing with the question of discrimination is that the time has surely come when anywhere that has a licence to sell liquor to the public, be it a retail licence, a wholesale licence or a club licence, should in some way have to face the fact that discrimination on the grounds of colour is not regarded as being a satisfactory part of the Barbadian way of life any longer. There are clubs in Barbados that have white and coloured members. The Lions, if the hon. junior member for Bridgetown does not mind me drawing a particular example, springs to mind, but the fellowship between the white and coloured members often ends at the Lions, because to my knowledge there are members of the Lions who also belong to clubs where the hon. junior member for Bridgetown cannot enter as a member, or indeed in one case, I believe, even as a guest. Let us face the fact, if we are going to talk about discrimination, that this Section 8 of this Act, passed though it was very laudably ten years ago by the then Government, does not today cover what many Barbadians and many outsiders who know of it regard as reprehensible. The fact is that there are at least three private clubs who still feel themselves in an independent Barbados in a position to object to having black persons as members. Although they have their clubs licenced under the Liquor Licences Act, although they have to go and apply for a licence just like the Barbados Labour Party's social club or the Democratic Labour Party's club or any other club, they still feel they are in a position to make discrimination one of their standbys. Whether they do it as a part of their rules or not, we know that it still exists; and if the Minister thinks that shops are places where discrimination can be practised, he should really have a look around Barbados and see where the residue of colour discrimination really is. 1.35 p.m.

We are aware at the moment that there is a young ruffian who is a member of my profession,

I regret to say, walking about at night disturbing the peace, preaching Communism and racial hatred. At Chapel Gap recently this young ruffian, by name Clarke, a lawyer, told the people three separate times how to make Moloto cocktails. He described how they must mix kerosene with methylated spirits and put it in a bottle and what to do with the cocktail; said he, they must carry it into Broad Street and throw it into the white man's stores. That sort of thing flourishes on the residuum of discrimination which still exists in Barbados. If there was not some continuing resentment against what can be seen of the best privileges of persons of European race, persons like Clarke would not be able to get on a political platform and incite persons to violence. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the white people in Broad Street are the first, and we, in the House of Assembly, would be the second because persons like Clarke - (Hon. N.W. BOXILL: He is using your equipment) Not my equipment. If he means that Mr. Clarke was using the Labour Party's equipment, I would like to know how he got it out of the very safe place, not even the Party Headquarters, where it is stored. I, as Secretary of the Barbados Labour Party, have never lent the Black Power Movement any amplifying equipment and I say that unequivocally. On one occasion which is known to me, a Mr. Eric Sealy rented an amplifier and made a deposit of \$30 and that was two months ago or so. I can only say that I gave certain instructions, and when I understood that there was a danger that the instructions would not be carried out, I took further steps to make sure that no incitement to violence would be heard by the public over the loudspeaking equipment of the Barbados Labour Party. That can be checked because right here in this Honourable House, a person who is well known to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas - I can name him, "Slims" - right here in the Lobby I heard the same person - he is called "Slims", but his name is "Haynes" - say, and I was proud to hear it, that if he heard the same man Clarke on a platform using the Barbados Labour Party's equipment, he would go and pull it out and call a policeman to help him to carry it away. That happened two Tuesdays ago outside in the Lobby, and therefore nobody is going to accuse the Barbados Labour Party of giving any equipment to anybody to be used for incitement to violence. Get this quite clear. And any instance of the equipment being used for such incitement, if discovered by me, will result in the full rigours of the law applied to those who have done it or those who have made it possible to be done. But that is a digression.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I will repeat to the Minister is that he should have some consideration given to the possibility of expanding the anti-discrimination Section - Section 8 of the Bill which is now before the House - to cover a wider field than merely shops. I do not think that there is any danger that anybody who goes into Cave Shepherd & Co. or any store in Broad Street tomorrow - that anybody is going to say to him: "The colour of your money is different from the colour of a white man's money". I do not think that there is any danger of that any more; but there is still some danger, in addition to

the Clubs which exist, of coloured persons not being made to feel welcome in certain hotels at certain times. It varies with the hotel, with the manager and with the very hotel receptionists in certain circumstances. You have to look even to see how the barman regards it. The barman may very well feel that he is doing something which will please the management if it takes a longer time to serve a Barbadian in the bar than an American. Let us get that out of everybody's mentality, I would suggest.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as to the Bill as it is drafted, obviously the purposes as set out here by the Committee have been well carried out. The Bill bears the mark of good draughtsmanship. As I say, I would to some extent doubt, or I would say that, to some little degree we should have a slightly better idea of what changes are going to be made in shop conditions in new Shops Orders, if any. I cannot expect the Minister to give at this time - the very fullest possible explanation of what new Orders are going to be made. At least, if new Orders are contemplated, when they are going to be brought before the House, we will know how long we have to wait, if for any particular length of time.

The Minister also referred to bank holidays. As far as they are concerned, I am going to be very brief. I could never understand why Good Friday and Christmas Day are not included in the list of bank holidays. I am not familiar with the common law of bank holidays so to speak. It may well be that there is some doctrine of the common law which says that it is un-Christian to work on Good Friday or Christmas Day, just as it is un-Christian to work on Sunday. Although it is conventional in some ways not to include them in the list of ordinary bank holidays, yet it is also conventional, when you are publishing lists of bank holidays in diaries or work of reference, to include Good Friday and Christmas Day, and it is strange when you do not refer to Christmas Day at all in the Bank Holidays Act. But then in a little note in the Schecule, you say that if Christmas Day falls on a Sunday, the next following Tuesday should be a bank holiday. It achieves its purpose, but it is a very roundabout way of saying what you really mean. Which day is Boxing Day then? And how do you describe the following Tuesday's holiday? I presume you mean that Boxing Day is the Monday and, on the interpretation of this Act, you will find Boxing Day falling before the day on which Christmas Day holiday is celebrated. That is by the way.

What I certainly cannot understand is this: If May Day is a holiday, and let us face the fact that May Day is a holiday - crowds a lot of holidays into what is sometimes the period of the crop season. In the middle of the crop season we say that Monday is May Day and then we have Whit Monday. I am not so familiar with the golden numbers of the years to say whether Easter Monday can fall as late as May 1, but certainly Whit Monday could fall on May Day and no provision has been made for that. I am informed by the hon. senior member for the City that Easter Monday cannot fall as late as May 1. Imagine a situation where you have Easter Monday in one week

and then May Day the next week and all of this at a period when we have the crop season. Quite recently something like that happened. It may be thought desirable to have May Day as a holiday. I wonder if we cannot have a variable Labour Day. As you used to have the Queen's Birthday as appointed, why could we not have a variable Labour Day? I do not see why we cannot have a bank holiday in July. In certain circumstances, if you have a convenient Easter Day, and a convenient Whitsuntide in June, then give us Labour Day in July. I do not think that we should crowd three bank holidays together at a busy time like that. I think that every public holiday, except possibly Independence Day, should be on a Monday. That is the practice which is being adverted to in every country where it is possible.
1.45 p.m.

I think that all American holidays, including Washington's and Lincoln's holidays, are now the subject of a Bill before Congress to make them fall on a Monday. I think that George Washington's birthday, if the Bill passes Congress, is going to be celebrated on the nearest Monday. I, certainly, think all our holidays, except Independence Day, may very well be on a Monday. Mr. Deputy Speaker, subject to that, we will support these Bills.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support both of these Bills, but certainly the hon. Member should give us some explanation. I speak as a layman, and even the hon. and learned senior Member for St. Thomas seems to be at sea on this. He referred to the question of Christmas Day which can fall on any day. It says:

"the 1st January, if a week day;

Easter Monday;

Whit Monday;

the 1st May, being May Day, if a week day;

the first Monday in August;

the first Monday in October;

the 30th November, being Independence Day, if a week day;

the 26th December, being Boxing Day, if a week day;

Provided that -

(a) if in any year the 1st January, the 1st May, the 30th November or the 26th December falls on a Sunday, the next following Monday shall be a public holiday;

(b) if Christmas Day in any year falls on a Sunday, the next following Tuesday shall be a public holiday."

I can quite understand this, but what I do not understand - (Asides) Good Friday might not be a bank holiday, but we have always observed it as not a working day. When you make this legal, it will be illegal, so to speak, on a public holiday to work people without giving them adequate remuneration. Good Friday, if you take Christianity as a nationality, is certainly considered in this country as a public holiday, or a day on which we do not work. It is not observed in the same way as Sunday, but it is a day on which you do not work.

In the United States Good Friday is not observed in that way. All stores are kept open. In the district of Wall Street where business is done the people usually observe Good Friday as a day on which they should close. I should like the hon. Minister to tell me - he must have good reasons for leaving it out. You have Easter Monday and Easter comes on a Sunday. Is this omission due to the fact that it is provided for in some other part of our common law, as the hon. Member has stated? Otherwise, I support both of these Bills without any further comment, but I should like to know from the Minister why Good Friday was left out.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, while I support the Bill, there are a few things in this Bill, in relation to the other Bill which is to be introduced later, which are somewhat confusing. In the Schedule attached to this Bill shops relating to articles of clothing, boots and shoes, are exempted under this Bill, but under the other Bill which is to be introduced, barber shops, joiners, and certain other shops cannot open. In this Bill tailors and shoemakers can open their shops, but under the other Bill barber shops and joiners are excluded. I do not know if this is the intention. I can see where the difficulty with joiners may arise, because several people are employed in the manufacture of furniture, etc.

I think in the other Bill certain things were taken from large countries where you have one man owning a barber shop, but he is not the barber; he may have fifteen or sixteen people working for him. The same thing is true about tailors. For my part, when I used to be a barber, I did not like working on Sundays, but I know that there are certain barbers both in Town and in the country who like to work on Sundays. Some of them do other work during the week and they cut hair on Sunday. There seems to be some confliction between the two Bills, and I would like to have them cleared up.

I was very glad to hear the hon. senior Member for St. Thomas on the question of Black Power and the people who rented or were loaned certain equipment. Political marriages, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are very strange things - strange in this respect. If you get politicians married to something other than what they really believe in, you will find that they use people for one purpose and, at another stage, somebody else will use those same persons for a different purpose.

I heard some names called today, and I remembered well during the election campaign before Inde-

pendence two different groups of people were being supposedly used by the two prominent parties. The group I have heard the hon. senior Member for St. Thomas attacking today was the group with which he was married during that campaign. It will do him well to know that if a man is doing a job, whether it is talking on a political platform or not, his main course is to get a living out of it. I will say that the job which is being done by the people who are going around preaching Black Power - the preaching of violence should not be advocated. But if these supposedly decent people would ostracise such people and forget them, this community in which we live would have no fear of having such people around. You get certain people today and ask them to go around and say unkind things about the Prime Minister and to say unkind things about the Speaker tomorrow, and when you can no longer use them somebody else will use them. If a man is for sale, he is for sale.

Some time ago they bought him and somebody else has him now, but the thing to do in this whole exercise is to let us decide where we are going. I heard the name of Mr. Eric Sealy called today. I believe, with the probable exception of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, that I know Mr. Sealy better than any other member of this House, and I would say that there are a lot of people in public life whom I would prefer to have as enemies than Mr. Sealy. He has always been my friend; but I want hon. members generally and political parties on the whole to realise that this would be the situation whether it involves Mr. Sealy, the people called the underprivileged or Mr. Clarke. It is a good thing to hear one lawyer say some very unkind things about another lawyer, and I believe this is an expression of what took place last night at Eagle Hall. If this did not take place, they would still be friends. If the Prime Minister or myself were under the guillotine, it would be all right; but the hon. member was under the guillotine this time. If you create an atmosphere in which you tell people they are for sale and to let you buy them now, somebody else is going to buy them later. It is a good thing that at least the hon. member realises that his turn is next, and then all members in this House. I do not feel mine will come; I feel I had mine already. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Whose turn?) The hon. senior member for St. Thomas. He feels his turn is next and he is getting worried. You cannot set people up for sale and think that only you can buy them.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Michael is well taken, but if he looks at Section 6, he will see where the Minister is given authority to add or delete from the list of shops and places or businesses to be exempted under this Act, and I promise him that I will give this matter some consideration, because the only time I get my hair cut is on Sundays.

With regard to the omission of Christmas and Good Friday, it was felt that this was conventional and should be left to convention. The point was raised when we dealt with the Bill, and it was felt that it was

not necessary since the 1908 Act makes provision for the closing of shops on Sundays, Christmas Day, Good Friday and so on. None of these shops can open for business on those days by the provision of the Act of 1908, and because of the acceptance of certain usages and customs to which we adhere, these places cannot open to business on Christmas, Good Friday and so on. (Mr. MOTTLEY: It does not say factories.) They are included. It depends on what interpretation is given to shops under the Act. The Crown Law Office did not therefore feel it necessary to include these days in the Act. Section 3 of the Shops (Closing) Act 1908 reads as follows:-

"No person shall expose for sale or cause or procure to be exposed for sale, or shall sell or purchase or cause to be sold or purchased, any goods, chattels, merchandise, wares or articles whatsoever, on any Sunday, Christmas Day, Good Friday, or other day set apart by public proclamation for Divine Service."

There should always be some sort of flexibility in legislation, and it calls for co-operation on both sides. I think it is accepted that Christmas Day and Good Friday because of our Paschal system are both bank holidays. I think this satisfies hon. members.

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

On motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were called and passed. Clause 7 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, you will notice that in the Bill that Clause 7 is numbered 8.

I am asking leave to substitute the figure "7" for the figure "8".

I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part.

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

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

2.05 p.m.

The two Schedules of the Bill were called and passed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who took the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to enquire if it is the wish of the House that we proceed with the next Order of the Day or take the luncheon break at this stage. (Asides). I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 p.m. o' clock.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

2.10 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present and I ask that the Bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for drawing that to my attention. Let the Bell be rung.

On the Bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

SHOPS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance:- To move the second reading of a Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to shops.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 18 inclusive were called and passed.

3.05 p.m.

Clauses 19 to 29 inclusive were called and passed. Clause 30 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 30 stand part.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister say when he expects the Act will come into operation?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, no.

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

The Schedule was called and passed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the recommittal of Clause 2.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 be recommitted. All those in favour please say "Aye", and all those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Divide.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on the Motion for division. Are hon. Members going to divide on this? (ASIDES). I am perfectly in order; if hon. Members do not know the rules, then they should get somebody to teach them.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mr. LOWE; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. SARGEANT; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. HINDS; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SMITH; Mr. St. JOHN; and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 14.

NOES: Hon. G. G. FERGUSON and Hon. N. W. BOXILL - 2.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I think the time has come - I am referring specifically to the definition of "shop" - when applications are made for licences to sell intoxicating liquor, that every applicant should be required to have permission from the Town and Country Planning Office to use the premises for that particular type of business before the Magistrate, or the Licensing Authority, grants a licence to carry on a business for the sale of intoxicating liquor on any particular premises.

One might well say that the time has come when, as it occurs now, an application is filed and someone from the Police Department carries out an inspection. I am not sure whether the Public Health people are always called upon to issue a certificate in respect

of the particular premises, but I am sure that it has been voiced time and again that licences have been granted to persons to sell liquor on premises and permission has not been granted by the Town and Country Planning Office to use the premises for the purposes for which the licences were given. If at the hearing of the application for a liquor licence the person is called upon to certify to the Licensing Officer that the premises are duly authorised by the Town and Country Planning Office for the purpose for which it is sought to get a licence, then it would make for a better arrangement in the future and it would also help to give some meaning to Town and Country Planning in this Island.

3.15 p.m.

One other small point is the question of whether the ante-room is part of the shop. I would like to hear from the Minister if there is any explanation to offer as to whether the ante-room is part of the shop under this Act.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: With regard to the last question which the hon. member raised about the ante-room, provision is made for it in the Bill. The Bill provides for a rest room to be provided for shop attendants and it would have to be part of the shop on the compound.

Mr. HINDS: I am not referring to a rest room. That is a different thing altogether from an ante-room.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: What exactly does the hon. member mean?

Mr. HINDS: The ante-room is a room that may be leading into the main shop where you find people sitting on benches or something like that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: That is part of the shop. I think I understand the hon. member to mean an ante-room where the boys can go and have a drink. If this is what the hon. member means, it is part of the shop as long as it caters to customers.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, this Bill also makes provision for the posting-up of Shops Orders, and what I am enquiring is if you do not have the Shops Orders posted in the ante-room, whether the proprietor would be committing an offence.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Order is posted in any part of the shop.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I had intended at some stage to move the recommittal of Section 8 because of certain questions which I raised on the second reading, but they do arise under this Section as well, because there was mentioned the question of discrimination on the grounds of race, colour or creed, but we have here in Section 2, the definitional Section, that "shop" does not include hotel or boarding house. There is, of course, some slight ambiguity because you have an expression here

that any premises licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors is a shop. I do not believe that the Yacht Club would necessarily be considered to be a shop even though it might come within the apparent ambit of these provisions, but I would be glad to hear at this stage what the Minister's attitude is towards this question of the extension of the anti-discrimination provision to hotels and boarding houses - and indeed I would have said specifically to clubs - so as to make it clear in case it is held that a club licence is not a premise licence for the sale of intoxicating liquor. There are English decisions that say that a members' club is not selling liquor when a member buys liquor in the club, that that is an apportionment of the property owned jointly by the members, and therefore it is not a premise opened for the sale of intoxicating liquor. When you go into a club which is not a proprietary club, all the members own all the drinks inside: and even though they have to pay for it, they are not buying it because they cannot buy from themselves, and this is the effect of a decision at some stage which, I think, would exclude the Yacht Club and the Bridgetown Club from the definition of "shop". I would be glad to hear before we wind up the Shops Act altogether what the Minister's attitude is and what the Government's attitude is towards these problems of discrimination, not only as applies to shops, but as applies at large to areas where it can take place.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the Minister answers, following up the point made by the last speaker, as I understand it, in this Bill by Section 2, that part of the hotel in which a business of, let us say, a boutique is carried on, is not included in this legislation as a shop. In some hotels, within the structure of the hotel itself, we have genuine shops which are sometimes rented to concessionaires, and it appears to me that where you say that provided the term "shop" shall not include any hotel or boarding house, that is so wide that it contradicts the previous definition of 'shop'. I think that the intention is to exempt that part of the building in which only the hotel operations are carried on, but you would want to cover that part of the building where a retail business of selling goods to guests in a hotel is carried on as a shop.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the position is that we feel that the shop attached to a hotel should cater to people when they are in the hotel, and when we speak of a hotel not within the ambit of this, it includes the shop, because we place great emphasis on the tourist industry. The shop is catering to the tourists who come in, therefore it should be operated under the same conditions as the hotel, and when we speak of a hotel, we speak of the entire compound. As to the question raised by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, his point is well taken, and I will give some consideration to the question of discrimination at hotels and other places.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is just one point in the final paragraph of Clause 2. It says "week" means the period between midnight on any

Saturday night and midnight on the succeeding Saturday night". I should like to hear the Minister explain that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It means just what it says, that is, from Sunday to Sunday or from midnight on Saturday night to midnight the following Saturday night - seven full days.

Mr. HINDS: I really wonder if the Minister understands what he has said, because I also heard him say from Sunday to Sunday.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I understand it, the Minister is saying that great emphasis is placed on the tourist industry, and therefore the Government does not intend by this legislation to bring within the ambit of its protection people who work in shops which are contained within the structure of a hotel. I can understand if you say that you want to encourage these shops, but surely people are employed in these shops; and the same reason that you want to give protection to people who are employed in a shop normally, once they are employed in hotel shops they should not be deprived of the protection which the Shops Act gives them.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The position is that the hotel industry is unionised, and this was a recommendation of the Committee that hotels should be left to collective bargaining between the Union and employers. This was a recommendation of the Committee which I read out earlier today, and they did not feel that you should necessarily legislate for this, because these agreements with respect to conditions of service are done by collective bargaining.
3.25 p.m.

If the hon. member is trying to say that they are not represented by the Shops Act, that is not the intention. The intention is that the employees in hotels.
(ASIDES.)

Mr. ST. JOHN: Let me explain myself. I am not dealing with the employees of the hotels at all; what I am dealing with is that, in the hotel structure itself, you have definite shops. They are let to concessionaires; they are nothing to do with the hotel management at all, except that the hotel management gets a specific rent for that specific area within the hotel. If you define these in this manner, you exempt these shops which are nothing to do with the hotel operations at all or the operations of the Shops Act. Collective bargaining, I understand, covers the case of genuine hotel employees, but there can be two classes of shops - one run by the hotel management itself in which one would say that they are employees of the hotel whether they are working in the dispensing of food or anything like that, but it is the other type where you have the boutiques or whatever you call them, which are situated within the physical structure of the hotel. I think that they should be covered by this Bill.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has a point, and I will give consideration to it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, in this definition of "shop", if I were to read it, that might be better. It says thus:

"shop means any premises or place where retail trade or business is carried on (including the business of a pawnbroker, barber or hairdresser), any premises licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquor, any wholesale provision shop, refreshment house, restaurant, shop in which milk or milk products are sold, parlour or cook shop, and includes any part of a building in which a shop is located when such part is used for the purpose of exposing goods for sale or for the storage of such goods or otherwise for the carrying on of the trade or business of such shop".

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to hear from the Minister what explanation there is to offer in the case of a proprietor of a shop having an occasion to go to his storeroom, because this refers to a place like the storeroom, and it might be a case where the storeroom does not have to be on the same premises as the shop in this case. You will find that there are some cases like that. I would like to hear if there is any explanation which the Minister can offer.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member has read out the definition of "shop" and he mentioned "and includes any part of a building in which a shop is located when such part is used for the purpose of exposing goods for sale or for the storage of such goods or otherwise for the carrying on of the trade or business of such shop".

If a storeroom is somewhere else, it is part of the shop. If it is the storeroom of a shop, the hon. member wants to know what happens when the storeroom is somewhere else. If you read the interpretation here, "when such part is used for the purpose of exposing goods for sale or for the storage of such goods or otherwise for the carrying on of the trade or business of such shop", if it is a storeroom belonging to a shop, it is to be part of the shop, and the people who are working in the storeroom of the shop would come under the same legislation as those who are working in the shop. The storeroom of a shop is part of the shop.

Mr. HINDS: That is if it is the part of the building in which the shop is located. (Asides). That is what he has said here. I am asking about when the boot is on the other foot now.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot answer the hon. member's question. I do not understand it.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg to second that.

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. N. W. BOXILL, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

INCOME TAX BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister:- To move the second reading of a Bill respecting Income Taxes.
3.35p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there has not been a comprehensive review of the tax system of this Island since the Income Tax Bill of 1921 was passed with a considerable degree of controversy. The nature of the Bill at that time, in keeping with the prevailing superstitions of the United Kingdom, was that an Income Tax Bill, because of the composition of the Legislature, was something which the Government introduced very reluctantly and was of a transitory nature only. At least this was the assurance which was given to the propertied and monied classes of this Island, as the Tory interest in the United Kingdom regarded income tax as an invasion of the sacred rights of the propertied and the sacred rights of the monied classes of the country.

I should invite hon. Members to read the debate which took place in this House, I think, in 1925 in the Official Gazette when Sir Charles Pitcher Clarke had to defend the provisions in the annual Income Tax Bill when some Members of the House wanted the Income Tax Bill repealed altogether. Although Sir Charles Pitcher Clarke may be regarded as a member of the landed and propertied aristocracy of this Island, he had to take some of his colleagues very severely to task - particularly some of the plantation owners who owned plantations in St. Philip - for the strictures which they levied against the reimposition of the tax.

I think that in every democratic society it is now realised that one of the most equitable forms of redistribution of a country's wealth is the provision whereby progressive taxation is levied on the citizens of a country, each according to his ability, and then by way of the social services, educational facilities and otherwise, the wealth of the country is redistributed to each according to his need.

It is in this context that one has to realise that some of the revolutionary doctrines which are now being preached were doctrines which were fostered at the time some 20 or 25 years before the concept of progressive taxation was accepted by any European country; so that round about the 1840's when Mr. Karl Marx prognosticated that the expropriators will have to be expropriated in order that the Capitalist state should be rent asunder, he was really prognosticating in an atmosphere when the prevailing economic doctrines were that there was a limited fund of

money for distribution amongst the working classes, and that the population, according to the Malthusian concepts, was outstripping the food supply, and that unless some moral restraint were exercised, or compulsory limitation put on early marriages and the size of the family, the inevitable result would be pestilence, disease, and so on. All of these were during the days before the concept of income tax as a method of redressing the imbalance in what we choose to describe as the Capitalist system of society had been introduced.

There are still some objectors to income tax. As a matter of fact, quite recently in Barbados we had a Party of the extreme Right Wing that was described as the Tax Payers' Association, as if we are not all taxpayers. I do not know if they were trying to recruit all the members of society into that Association, but then I do not know whom they would be fighting against. Quite recently, I believe, a Member of the Other Place was heard to bring forward an amazing theory that all income tax should be abolished and that the populace should supply the Government with the necessary revenue by way of import duties.

I have mentioned the historical background to demonstrate that although in every democratic society income tax has now been accepted as, probably, the most equitable way of redistributing the country's wealth, and the progressive system of taxation which we have had has been endeavouring to do this, there are still people who are fighting a rear guard action even against the very existence of such a tax. I do not think that there is any person in this House who is of the opinion that income tax is not a desirable and equitable method of redistributing the country's wealth. I think that what we would differ on is not necessarily along political lines, but probably on economic prudence as to the incidence of tax. This is a matter which I have promised Members of this House and the general public for some time that I would have had under active consideration.

The incidence of tax being, of course, the progressive rates which are levied, I have endeavoured ever since 1963, from time to time, to vary some kind of relief such as a married woman in respect of medical expenses, relief in relation to children's allowances and matters of that kind without actually interfering with the progressive rates which have been in existence for a considerable amount of time.

The situation is that in each and every year, for the historical reasons which I have given, the Government is called upon to introduce a Bill approving the rates of income tax for that year. We have already done so for this year, but in view of the fact that the year which we are dealing with for tax purposes runs from the 1st January to the 31st December in most cases and we are now in December, Members will see from Clause 86 of the Bill, which intends to repeal the Income Tax Act of 1921 and bring this new Bill into effect as the prevailing law, that the year that this Bill will be dealing with will be the year of assessment 1969, or the year of income 1968, which is the current year that we are now in.

Without waiting for a new Budget Speech, I intend to include the new progressive rates of tax, which I will pass around to hon. Members at an appropriate time, which will become the rates which will be employed for the assessment of taxable income for the year in which we are now engaged. I hope that at the end of this exercise Members of the House will have some small rebate coming to them. I cannot promise them much; the wealthier ones will get a little more than the less well-off ones, but not so much more. We are trying to keep the maximum, up to the £5,000 taxable income range, to within the confines of 50%, or 75% immediately thereafter.

3.45 p.m.

In Trinidad and Tobago, a neighbouring territory, the maximum rate on any income has been placed at 50%. Our rate goes up after about £6,000 to 75%. I do not intend to change the people in the higher brackets for the simple reason that in Trinidad and Tobago they have a substantial proportion of their Government revenue derived from oil royalties, and we do not have even one per cent or one-half of one per cent of our Government revenue coming from such a source; therefore they could afford in Trinidad to give relief to the wealthy people over the £5,000 or \$24,000 range. I do not think that anyone who is in possession of a net income, after taxation, of \$2,000 a month can complain if we do not give relief to them; but I intend to give substantial relief amounting to almost \$1 million less, despite our Budget deficit, to those below the £5,000 range. I just serve notice of that, Mr. Speaker, and I will at an appropriate stage pass around the new rates to members so that they may be able to peruse them. I should also like to state that there are certain amendments which I intend to read into the Bill, and these amendments are the result of representations made by the Law Society, the Judiciary, the Life Assurance Companies and various other interested organisations such as the Accountants, the Life Assurance Association of Barbados, and some amendments which I have inserted myself because on reflection I would like to see them - I will indicate what those are - and the Chamber of Commerce, of course, has also registered some observations, some of which we have found are similar to those which have been made by other organisations and interested bodies. Unfortunately, Sir, they are not quite ready, but I hope that in a few moments these amendments will be circulated.

Now how did we come to the existing revision? As I stated before, Sir, no substantial change has been made to the Income Tax law as a law of Barbados since 1921. We have had various amendments to the 1921-6 Act, and although from 1943 when we had the law revision, and I suppose in years before, we have had an amending Act in each and every year making minor amendments, there has not been any comprehensive review of the legislation to bring it into line with modern thinking. So in 1966 the Government engaged the services of a very well known Canadian firm of tax experts and public Accountants - Messrs. Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart who are represented here in Barbados by the firm of Bovell and Skeete - and one of their Canadian experts who had done similar surveys for various municipalities and provinces came down here and

submitted a Report. I gave very careful consideration to this Report, and I was fortunate at the time that around the time that the Report of Mr. Newman from the firm of Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart was submitted to me, the Canadian Government brought out the voluminous Carter Report on taxation, and I had a very close look at the recommendations. I should like to admit that up to now I have not finished reading the Carter Report because it was contained in four or five Tennents Beer boxes. There were so many volumes that it took five Tennents Beer boxes to bring them from the Post Office into my office. This was my personal copy which I had asked for, and I gave detailed consideration to the recommendations only of the Carter Report, and I have not read the complete Report because it goes into a lot of detail that I am not immediately concerned with, and some of the recommendations in the Report on taxation known as the Carter Report you will find incorporated in the Bill which we now have before us.

I should like to say that although the firm of Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart submitted an excellent Report on taxation - the terms of reference of the expert was, firstly, a review of the relevant statutes to assess their clarity and simplicity and also to reveal any anomalies or inequities; secondly, an examination of the existing operation and administration of the tax laws; thirdly, the determination of the incidence of each tax and the relative burden on individuals, companies and other organisations so far as this is feasible, having regard to the availability of historical data and statistical information; fourthly, an examination of the rate structure of the personal income tax including personal exemptions with particular emphasis on the ability of individuals to save and invest, and the effect on employment and living standards; fifthly, a review of the taxation on companies to determine whether it is conducive to the economic expansion of the Island; sixthly, an examination of existing incentive legislation to assess the need for and desirability of industrial incentives and their effectiveness; seventhly, a review of estate and succession duties with particular emphasis on the use and taxability of trusts; and eighthly, consideration of the desirability or feasibility of a tax on capital gains either in all fields or in certain fields only.

The House voted money for the carrying out of that Report, and the Report was presented to me as Minister of Finance on a confidential basis; and having studied the Report, I then submitted to the other members of the Cabinet what I considered we should accept in the Report and what we should not accept in the Report, and I think, since I am talking about taxation, that I should indicate at this stage what I was not prepared to accept in the Report, and they are the following matters. This is what I could not at that stage, studying the overall economy of the Island, agree to. I did not agree that there should be a surtax on gross dividends. I did not agree that business losses should be carried forward indefinitely instead of five years as at present. 3.55 p.m.

I did not agree that Life Insurance Premiums should not be deductible from your assessable income as against your taxable income. I did not agree that, as I indicated some months ago, a Corporation tax should be introduced in Barbados. I did not agree to make capital allowances in respect of land, commercial buildings and hotels; and there were other matters recommended by the experts which would have resulted in a change in the existing tax laws which I did not agree with; but the most significant matters are those which I have outlined because Corporation tax has now become very popular in the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States. I have made some calculations on the question of a Capital Gains Tax, but I am not satisfied that we would have the staff, in the first place, or that there are not too many loopholes in the imposition of a Capital Gains Tax that we should introduce it at this stage. I am not satisfied that the amount of money which we would be able to collect will justify the tremendous amount of invigilation which we would have to do. It does not mean that I am satisfied that there should never be a Capital Gains Tax in Barbados; but we have now embarked on a new system of tax enforcement and tax collection, and I was not prepared to overburden the Inland Revenue Department at this stage.

The United Kingdom has gone much further within the past three months than even a Capital Gains Tax, having introduced the Corporation tax. Formerly the Corporation, as we lawyers were fond of thinking, was a separate entity, yet for tax purposes the Corporation was not taxed in its own legal personality, but only on behalf of its shareholders. The Corporation tax has introduced the principle of the Corporation being taxed separately and distinctly and then the shareholders being taxed all over again. They have certain problems, and we may come to the stage when we need extra money where we should introduce the Corporation tax as distinct from the Company tax; but as far as the Capital Gains Tax is concerned, it does not mean that we do not need extra money, but I am not satisfied that, at the present stage, the extra money which we would get would justify the tremendous amount of problems which we would have in circumventing evasion and even in collecting the tax. Again, I should like to repeat that my mind is not closed forever to the idea of a Capital Gains Tax. We have not put it in this Bill, neither have we put in a Corporation tax. We have not gone as far as the United Kingdom where they are now paying 15% tax on wealth. By that 15% tax on wealth, by calculation, in eight years, the United Kingdom should really be reduced, theoretically anyhow, to an egalitarian society; because if you put on 15% tax per annum on people's wealth, you are really reducing everybody to the stage where they would really have to go out and work for their living. I am waiting to see how this experiment is going to work out in England. I have not even considered it, putting on a wealth tax; I am satisfied that our rates of progressive taxation are sufficiently steep, even after the concessions which I intend to make to the tune of nearly \$1 million in refunds which people have been

paying on the P.A.Y.E. system. I am giving them a Christmas present, including members of the House, of \$1 million, not to be divided among the twenty-four members in here, but to be divided among some 19,600 of us. Therefore, I do not want hon. members to start ordering new motor cars or anything like that in the expectation that the House of Assembly members are going to get back \$4,000 or \$5,000 in taxation on this year. They will get back something, having paid as they earned; but they are not going to get back any phenomenal amounts. We have certainly done something in easing the burden so that they will be able to divert those funds into some form of investment, which I hope, will be Government bonds.

After Mr. Newman from the firm of Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart delivered his Report, we were then fortunate in securing the services of a Canadian draughtsman, a Specialist in Income Tax, and almost immediately after we had accepted the policy line along which the new Bill should be drafted, the Canadian External Aids Department lent us the service of Mr. Lambert, a tax expert, and Mr. Lambert completed his labours earlier this year. Then, again, with the assistance of the Canadian Government, they supplied us free of charge with the services of Mr. Lacey, who had been re-organising the tax system of Guyana and Trinidad. Mr. Lacey is still here, and we are already seeing the result of his work in the number of returns and the amount of tax actually collected, and two of our Senior Officers in the Tax Department will be spending some time in Ottawa within the next two or three months in order to further familiarise themselves with the modern systems of tax collection and tax enforcement. They are two very Senior Officers; one of them will have to stop in on his way back from Australia and the other one is about No. 3 in the Inland Revenue Department. On Mr. Lacey's recommendations, these two gentlemen will be going up there. Therefore, we have had a three-pronged drive, and there is a fourth dimension, which is a new dimension, which I hope to introduce very shortly and which I have mentioned and I have hinted at before. Firstly, we have had the survey with the terms of reference outlined by me earlier, carried out by Messrs. Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart, a Canadian firm, which has a local office in Barbados. Secondly, we have had the draughtsman, Mr. Lambert, to draft a Bill along with our Parliamentary Counsel, and then we had the person who has been responsible for the re-organisation of the Departments, both in Guyana and in Trinidad and Tobago who is still with us, Mr. Lacey, re-organising the Department. Therefore, we have had a three-pronged drive on this problem of tax collection, tax evasion and tax imposition. The fourth dimension which I intend to introduce shortly in the New Year is the computerising of all the systems in the Inland Revenue Department. We now have over 20,000 income taxpayers in the Island, and it is a very laborious business for assessment notices to be sent out by hand, and reminders and that sort of thing.

4.05 p.m.

I have looked at one computer which is eminently suitable for the job that I want done. This computer

will cost us about \$45,000 a year to rent; but since I have already collected, or will collect by the end of the year, over \$700,000 in additional tax without the computer, I could probably collect about \$1 1/2 million with the computer; so if we have to vote \$45,000 to have the computer in the Inland Revenue Department, I would consider that a good investment.

I have another alternative and I have an offer of a \$2 million computer, provided I am prepared to allow the people who give me the computer unlimited access to it at certain specified periods, and this offer I am considering seriously. The complication as far as this other very sophisticated computer is concerned, is that whereas on the less sophisticated model - I do not want to be derogatory by calling the name of the firm that manufactured it - can do all the work that I want done in the Inland Revenue Department, the other \$2 million computer can do all the work that I want done in statistics, all the work done in population census, all the scientific work that could possibly be done in Barbados; it could also be used by the University, and we could also do all the work for the Windward and Leeward Islands and charge people outside - business firms and so on - for the use of the computer and still have surplus capacity. I think that, from all indications, I may have to end up with both computers, because what you need in an Inland Revenue Department is a discreet channel to which nobody else has access, and I have been studying this problem. If you have a multi-use computer, your security factor will be less than if you have a discreet computer for Inland Revenue.

I should like to assure hon. Members that I would like to save the \$45,000 a year. I am investigating all of these angles, and we may have to end up with four computers. It is time that Barbados really move forward into the Space Age instead of working under the old laborious method of tax assessment and so on. With the computer that I am thinking of, it is possible for a taxpayer to go straight to the Office to ask a question, for a button to be pushed, and the answer comes out within 15 seconds. This is the kind of computer that I want to see in the Inland Revenue Department. It will need programming - probably about seven people for programme and data processing - and we already have people who are trained in the Statistical Department, and they are not very difficult to come by as key-punch operators.

I just mention that because this is the next move to the final move I am making to bring the tax system in Barbados up to date. It is no point in having efficient tax laws and efficient collection, if the work is going to be bogged down by some temporary clerks laboriously writing out things and falling over each other looking for files and that kind of thing. We want to put everything on magnetic tape. This, I assure you, will be put into operation by June 1969, if not before.

I have the availability of one computer by the end of January, but we will have to train the members of the staff into its efficient use so that they do not blow up the machine. We have to be very careful; we do not want the whole of the Treasury building going up in smoke because somebody does not know how to handle the machine. I just mention this. I have thought of all possible angles, and I think that by this time next year, at the end of 1969, the passage of this new Bill which we have before us and the introduction of the new systems which are already in train, and the employment of data-processing machinery and computerising the whole system in the Inland Revenue Department, will result in a much larger yield of taxation and a much more ready flow of cash into the Treasury, and will completely vindicate the concession which I am making to the taxpayers of this Island, even although we still have a Budget deficit, of a Christmas present of \$1 million in tax relief.

The Bill, of course, Mr. Speaker, has to go into Committee stage with the obvious changes which have been made about when tax is to be paid and that kind of thing. The Income Tax Bill has been completely re-arranged, and this has met with the approval of the Chamber of Commerce, the Accountants, and so on, because it is much simpler and easier to read and understand its provisions than under the old Act of 1921.

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that the Act is divided into 8 Parts, and that Part 1 sets out the short title, and the parts and divisions of the Act. Part 11 deals with the imposition and the extent of tax. Part 111 deals with administration and enforcement. Part 1V deals with double taxation relief, because we have to sign Agreements and Treaties with the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada particularly, on double taxation. I have deliberately, I should like to say "stalled", Sir, or deliberately refrained from signing these double taxation Agreements with the United Kingdom because there are still one or two points which, I think, are in their draft Agreement which would tend to operate as a discouragement to investment in Barbados. I am referring particularly to their provisions relating to the Corporation tax.

Whereas we are operating in the United States and Canada now on more favourable grounds, if I had concluded the Agreement with the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada would immediately say: "If you were part of the Mother Country, and they are now putting in all of these restrictions, then we want our *status quo* arrangement reviewed and we want a new Agreement signed." So I have not concluded the double taxation Agreement with either one of those three countries, but some time next year, I take it, we will find ourselves constrained to conclude such double taxation Agreements. That would come under Part 1V of the Bill. Part V deals with Regulations and the power to make Regulations. Part VI deals with interpretation. Part VII deals with transitional and expiring provisions. So altogether there are VII Parts, but I said VI11. I now correct myself. There are VII Parts which have been set out in this way for the purpose of clarity and for no other purpose. The

general reaction has been, from all sections of the general public who are involved in the administration of tax, that the new arrangements are much more convenient and easier to comprehend than the old arrangements under the Income Tax Act of 1921.

I should like to deal, Sir, with some of the Amendments. Since Members were given the printed copy of the Bill, you will remember that I said I would allow a convenient period within which the observations of the various Associations and bodies such as the Chamber of Commerce, the Law Society, and so on, could be received and studied. I have mentioned the bodies from whom I have received comments: the Law Society, the Chamber of Commerce, the Life Assurance Association, the Judiciary, the firms of Accountants individually and, I think, as a body as well, and from Mr. Lambert himself, the Canadian Draftsman, who is now back in British Columbia.

4.15 p.m.

He also had an opportunity and was quite willing to come down if there were any great difficulties in re-drafting, but we managed to cope with the proposed amendments ourselves. I should like to indicate some of the amendments. I have not got the copies of some of the amendments which I will be introducing. I am still waiting for them. The first one is on the qualification of the Chairman of the Appeal Board, and we are going to include a provision there that he should be a retired Judge or Barrister or Solicitor of not less than ten years' standing who is not in private practice. There is also an amendment which I have inserted myself, that in the absence of the Chairman, the Minister shall have power to appoint another member as Chairman or some other person as a member and Chairman of the Board during the Chairman's absence due to illness, leave or on any other grounds. Then in the constitution of the Appeal Board which will be found around Section 58 (5) dealing with appeals, I have inserted an amendment there myself which the draughtsman is now bringing down for me. This was not represented to me by any of the societies, but in re-reading the Bill, since we decided to make the Chairman a person with certain legal qualifications, I have inserted a provision there about the appointment of someone to act as Chairman if the Chairman is absent due to illness, etc. The Appeal Board under Clause 58 (7) would have been three members appointed by the Chairman, but since we stipulated that the Chairman himself should be a legally qualified person, we are going to make it the Chairman and two other members of the panel. This was a representation, I think, made to us by the Law Society and I agree with it. The formal amendments have been printed, and I hope shortly to circulate them.

You will notice in Clause 66, Mr. Speaker, the payment of tax by companies. My copy of the Bill unfortunately skips from page 73 to page 78. I do not know if anybody else has that as well, and the funny thing is that page 73 is printed on the opposite side to the leaf from page 78. In Clause 66 - payment of tax by companies or other persons - you will

notice that provision is made that in the case of a company the tax becomes due and payable on the date on which the return is filed with the Commissioner. Then you will notice on page 75 in Clause 66 (2) that any amount of tax which under subsection (1) is required to be paid on the date of the filing which is not paid on that date shall be paid not later than 30th May. This creates a dichotomous situation which some of the persons who made representations like the law Society considered should be undesirable; so we are making it now that in all cases the tax should not be payable on the date that the return is filed. Under Clause 66 (1) you file the return and before the Commissioner assesses you, you pay the tax, and then you are given until 30th May within which to pay. We have a situation right here today - I am talking about 3rd December - in which some companies are ready now to file their returns. They have made up their books and everything, and are ready to file their returns this morning or on 2nd or 3rd January; and although it says you must pay the tax when you file your return, yet you do not really have to pay it until 30th May; so this creates a kind of ambiguous situation which on reflection I considered undesirable. I am not blaming anyone for this, but Mr. Lambert, the draughtsman, had for some reason imported from Canada the reason for doing this, and we went along with him because we did not see the anomaly at the time, but on reflection I do not think this is desirable; so we are making the tax payable on the 30th April, and not May, under that Section. That is an amendment which I will be introducing. Normally you should not have to pay tax until the Commissioner assesses you, but in the case of a company it is very difficult, because a company makes up its books and the Commissioner inspects the books. It is a straightforward 40% that they pay, and in order to get in money quickly, the draughtsman says to file the returns, pay the tax and argue about any discrepancies later. Pay now and argue later. What we are saying now is to file your return; - if you want to pay the tax, pay it; but we are not going to make it compulsory, but you must pay the tax by 30th April. Notice that "May" is on page 75; we are saying it should be 30th April because this is the last day on which you should send in your return. The effect therefore would be more compatible with what we have in Section 52 whereas it was incompatible as it is drafted in the Bill.

Now you will notice in Clause 32 (3) that in the case of contributory pension schemes, the total contribution should not exceed 15% or \$1,500. The existing provision is 20% as far as I can remember, speaking now from memory. What was recommended to us by Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart was 20%, but \$1,000. We have done some calculations and we discovered that it would be impossible for people in certain brackets to get two-thirds of their working emoluments - which is a sort of general principle - if we kept on the \$1,500 restriction, and therefore we are going to remove the \$1,500 restriction, but we are not going to go back to 20%. We are satisfied that 15% is about the average that people contribute between the employer and the employee towards these pension contribution schemes.

4.25 p.m.

The Bill as drafted also provides that return contributions - suppose let us say, for instance, that a person is working for a firm for a period of twenty years and he has been paying towards a superannuation fund. In normal circumstances, if that person decides to leave the Island or quit the job, or even suppose in a case where he may be fired from the job, the employer should or does - Sir, there is a little complication here because under the prevailing Income Tax Law, a pension fund is supposed to be an irrevocable fund. I do not know whether it is legal; it is equitable, but it may not be legal within the law for pension contributions to be refunded because they have been exempted from tax. But we know what happens in practice, since most of the employers in Bridgetown insure with insurance companies in which they are the agents and usually, if an employee leaves, they give him back his pension contribution. The point we are making in the new Bill is this; if you get back your contributions over a period of ten, fifteen or twenty years, you have been exempted from tax on those contributions all the way along and therefore we should now tax you if you get back the contributions. The amendment I am going to bring in now is that if you put that money into an annuity fund or a new scheme within four months, then you will not be taxed. I think it is simple, but we cannot allow people to go on indefinitely because a tax year is only twelve months and if we tell them: "Whenever you join back a scheme, we will not tax you", we will never be able to administer it; so that if we give you four months to make up your mind as to whether you are going to make provision for your children and your family by re-investing in some annuity - you can buy an annuity for instance, or re-invest in some contribution fund - then we will not call for the tax; but if you do not do it within four months, then we will have to call for the tax.

Sir, it will be a lot easier for me to explain, now that I have got the printed amendments, and it is fortunate that the first amendment to Clause 9 is the one which I was just dealing with, so that hon. members will be able to follow me a lot better. I have just dealt with the very first amendment in Clause 9. The amendments in Clause 10 and Clause 11 are merely verbal amendments and so as regards Clause 17. Then there is a new provision in Clause 21 in which we are putting in a new Clause, and this Clause is what we describe in tax legislation as companies dealing at arms length with each other. I will try to explain that as much as I can. I can work out some figures and demonstrate how it operates. You may have a company here in Barbados which wants to expand; so that company will either go to the Bank or some other investment company and borrow money from that investment company, and then the interest payments which you have to make, are a deductible expense for the development of Company "A" down at the bottom. Company "A" borrows from Company "B", but both Company "A" and Company "B" are owned by the same people. I know of cases in which that has actually occurred, and it is still happening in Barbados. We would not normally allow Company "A" to claim a deduction of interest payments which it has to pay to Company "B", unless the Commissioner

is satisfied with what we call dealing at arms length policy, that these are two companies dealing at arms length - I cannot say with each other, but from each other, because, if they are dealing at arms length with each other, they are not really at arms length, but they are dealing with each other and they are dealing at arms length from each other.

That was actually in the old Bill. I cannot remember what Section it was, but I am trying to find it. I cannot remember the exact Section. It is a long time since I have had to advise anybody on this particular matter, but there is a Section in the old Act which actually uses the words "dealing at arms length" and the Commissioner can only allow those deductions if he is satisfied that these two companies are separate and distinct entities, and there are not merely lending money from one company to the other as a means of tax evasion from the second company. Company No. 2 may be making a lot of profit. Company No. 1 may have undistributed profits and may not be making so much money because they have got their money just laying down in the bank, Company No. 2 then lends money to Company No. 1 and as a result of that, Company No. 1 may not actually use the money at all. They just hold a Directors' meeting and say: "We want \$1 million which we can borrow from Company No. 2". From their gross income, they deduct \$80,000, having borrowed \$1 million from Company No. 2 which is really a parent company, and unassociated company they do nothing with the \$1 million, so that the \$1 million is still in the bank drawing a fixed deposit rate return, but they get \$80,000 off their gross income which, for us, will represent \$36,000, or something like that, in taxes. The Commissioner would never allow that deduction unless he was satisfied that it was a *bona fide* transaction and that the companies are dealing at arms length; in other words, that there are not hugging up - in other words, that they are not scratching each others' back; they are dealing at arms' length with each other as a *bona fide* transaction.

4.35 p.m.

Under Clause 21 which we have, the companies may be closely associated. This is on page 2 of the Amendments. The Commissioner now has a wider discretion, and we are deleting certain things. Instead of using the old phraseology of "independent persons dealing at arms length; or

persons, one of whom controls the other, being transactions which the Commissioner is satisfied were entered into in good faith by such persons dealing at arm's length, for the purpose of promoting industrial, commercial, scientific, educational or other development in Barbados shall be deemed to be a separate business carried on by a separate person, for the purposes of this Act."

We are going to delete this and substitute a new Clause. The new Clause 21 states:

"The business carried on by a non-resident person of lending money upon transactions between

independent persons dealing at arm's length; or persons, one of whom controls the other, being transactions which the Commissioner is satisfied were entered into on the basis of the same commercial principles that would have been applied by independent persons dealing at arm's length"

Then it goes on:

"for the purpose of promoting industrial, commercial, scientific, educational or other development in Barbados shall be deemed to be a separate business carried on by a separate person, for the purposes of this Act."

I have explained the reason for the Amendment, and if the Commissioner is now satisfied that it is a *bona fide* transaction, then he is entitled to say "Yes, you can make this deduction in respect of the capital you have borrowed." It has been becoming increasingly popular for local companies, who have associate financial organisations backing them, to borrow money from those organisations, because it is difficult to raise capital on the open market nowadays. The British West Indian Airways is a case in point, where you have to have a consortium of financiers and Trans-World Airways as a kind of consortium going into the matter with a mutual Agreement - they are dealing at arm's length in one sense of the term, and in another sense of the term they may be closely associated.

You have the same thing with Trans-World Airways and the Hilton International, with Trans World Airways now controlling a predominant interest in Hilton International. So we also have in T. W. A. Mr. Howard Hughes, who is a very large financier and used to be a majority shareholder in T. W. A. until he was forced to sell out his shares for a few million dollars. That is the kind of situation you get in the world today, where finance companies are closely connected actually with the running of the businesses themselves, and the businesses usually have to borrow money from the finance companies.

Clause 23 is a printing error.

Clause 24 is a printing error.

Clause 27 is a printing error.

Clause 32 I have dealt with already : it is a straight 15 per cent.

Clause 52 is a printing error.

Clause 52 (b) is to clarify the provision for self-assessment.

Clause 52 (a) is a printing error.

Clause 54 is a printing error.

Clause 58 I have dealt with at some length, and there is no need for me to go into that again.

Then we come to Clause 59. This is consequential to the Amendments which we have already made to Clause 58.

Clause 60 is a consequential Amendment to Clause 59. Here we are requiring the Appeal Board to give reasons for the decision. I cannot remember which Clause it was, Sir, which dealt with the onus of

proof, but I have taken that out because I cannot, honestly, understand the mechanics of how you should ask a respondent to have the onus of proof on an appeal. Usually appeals are not on questions of fact, but usually on questions of law and misdirection. There was no provision before for the Appeal Board to give reasons for the decision, but now that reasons are being given it would not be equitable to ask the respondent to justify a right decision but for wrong reasons. I am sure that my friends on both sides of the House will agree with me that in an appeal you sometimes get the right decision but the wrong reasons written out, and we spend most of our time trying to justify the reasons rather than the decision.

We do not think, if an Appeal Board is now going to give a decision that a respondent should be asked to justify, probably, bad logic or bad English. Let me put it that way; I leave it at that, Sir. I think that all members of the profession on both sides of the House will agree with me that there is no reason for us to put the onus of proof on a respondent even although the respondent is a taxpayer. I would find it very hard, Sir, to defend such a contention. To use the words of one of my friends in the Trinidad Circuit Court, "It would be monstrously inept." I refer to Mr. Hudson Phillips, Sir.

4.45 p.m.

The next one is Clause 60, and as I said, we are giving reasons for the decision. In Clauses 63 and 64 these are printing errors. Clause 66 is a new Clause drafted to clarify provisions relating to the payment of the tax and to remove certain inconsistencies. We have already dealt with this at length, Sir, so there is no need to go into that again. I am merely going through the amendments *seriatim*. Clause 67 (a) which is Item 18 on the amending paper is to expand Clause 67 (1) to cover cases where persons fail to make self-assessments as required by Clause 52 (5). Clause 67 (b) is a printing error. Clause 72 (3) is another correction of a printing error. Then we go to Clause 85 (a) which is a clarification of certain printing errors in Clause 85 (b), (c) and (d). In Clause 88 in which I think are the transitional provisions, we are adding a new subclause (5) after the existing subclause (4). In the old provision under the existing pension schemes, the deduction was 20%. As I explained in Clause 32 (b) we are now making this 15%, and the reason for this additional subclause (5) to Clause 88 is to preserve the right of the existing pension schemes in the transitional Bill. I hope this is clear.

Mr. Speaker, I think that any tax bill tends to be in the eyes of the layman a complicated matter, and I have used my best endeavours to give simple, satisfactory explanations to the new provisions that we are introducing, the revisions that we are making to the old Income Tax Act and the amendments which I will be asking the House to accept during the Committee stage of the Bill.

Having done so, it is now my privilege to move in a formal manner that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, when this Bill was first published, there was a great deal of criticism to the effect that it changed little. Some of this was directed towards the structure of the Income Tax system of Barbados, and some was directed towards the promise to which the Prime Minister himself has referred today relating to a certain easing of the income tax burden, and we must say that the first part of this criticism is still justified. On the second part we have to withhold judgement until we see the new rates and new allowances which the Prime Minister proposes to introduce, I presume also, at the Committee stage, and no doubt that will form a part of our speeches on the third reading if the occasion arises.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister gave a brief historical conspectus of the income tax. I did not quite catch if he mentioned that it started life as a temporary measure at the time of the Napoleonic wars in Britain. I think that is in fact when it started, but it is still with us today and I am going to say at the outset that we on this side of the House have to agree with him that the prospect of removing income tax, and that opposition to the principle of income tax, as far as we are concerned, died with the dodo. In the United States, the constitution had to be specially amended after the Supreme Court, appointed mainly by a President who conceived it his duty to represent the interest of the rich and those in business, had decided that income tax was against the Constitution of the United States. I am glad to say it is not against the Constitution of Barbados. The Prime Minister mentioned that a certain figure in the Other Place was significant among those who suggested that we can do without income tax, and we can lay the tax burden in the way of increased excise and other duties on the population at large. I regret only that he did not mention the name of the gentlemen which is Mr. K. R. Hunte, and that he did not mention that Mr. K. R. Hunte's views are regularly put forward with the aid of black boards, population figures and other paraphernalia at Branch meetings of the Democratic Labour Party, among other places. So far, although he has invited himself to speak at similar meetings of the Barbados Labour Party, no Branch has yet found it possible to accept his invitation to invite him. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: That shows we are really democratic.) I am sure I would have enjoyed the joke of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as much as he himself did if I had been able to hear it. We do not want to dwell at length on this, but I am just going to say something which in a sense, Mr. Speaker, is an amplification of what the Prime Minister has said.

Barbados is not like the Bahamas or Bermuda where you can offer a haven from income tax to foreign businessmen and other persons who are willing to live there. In Bermuda the resident population is smaller than the transient population at the height of the season. There are 35,000 people in their 19 square miles. The services which have

to be provided and which have been provided by the Government of Bermuda for its people are smaller in scale as well as in expenditure, and are much smaller in relation to the revenue that can be raised by import duties than a similar situation in Barbados, because import duties in Bermuda fall very nearly as heavily on visitors as they fall on the population at large, and you do not have to provide education for visitors. That is the reason why you can do without income tax in Bermuda. In the Bahamas there is a very similar situation. Import duties, excise and purchase tax fall almost as heavily on non-residents as they do on residents, and therefore you can do without tax in these places. That is the answer to Mr. Hunte when he suggests that Bermuda and the Bahamas have no income tax, they are both richer than Barbados, and therefore if you take away the income tax in Barbados, we would become rich like the Bahamas and Bermuda. I think that is a fair summary of Mr. Hunte's standard argument. An unfair summary of it would be that he and his companies are responsible for paying \$70,000 or \$80,000 a year in income tax, and it is hardly likely that he could eat foods and buy articles upon which the increased purchase tax could amount to \$70,000 or \$80,000. But this is not the only respect in which Mr. Hunte puts forward ideas which, if carried to their logical conclusion, would damage Barbados. I only wish that other Ministers were as successful as the Prime Minister in resisting his demands and withdrawing from his influences.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the burden of income tax is heavy on Barbadians. In its more capitalist days or in the days when it was run by the local capitalist the *Advocate* newspaper regularly published figures and graphs, and I think the *Daily News* newspaper also published them. It is something that came up almost every year around Budget Day as to how much more heavily taxed Barbadians are than persons in other parts of the world. It is not true to say that a Barbadian or someone resident in Barbados and paying income tax in Barbados pays more tax if, say, he has an income of \$50,000. He would pay substantially less tax in Barbados than he would in the United Kingdom or indeed in most parts of the United States.

4.55 p.m.

I think that even the Federal income tax is more at the higher levels than the highest level of Barbadian income tax; but, Mr. Speaker, very few of us in Barbados earn taxable incomes - I do not know if anybody in Barbados, any native Barbadian, has a taxable income - of \$100,000. Perhaps, the Prime Minister can enlighten me on this, and the fact that it may be

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know about individuals; I can tell you the number of persons.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this a point of order or a point of explanation?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: A point of explanation. It is not competent for the Commissioner of Inland Re-

venue to tell me who is paying what tax on what kind of income, but I can call on him for statistics, which I did, on how many persons in a certain bracket pay an amount of tax, and there are about 60 persons in Barbados who pay taxes on net incomes of more than \$30,000. There are another 50 persons who pay taxes between \$24,000 and \$30,000 and there are about 50 who pay on more than \$30,000. Some of these 50 persons may pay on \$1 million - I do not have any means of knowing - and there are 450 persons whom I am not giving any relief to. (ASIDES). There are 100 people paying on over \$24,000. Most of the people who pay tax are the people between \$12,000 a year - two per cent of the people pay over 30% of the tax in Barbados.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I was not suggesting that the Prime Minister should tell us how much, for example, Mr. K. R. Hunte pays tax on. I know that the Commissioner only provides statistics for a class, as they do in every country. Britain is in the fortunate position of having annual statistics for all those whom the Commissioner estimates pay tax on an income which represents capital wealth of £1 million. I do not think that a very large number of persons in Barbados are in that position. What I am saying is that that class of person is already well provided for; they are the very rich. There is no need to revise those rates except possibly upwards. It is the middle income group - the Prime Minister, of course, speaks from a position of strength *vis-a-vis* the point which we are now trying to make, because he knows who is getting the relief, and what relief those persons are getting, while we, on this side, do not know. Again, I must say that until I hear those figures, I cannot pursue this matter any further; but for many years it has been emphasised that this is the part of the tax ladder that is bearing the greatest weight. We do not want to be avaricious if we happen to be taxpayers, but we feel that some respect must be paid to the fact that if, in Barbados, you work for £4,000 or £5,000 net a year, you are paying much more tax on it than you would be paying if you went to the United Kingdom to work for the same money. That is only an incentive to emigration, and it is an incentive which I very much hope the Prime Minister has reduced by giving allowances in rate structure, and at the bottom of the ladder as well. Again, I do not know what is in the red bag today, but I hope that at allowance level and at rate level there has been some concession to taxpayers in this category.

The Prime Minister may have seen in the newspapers that the new regime in Greece, while putting an end to democracy in one sense, also put an end to all tax arrears and reduced the rates of income tax, and there has been an immediate increase in collection. I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that I will not be benefiting myself if I put an end to all arrears of tax. I do not know what members of the House think, although I can well imagine that there would be some who would be in that fortunate position; but, unfortunately, I am too much afraid of the 5% and the 6% subsequently, and therefore I try to avoid income tax arrears as far as possible. However, Sir, I will return to this point as to how far professional persons will be able to avoid this in this forthcoming year.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister talked about a concession of \$1 million a year. I take that to mean the amount which he expects to give in tax relief. It may well be that we will find that the concession of \$1 million in this year works out at a lot less than that, not because figures have been miscalculated, but because when you dangle the carrot on the one hand, you make it easier to bring the donkey along on the other. If you do not cripple people with taxes, they may find it easier to pay the lightly smaller amount which you seek to get from them. We heard these figures about people who pay up to 50% of their incomes in tax. Mr. Speaker, let us face the fact that one - half of your income in tax is a very great deal of money to pay out. I remember being told in Russia that the maximum amount of income tax payable by a Russian taxpayer is 11%. That was then the highest rate of income tax in Russia. Do not let us make any mistake about it; when people suggest that the rate structure should be revised, it is not because the people who are suggesting it are in the position of the selfish oligarchs who opposed having an income tax at all in Barbados in the 1920's or in the 1900's in the United States. It is because you have to make your tax structure conform as far as possible with those of neighbouring places. There is no point in taxing people at a 90% rate if they are going to earn their money somewhere else where the rate is only 70%.

5.05 p.m.

We are not in favour on this side, Mr. Speaker, of reducing income taxation and at the same time seeking to raise revenue through unprogressive forms of taxation like Customs Duty, Excise Duty, and Purchase Tax; but if the economy can stand the withdrawal from taxation and the putting back into circulation of \$1 million, Mr. Speaker, we are only too glad of it. After all, \$1 million is less than what the Barbados Marketing Corporation has wasted, less than what the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation has thrown away. If you added together all the Government "White Elephants", then the Prime Minister would be able to reduce income tax by \$1 million a year. It is no more than our due that we ask from the Government efficiency, and that they do not finance inefficiency out of an overburdening and overweaning taxation. It is no more than the people's due that taxation should not always go in one direction and, that is, upwards.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government wish to embark upon schemes like a Caribbean Broadcasting Station and a Marketing Corporation, they should be reviewed as things to relieve the taxation burden. After all, the Prime Minister corrected me in here once as to who had said and what exactly had been said along the lines of a Television Company being a licence to print money. I think it is Lord Thomson, our own dear Lord Thomson of C. B. C. fame, who said it, and the Prime Minister reminded me of that. If Lord Thomson knows that a Television Company is a licence to print money in Scotland, he should also know it is a licence to print money in Barbados, and allow the burden to be placed on income tax payers, and everybody in Barbados who will have to carry the losses of C. B. C. The same thing is true of the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

If, as the Minister of Agriculture knows, the people who run the Barbados Marketing Corporation cannot be trusted to run a Feed Plant and it has to be handed over to others, in that case, long ago he and other Ministers should have seen that this money should not be wasted, and the Prime Minister would have been able to make these concessions at an earlier stage.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain things which are not in the Bill that I will have to advert to, first of all. Now there is this particular question: in Barbados if you are a landowner in occupation of your land and now, if I read the Bill correctly, if even you are renting land or a house, you are allowed to set off your mortgage payments, or the payments of mortgage interest in full and also any repairs which you carry out on your property. This corresponds to what in England is known as Schedule A taxation but, as I understand it, Schedule A taxation in England is limited to Schedule A income. In Barbados it is within my knowledge, and I have professionally advised persons on this matter - the House may very well appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that I am giving advice which is against my own interest. Even members of my family I have advised along these lines that it is possible, in effect, to buy a good bit of the house out of income tax by skilfully arranging the payments of mortgage interest, and it is also possible because the rateable values of properties in Barbados are much more inflexible than the tax. It is also possible by repairs, by decorating and painting the house every three years to keep the property up to a very high standard at the expense of the taxpayers, the reason being that the taxable value of houses is, I understand from the present Director and I understand it will be continued, kept at a moderately low rate. It is one-third more than the original value of the premises, while you can set off all of these payments against your other income.

So if you owned a house, and you are asked, in fact, to pay income tax on the rental value of \$1,000 against that \$1,000 you can set off your insurance for the house, you can set off mortgage payments, if any, and you can also take \$3,000 and have all the walks done, the house painted inside and outside and get them off your income tax allowances.

Mr. Speaker, I see the hon. junior Member for St. Philip is shaking his head. It looks as if I will have to, professionally, advise him in this matter as well. You get that, Mr. Speaker, and I really do assure hon. Members that this is within my experience. I really do assure them that you get that set off against your other income - not just the income which the particular asset earns, but other income.

Mr. Speaker, this is desirable for those of us who own houses, but it may not be totally equitable and sensible. I fully acknowledge the fact that, were it changed, it would cost me a great deal of money at some time in the future. Nevertheless, I suggest it as something to be borne in mind. At certain times we have to put principle about pocket. I do know of cases where the most expensive redecorations have been carried out on properties, where the alterations have

been made, where the services of persons to condemn floors and woodwork have been solicited so that the floor can be converted from wood to tiles because of wood worms, and this is taken out of income tax. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that, house-ownership being so valued in Barbados, persons would still be willing to own houses and pay on the gross rental value even if some element of this concession was reduced in the future. That is the gloomy side as far as house owners are concerned.

Now, I will suggest something on the brighter side. I would earnestly press on the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, at some stage, to introduce a distinction between earned and unearned income. I was glad to hear the words "progressive taxation" being used. When week after week we sit in this hon. House, it is easy for us to forget that the Democratic Labour Party ever possessed the principles of democratic Socialism, because as it faithfully propounds Capitalist policies, as it faithfully carries on Government unsound business principles just as Mr. Herbert Hoover advised in 1928 the American Government should be carried on, we wondered what happened to Socialism when the D. L. P. got into power. But it was like ringing a bell from the past, striking an ancient cord, Mr. Speaker, to hear the words "progressive taxation" being used. Those were the words which I imagined the Prime Minister, upon being introduced to politics in Barbados on the platforms of the Barbados Labour Party, was only too proud to use back in 1951 and 1952. I am glad that he remembers them to this day.

Mr. Speaker, what is more unprogressive than to allow the rentier class, the shareholders, the drawers of dividends, to pay exactly the same taxation, by sitting down at home and watching money come in, as the people who go out and earn it by the sweat of their brow have to pay?

5.15 p.m.

Progressive taxation is not only an income tax principle; it is also, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, a principle of making those who do something to earn their money pay a little less, have a little relief, as against those who do nothing to earn it. I do not tell you that you should put the tax up for those with unearned incomes - the drawers of rent. If I refer to Karl Marx, the Prime Minister would well know what I mean by the 'rentier' class, the class whom Karl Marx most attacked, and one would think that concerning whom his attacks have held the most validity. What I am suggesting in this respect is to leave the rate on taxation for unearned income, but give an earned income allowance that everybody who actually has to work for his living gets a certain allowance in respect of the fact that he does work. This is system prevailing in the United Kingdom. I do not know what the earned income allowance is now. I think it is a two-ninth allowance. If you work for your income, you get a further allowance of two-ninths deductible whereas if you just sit down at home and clip coupons or draw your dividends, you do not get such an allowance. That is something which we should like to see in an Income Tax Bill.

Mr. Speaker, on the question also of relief for insurance premiums, I tried to take down exactly what the Prime Minister said when he rejected the idea that they should not be deductible from assessable instead of taxable income. The number of negatives has me somewhat baffled, Mr. Speaker, and I must confess that the arithmetical calculations involved in working out how much tax relief you get on insurance premiums have defeated me every single year that I have ever made a tax return in Barbados. I have never understood what is meant by not reducing the tax by more than 28% of the total deductions in Clause (c). I hear my Hon. and Learned friend, the hon. senior member for Christ Church saying that you take off 28%. If he takes off 28% he would find himself within the penalties of those who fail to estimate their tax correctly. All I know, Mr. Speaker, is that insurance salesmen come around and explain to you that you can get so much tax relief on the premiums, but they do not tell you that the more money you work for, the less tax relief you get. How equitable is that? You plan to get \$1,000 a year tax relief on premiums. You get a raise in salary and find you are only getting relief on \$900 in premiums. How sensible is it, Mr. Speaker? I defy any member of the House here today if I gave him a problem in that tax deduction to sit down right away and work it out with pencil and paper. I want to know how people are going to estimate the tax they pay when they read the section on insurance premiums. I know I cannot do it. I was never a genius at arithmetic. I could not look at arithmetical problems and work them out in my head, but I have never been able to find a principle applicable to this business of the insurance policies. What is the use of giving a fixed amount, \$1,000 a year for example, for the policies of self-employed persons who wish to have retirement plans when on the other hand persons who wish no particular retirement plans but wish to arrange an insurance policy especially from American companies - a little modest 2% or 3% a year and maybe 4% or 5% in the British companies, the little modest capital growth you get on a particular sum at some stage, when you find that one is so much more desirable than the other, so that in case of one, you may know if you pay \$1,000 a year this will always be tax deductible, but in the case of another insurance policy, you know you are getting \$1,000 a year tax relief from your insurance but if you work for a little more money it falls to \$900. Persons perhaps may enter into insurance policies at some stage with a belief that they are getting this much in the way of relief, but as they find themselves getting a little more prosperous in the world, down goes the relief that they are getting on insurance policies. It encourages the growth of certain types of insurance premiums. It encourages policies which in fact make for you capital accumulation rather than protection, and it is always considered that the reason for giving tax relief on insurance policies is to relieve persons so that they can put by a little protection for their old age. That is a fundament of insurance policy; but the present insurance structure that we have places less emphasis on the protective aspect of insurance and more emphasis on the growth aspect of insurance. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that there is an element of unprogressive taxation in this too. I

cannot see, Mr. Speaker, why another principle of taxation cannot be applied to relief for insurance premiums that does not penalise a person whose income may be growing, or indeed a person whose income gets larger or is larger.

Mr. Speaker, I also have a very small point on international business companies. I do not regret that the Prime Minister did not see fit to incorporate the legislation relating to international business companies in the Income Tax Bill relief itself. I received a telephone call from a firm of New York lawyers on America's election day who were interested in forming an international business company, and it seems that having somehow got hold of a copy of the Income Tax Act, they were worried because they could not find a provision for international business companies in there. This is only a small point, Mr. Speaker, but I mention it as it has given rise to a problem. This is a very big firm of New York lawyers; it is the late Mr. Foster Dulles' firm, and they were worried because they were thinking of forming a company in Barbados and they wondered for a moment if in fact, since it was not in the new Income Tax Act, it still applied. I myself was very confused, I may say, Mr. Speaker, but the International Business Companies Act is not, I would submit, an Act as those or does not contain provisions such as those which exempt particular industries from tax for a certain period of time and that sort of thing. It is a structural part of the Income Tax Laws. It is a structural part that those companies in which, even though it is resident in Barbados, the majority of shareholding is held outside, pay tax at a different rate. It is a structural part of the nature of taxation in Barbados, and I would suggest that it belongs more properly in this Act than to a separate Act which can be lost sight of in the laws of 1965. I mention that for the Prime Minister's consideration.

Now as to the Bill itself, Mr. Speaker, I can see that we are going to have a good deal of work in Committee, and I really have no idea of what the Government's intentions are as to whether Committee stage is to be completed today; but we have not had the opportunity of studying the amendments and even though they have been very clearly outlined by the Prime Minister, we on this side would like an opportunity of checking them further. There is one thing that springs to my mind and it is this question of estimation of tax. I have been worried by this all along. As I see it, there are places where you estimate your income tax, and these provisions for estimating it have been put into the Act really only because other places have it too. The advantage of estimation, financially, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, can exceed \$100,000. In effect, what is happening is that there will be an acceleration of the payments by self-employed persons mainly which amounts to under \$4 million. There will be a five month acceleration in these payments in the year 1969. The only real advantage that you will derive from that is getting half the payments five months earlier than you otherwise would. The only advantage would be presumably the interest advantage, 3% or 4% interest, but at the

most \$2 million which, as I say, would work out to around \$80,000. Is it worth it for the trouble of printing new income tax forms to contain a column for estimation? Are you saving in time when you consider that previously the clerks who worked out your taxation on the basis of your return are now going to have to check your estimation? You now have to make the return on the estimation, and I am sure the Commissioner is not going to accept anybody's estimate. I can see nothing in the Act, Mr. Speaker, that says in so many words that you are going to be penalised if you make an honest mistake in the estimate.
5.25 p.m.

I can see nothing that says that and I very much hope that that is not the intention. There is no doubt that there are going to be persons who, in order to avoid paying their entire half tax on the 30th April, perhaps might find themselves saying when they know very well that if they add it up properly it would come to \$4,000 tax, in order to avoid paying \$2,000 from the 30th April, they will make their estimation for \$2,000 so that they will have to pay only one. There is a Clause in the Bill which purports to deal with this, and when we reach Section 66, I am going to suggest that the amendment may be redundant. The amendment to Subsection (1) of Section 67 may be redundant in the light of Subsection 6 of Section 67; because Subsection (1) says that if you fail to estimate the tax at all you have to pay a five per cent penalty, but does that take us any further than Subsection (6) which says that a person who fails to pay the amount that should have been estimated - does the new amendment really add anything to Subsection (6)? In my opinion, Subsection (6) is unnecessarily penal anyhow, because although I said that what is there does not necessarily preclude an honest mistake, yet I suppose that the words are capable of saying that if a man adds up his tax \$50 wrong, he has to pay a penalty for so doing. After all, we cannot all be mathematicians, and do not let us forget that if the income tax sections of the Inland Revenue Department do their job, stevedores in the Port will be making their assessments. They will get some figure from their employer and they will work out their deduction. Take, for example, the employer has given wrong figures, or that computer down at the Workers' Union which we hear exists gives them wrong figures. They make a wrong estimate on the amount of tax payable, and are they then going to be penalised?

I mentioned stevedores at the Port because I am trying to draw that this is not a matter which affects only professional men or Ministers or members of the House of Assembly; it is a matter which affects everybody. You are telling people that when they make out a return, they not only have to say how much money they have worked for, a task which many persons who make returns find difficult anyhow, but they are also going to have to estimate the amount of tax. There are persons who are well educated and who have passed through their Universities, but if you were to put Section 42 of this Bill in their hands and tell them that they have to pay 50% on every complete dollar of such taxable income above \$8,000 and up to and including \$12,000 they will get the tax

wrong. They can have a University degree and still, not understand the rates of income tax; so that I think that all of this pressure upon estimation of tax is something which can very well wreck hardship, and I do not see that it is going to save any labour in the Department. If we get these marvellous computers it is very much to be hoped that the computers will do this. The Computers presumably are not going to separate the dollars by the \$1,000 and 2,000 as, if you read this Act, you have to do. The computers are going to be given a figure and they will turn out a figure. They are going to be told that \$11,429.71 - in fact, the computer will tell you that that is taxable income, and the tax payable on that is \$3,621.33 or, as the case may be.

I do not see that this forcing on the shoulders of the income tax payers the necessity of computing his tax as well as his income, is going to assist in any way. I think that it is only going to put another burden on the taxpayers, and many poor taxpayers may not realise the full implications even of the things which they read in the allowance section, and they will perhaps make estimates which are too high. They will put the estimates which are too high, and on some day in the future they may or may not get a letter from the Commissioner saying that they are going to get a rebate. I know that there are very few such letters going out in Barbados. I have never seen one, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if you have been fortunate enough ever to be offered a rebate for income tax. I know that it is a matter in respect of which you have to go in to the Commissioner and fight with him there and then in his office, and persons who make these mistakes and have to pay before the mistakes are discovered - that is also in the Act. You have to pay whether or not you appeal an assessment, of which again, I have had actual experience with clients - I can think of a particular client who was assessed for an amount in excess of \$1,800. There was an appeal, and it was not only discharged, but a rebate of over \$1,000 in tax which he had already paid was given to him. He now will have to pay the \$1,800 even although he appealed, and all of us around the Table are only too well aware that sometimes you cannot put your hands on \$1,800 right away, even if it is tax that might be due. All of these are matters which appear to be tightened up under the Act, but they can work a hardship on taxpayers. These matters can affect the taxpayers, but they can more properly be dealt with in Committee stage.

Mr. Speaker, we welcome this Bill if for no other reason than that it consolidates a series of enactments going back to 1921 and amended every year, or every other year, comprising a large corpus of Statutes of which no colleague of my acquaintance has a complete copy in his Chambers. The last time that I remember seeing a complete collection of Income Tax Acts was made by a firm of solicitors in 1959. The Act gets amended and you cannot find out what the Income Tax laws are. Somebody asked recently about a charity, whether a certain gift to the Barbados Museum could be considered as a charitable gift. It is six weeks now

that I have been trying to advise on that very point because I am not aware of what the legislation is, and it is difficult to find out what the amendments are. In the absence of the laws of Barbados being readily available, who could now buy a copy of the Income Tax Act? Who could buy copies of the amendments? Suppose you could go to the Library and see the laws of Barbados, I do not know if they exist in the Library but certainly I imagine you could not easily find the year's amendments; you would have to look through 22 years' amendments and 22 volumes of laws before you could know what the income tax law of Barbados is at the present time. That is what you would have to look through, and we must therefore welcome a consolidation in this form. If for no other reason than that, it settles the law in respect of the future once and for all until the next Act. But it does not settle the past. We will still have the same trouble up to 1970 or 1971 or until 1972, perhaps, in checking because the old Act will still be in force for certain purposes; but anyhow this is at least a start.

5.35 p.m.

We would welcome it for that reason.

Mr. Speaker, we would caution everybody against thinking that this is any monumental achievement by a Government. The structure of income tax has not been changed; it is still a tax on income; the Prime Minister has always made a great deal of difference between the Corporation Tax and the taxation we have in Barbados. I see the theoretical point which he made that in law a corporation is not a collection of individuals, but for tax purposes it may be. Nevertheless, I think the hon. senior Member for Christ Church and myself have agreed that in many ways it is a distinction without a difference.

What, perhaps, is in issue is how companies should be taxed. Should all companies be taxed at 40% or should small businesses scrambling along be taxed at a lower rate? Is it necessarily right to tax Fix-it-Right as you tax the Barbados Shipping and Trading at the same rate? That is what is involved in the rejection of what the Prime Minister calls a Corporation tax. Is it right to have companies with an entire income tax holidays, some of whom may be fly-by-night adventures from parts North, who exist only on flattery, and they have been able to dish out things to some D. L. P. henchmen - is it right to have companies such as those paying no tax at all, and the next class or taxed companies are companies to whom the taxation rate of 40% is applicable?

Fix-it-Right is smaller than the Barbados Shipping and Trading. Is that any encouragement to small industries and small businesses in Barbados from the tax point of view? Small businesses may get a little encouragement from the approved products angle. Is there any encouragement when a business earning \$10,000 a year has to pay tax at the same rate as Barbados Shipping and Trading earning millions? Is that really a good principle? That is something which I will suggest to the House that the Ministry of Finance has rejected with all too little consideration.

We would like to know what was in the Report, and what was in the counter opinions that prevailed against the Canadian expert's suggestion that a Corporation tax, which would tax corporations on their earnings on a graduated scale, if appropriate, must necessarily be rejected.

With reference to the Capital Gains Tax, I believe there might be some division of opinion as the Prime Minister has said, not along political lines, but along different ways of economic thought. I know in our Party on this side of the House there is some division of opinion as to the desirability of the Capital Gains Tax. I myself think that in Barbados the traditional scope of Capital Gains Tax is, at present, too limited to justify, as the Minister of Finance has said, the imposition of such a tax. The training of special officers, and the collection procedures to be set up, I do not think in 1968 would really pay in the amount of returns that would be gained. Traditionally, Capital gains are made by persons who speculate in the Stock Exchange - persons who have portfolios of stocks they buy and they sell.

Mr. Speaker, that is the form which has invariably attracted the first Capital Gains Tax. The first Capital Gains Taxes in the United States were imposed not only to make money, but to discourage unhealthy speculation. I remember being in the United Kingdom in the last frantic year before the Capital Gains Taxes were introduced, and secretaries in stock-broking houses, journalists in Fleet Street, were speculating in stock exchange with £10 from one account day to another. They would listen to what their bosses in the office said, read what the financial journalists wrote in the paper, and they would pay down £10 as a 10% deposit on shares worth 100 when they did not have the £100.

On the next account day, there is never any question of paying £100 it is like gambling in better shops. If you win you will get £7, and if you lose you will get £2, as the case may be. The account day is run from three-week to three-week. I do not think it is intended, or it could seriously be contended, that the life blood of a country's industry should be subjected to this type of speculation, which extends from £10 to £1 million, so to speak. It is always this type of situation which the Capital Gains Tax seeks to control. But let us face the fact. The Prime Minister particularly said he has not ruled it out in Barbados; so I am going to say there are dangers unless that is the type of speculation that you are trying to control in imposing Capital Gains Tax in a country where the main burden would fall on land.

Persons who deal in land already have to pay income tax. But consider the situation of a person who buys a house or rebuilds a house, which costs him \$40,000. For one reason or another, he sells it for \$70,000. You can say he has made a profit of \$30,000 on that sale of a house. It is a capital profit and capital gains. If a Capital Gains Tax ever comes about, presumably, that is the sort of thing it would aim at, but that person has not made a profit of \$30,000 because he must have somewhere to live.

What cost him \$40,000 in 1963, was sold in 1968 for \$70,000; if you want to have a different house, it would cost you about \$80,000. So the fact that land values are going up all the time and you can make \$30,000 by selling a piece of land, or a house in five years, that fact does not mean that you have made a profit of \$30,000. You will have to find something to do with the \$30,000. A similar investment is going to cost you more than the profit you made. Land values are not going up for you alone, but for everybody. You will have to be aware of a Capital Gains Tax whose main incidence would form a situation that is not true profit.

The value of land in a place like Barbados does not go down. It is not like a share in the Stock Exchange where a company is making gramophone records today for the Beatles, and tomorrow the Beatles leave it and the shares fall to 10/-. That is something that could easily happen; business goes up and business goes down. Cave Shepherd makes money today, and DaCosta makes money tomorrow; but the land on which Cave Shepherd stands is not going to lose its value because Cave Shepherd has failed to make a profit the year before.

You have to be very, very careful, Mr. Speaker, not to have any Capital Gains Tax which would be aimed at capitalising land profits. That is already done by the Land Development Duty Act, and it can already be done more sensibly.

At this stage Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair.
5.45 p.m.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a good deal of the arguments in this matter, apart from any comment which we on this side of the House may have to make on the new rates of income tax when we see them - because we have not seen them yet and I do not know how long they intend to keep them a secret, but it certainly is hamstringing us on this side as far as that part of our argument is concerned - is, I think, going to revolve around the individual sections of the Act, and I think that with an Act such as this - I have had some intimation of this, I should say, - a Select Committee is shouted for. There are drafting points and there are points of principle, and I very much hope that this is not going to be one of these Select Committees where the Government side turns up to perform as a Government not on grounds of principle, but on grounds of defending the draughtsmen. It may well be that there are things in the Act which need not be there even with the most careful amendments, and even with the Law Society having gone over the Act, the House of Assembly may still have a thing or two to say about it, and I would therefore at an appropriate stage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because we really are not opposing the second reading of it, move that it be referred to a Select Committee, so that the more detailed part of our arguments may then take place at a place to which it will more properly belong, the body of the Act itself section by section.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I understand it, the desirability of sending this Bill to Select Committee has been agreed on by both sides. In such

circumstances, since the criticisms or suggestions that I have to make related to individual clauses, I will confine my remarks here to one or two points of principle only. Now I find it a bit of an insult to this Assembly for us to be considering this Act which is based to some extent upon the recommendations of an expert's Report and which Report was paid for by the taxpayers of this country and out of the vote of monies sanctioned by Parliament, and up to today this Report has not been made available to members on this side of the House. I cannot see that there can be any possible justification for this, and it may well be that the reason is that the recommendations which were made not being accepted by the Government, they thought it fit and right to conceal from members of this House the true nature of the Report.

I find it also difficult to understand, if today we are amending, revising and consolidating the law relating to income tax why, as a matter of principle in this part of the 20th Century in which the equality of the sexes is something that is accepted, the Government has not accepted the principle of separate assessment between husband and wife. Failure to accept this, I think, is depriving the community of a large amount of skill which because of the combination of husband-and-wife income is not coming forward and making itself available, particularly in the professions. Secondly, Sir, I find it very difficult to understand how a well-known device of reducing and, indeed, avoiding taxation legitimately at the present moment by way of reduction in capital procedure in a company has not been covered by this bill, and I do hope that a good look will be taken by the draughtsmen at the provisions of the sections which deal with reduction, with winding up, re-organisation and the failure to distribute dividends by companies. Whether some people like it or not, I do feel that the present specious gaps in avoiding taxation should be closed by this Bill, because I think most people in Barbados recognise that any Government which is in power will have to use the device of income taxes in order to derive for Government a large share of its revenue. What is a bone of contention, and what causes a degree of ill feeling on the part of many people in Barbados, is the fact that the tax rates are high on people who have to expend considerable sums of money in providing themselves with an education to earn in the relatively high income brackets, and for those who have been fortunate enough to earn their education by way of scholarship, the basic point still remains that they have had to devote a considerable amount of time as well as great sacrifice in their period of study, and that they are entitled to some rewards for the sacrifices which they have made.

Now the Government had announced that it will amend the rates of income on the taxable income. We have not again been circulated with the new rates, but I take it that it is just a matter of their inability by today to have all the typing and cyclostyling done. We also notice, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this side that if one summarises the effects of this new Bill, one will agree that what it does is basically two things: it clarifies the basis of assessment and sets it out in a more readable and simple form, and it tightens up con-

siderably the method and machinery for assessment and returns. That is all it does. It appears to me that, in the new provision for the collection of taxes, a point might have been lost sight of, that for the next year a number of self-employed people will have to be paying in 1969 two sets of income tax, namely their last instalment for the year of assessment 1968 which is not due until 15th February, and by 30th April half of their new tax for the year 1969 and by 30th September the other half. I remember reading somewhere when the P. A. Y. E. regulations were introduced that special consideration was given to prevent the hardship which resulted from the introduction of P. A. Y. E. in a year where you had to pay your last year's income tax as well as make your current payments month by month, and I hope that Government will have another look at this section and see if it is possible to reduce this burden in respect of the first year. It will only apply in respect of next year, because in the future, as I understand it, you would be paying one half by 30th April and the other half by 30th September. Perhaps now that it has been drawn to the attention of Government, an equitable method of cushioning the effect of that without interfering too much with the principle of pre-estimate of your income tax will be looked into.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, seeing that there are no great matters of principle involved in this Bill and that we are going to have the opportunity in Select Committee to deal with the individual Clauses, I do not desire to detain the House any longer on this, except to say this; I am one of those who believe that in a society such as ours in which a great portion of the wealth of the country is held in land, we should treat land or consider treating land in the same method as stocks and shares had been treated in the United States and in England where, because of speculations, a special Capital Gains Tax was introduced. Either it has got to be done by way of a direct Capital Gain Tax or it has got to be done by way of a change in your method of the stamp duties on the *per capita* value of land; but I think it is monstrously unfair that people can take advantage or rises in the value of land, make great gains and derive great benefits when a great part of the contribution to the rise in the value of land is derived from the expenditure by Government on the infra structure of the country which comes out of the taxpayers' pocket. The income taxpayers are paying at a high rate so that the Government can develop an infra structure in your company, and the speculators can derive benefits purely because they have greater access to capital because the courses of capital are all foreignowned and they prefer to deal with foreigners in the lending of money than to deal with Barbadians. That is a fact. I have no apologies to make for any criticisms that I make of any bank in Barbados. If you really analyse the situation, you will see that it is easier for speculators from abroad, now that the capital cost of land has gone this high, to get money from the banks, and this is particularly emphasised now because of the tourist industry. You get all advantages of all the concessions; year after year, out of the subsidies and income tax of this country, people have got to pay grants to the Tourist Board in order

to promote Barbados and we have to spend more money on water, roads and street lighting. We have got to deprive local people of essential services in order to carry them into areas on the ground that the tourist industry needs them and you are having the tourist trade, and when they come, they get hotel aids, your taxation, they go abroad and they sell their property at the end of a period. They do it by a reduction and winding up; after the end of a period they do it by a reduction of capital. They do not wind up their capital; they advertise. They go before the Judge and say "We have assets in excess of the needs of the company." The Judge says "O. K." If there are 50,000 shares, they cancel 25,000 shares and you pay back the profits you have made by selling the physical assets of the hotel. You pay it back by a dividend and you say that for every share you cancel, you will give back the owners of the share a pound. That is how they get out their money and they are gone bird's speed, and the Barbadian taxpayers have to deal with that. I could never accept that; I will never accept it, and I do not care who in this country feels that I am blocking capital from coming into this country. How could I be blocking capital from coming to this Country?

What I am doing, Sir, is pointing out the devices whereby capital which comes to this country, comes here purely with the intention, during the course of these people being here, to exploit every iota and what is more, some of these people, because they have the capital, attempt to pervert the Civil Servants of this country by offering them all kinds of inducements. You can pervert a man in more than one way. I am giving notice here now that I would like the Government to take a serious look and see whether the provisions as regards non-distribution of dividends are tightened up so as to cover this situation. Having covered it with a winding up and a re-organization, I would like to see that definition expanded - a re-organization whether by way of reduction of capital or not. In the English Income Tax Act they have that.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now referred to a Select Committee. It may well be that the Hon. Leader of the House will make suggestions as to the members of that Committee.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second that. We would commend from our side the Hon. and Learned Minister of Finance, His Honour the Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the hon. junior member for St. George, and we will ask Mr. Speaker to be Chairman of that Committee.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, from the side of the Opposition, I would recommend that the hon. and learned senior member for St.

Thomas, the hon. and learned senior member for Christ Church, be our nominees to that Committee.

The question that this Bill be now referred to a Select Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to propose that the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown be a member of that Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to ask the following hon. members to serve on that Committee:-

The Hon. and Learned Prime Minister (Hon. E. W. BARROW); His Honour the Speaker; the hon. senior member for St. Thomas (Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS); the hon. senior member for Christ Church (Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN); the hon. junior member for St. George (Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN); the hon. senior member for the City (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY); the hon. senior member for St. Michael (Mr. J. B. SPRINGER); and I associate myself with that Committee.
6.05 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT AND PENDING BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to throw out this suggestion, if I may, to the members of the Select Committee. I think it is most important that we get this Bill through its stages in this House as quickly as possible. I wonder whether it would be agreeable to the Select Committee to meet on Thursday to do its work and prepare its Report for a meeting of the House on Friday?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would suggest to the Leader of the House that the members of the Select Committee do not mind meeting on Thursday, but there is a very important Select Committee meeting on Friday afternoon. On this side we would hope that the House be adjourned until next Tuesday instead of next Friday.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that being the case, if we could have the two Select Committees meet on the same afternoon at different times, of course, this would expedite matters. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this would require specific and firm instructions being given to Mr. Clerk to arrange for both meetings to be held on Thursday at the appropriate hours.

As I understand it, the Public Accounts Committee is going to have a meeting on Friday, and it is therefore suggested that this Select Committee could meet on Thursday at 4.30 p.m., and the House will then meet on the following Tuesday as usual. This concludes Government Business, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 10th December, 1968, at 12 noon.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was no Question Time today consequent upon the suspension of the Rules, and I am asking under Rule 14 where a question has not been reached during Question Time - (ASIDES.) I am asking that the Questions be answered and not laid.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: There was no Question Time today.

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have already drawn attention to Mr. Speaker that he and I happened to arrive just too late and in consequence I could not give notice of a Resolution. I should be glad if I may now do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You may.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

WHEREAS there has been an increase in the number of cane fires that have taken place annually in this Island with a consequent loss in revenue to cane growers and a hurt to the general revenue, and

WHEREAS this increase has led to abnormal hours of duty to firemen and to policemen in their fight to control and to prevent the spread of these fires;

This House is of the opinion that special fire prevention efforts should be made by all those interested in the economy of this country and to that end calls on the Government to send down legislation designed to create a special service for fire control including *inter alia* the appointment of a body of special constables in every parish with personal knowledge of sugar plantations layouts whose duties would be to patrol selected areas at appropriate times;

This House is further of the opinion that legislation should provide for reintroducing a system of rewards to persons giving information leading to the conviction of those accused of setting fires;

This House is further of the opinion that the Government should prevent in this connection a repetition of the excessive hours of work which devolved on members of the Fire Service and of the Royal Police Force.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 10th December, 1968, at 12 noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.15 p.m.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th December, 1968

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock, today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.) (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P..

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 5th November this year, I am advised, have been circulated, and unless there is any objection, they will be confirmed.

There being no objection, I declare the Minutes of the meeting of 5th November, 1968, duly confirmed.

Also I am advised that the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 12th November, 1968, have been circulated, and unless there is any objection, they will be confirmed.

There being no objection, I declare the Minutes of the meeting of this House of Tuesday, 12th November, 1968, duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1968.

Also, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Trade, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Seventeenth Annual Report of the Natural Gas Corporation for the period 1st April, 1967 to 31st March, 1968.

Also on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Health, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Report on the Health Services in Barbados for the year 1967.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1968.

A Bill to incorporate the Caribbean Meteorological Council.

A Bill to amend the Evidence Act, 1905.

I also beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 214, 216 and 259 are ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 220, and 168, 227, 250 and 223, of which notice had been given formerly, are ready.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS and Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

1. BE IT RESOLVED that this House desires to see a tangible and meaningful expression given to the Prime Minister's Budget Proposal reference on 30th June, 1967, to wit:-

"to the panorama of Pico Teneriffe";

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Government be urged to take steps to enhance the scenic

beauty, and the panoramic and historic values of this important landmark by constructing an approach road from a point near the 18-mile stone at Boscobelle, St. Peter to a point nearest the said Pico Teneriffe, so as to make this landmark accessible to tourists and visitors to the Island generally; and at the same time providing an opportunity for peasant holders in the area to get their produce to market.

2. WHEREAS the Public Service Commission has appointed a suitably qualified person who is abroad to fill the vacant post of dietitian at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; and

WHEREAS such a decision tends to cast reflections on the competence or the ability of the highly efficient Matron and on the recommendation of one of this Institution's most eminent doctors; and

WHEREAS the statement by the Hon. Minister of Health delivered to this Hon. House on 14th May, 1968, in reply to Question No. 177 at No. 3 is grossly misleading and inaccurate and tends to endanger the fully efficient and expert dietetic services this Institution presently enjoys;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Hon. House, bearing in mind the fact that this Institution's dietetic service has never been more competently executed since the opening of the Institution, urges upon Government the necessity to regrade the staff structure of the Kitchen Department and to create the post of Assistant Dietitian with adequate remuneration, to ensure the continued smooth and efficient functioning of the services rendered therein, bearing in mind the relation of such services to the specialized medical and nursing care essential to the recovery of the sick who are ministered to at this Institution.

3. WHEREAS, pupils of several Government Secondary and Comprehensive and of Private Secondary Schools in this Island forsake attending school during the crop season or part thereof and during such absence from school, are employed for wages on the sugar estates in this Island in the harvesting of the sugar cane;

AND WHEREAS, despite such employment on the estates heading and loading canes in the fields, wages earned by school pupils are drawn or received by parents, guardians or agents in respect of the said work done;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to investigate the incidence of school-children being employed as labourers as stated above, and seek to take steps to remedy such a situation, bearing in mind at the same time the adverse social and economic conditions under which some sugar and estate workers and their children in this new Nation live from day to day.

4. WHEREAS several casual workers employed by the Ministries of Communication and Works, Health and Housing and Education are being retired from the service of Government annually; and

WHEREAS on such retirement some of these workers have completed from 15 to 30 years of service; and

WHEREAS despite such long service these workers are ineligible for pension rights through being "unestablished"; and

WHEREAS on reaching retiring age these workers are at the mercies of Government through no fault of their own, some, becoming frustrated after expending much energy assisting the various Ministries to determine eligibility for gratuitous consideration;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge upon Government the necessity to make legislative provision for all casual workers completing 13 years of unbroken service to receive a gratuity and for persons completing service in excess of this period to receive a gratuity and enjoy specified pension rights. 12.25 p.m.

QUESTIONS

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Does the Board of Education appointed under Section 3 of the Education (Amendment) Act of 1956-11 still exist?

2. How many meetings of that Board were held during the year?

3. At how many meetings did this Board consider the establishment of the Barbados Community College?

4. Did this Board ever approve the establishment of such a College? If so, on what date was such a decision arrived at?

5. How many members of that Board form a quorum, and who were the members forming a quorum on the date in question?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

How many applications for loans have been received by the Housing Authority from persons residing in the parish of St. Peter, between 6th November, 1966 and 5th November, 1968?

2. What was the total sum of the loans requested? How many loans were granted? What was the total sum granted?

3. How many applications were refused? How many remain unprocessed? What were the reasons for refusing, apart from the shortage of funds?

4. How many applications were received from each of the following parishes during the same period:- St. Andrew, St. George, St. John, St. Philip and St. Lucy?

5. What was the total sum requested by each parish?
6. How many applications from each parish were granted? What was the total sum granted each parish?
7. How many applications from each parish remain unprocessed?

Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that the conditions under which the officers and staff of the Parcel Post Department of the General Post Office at the Wharf perform their duties are intolerable and do not encourage them to give of their best by reason of the discomfort caused by the heat of the building in which they work, especially when there are large numbers of people waiting to be served?

Will the Minister recommend to the Government the installation of air cooling equipment, such as fans or other air-conditioning equipment, which would relieve such discomfort as a matter of extreme urgency?

Will the Minister also recommend the installation of a water cooler in the said building for the use of the workers therein and such members of the public who have to use the building on business?

Messrs. MOTTLEY, ST. JOHN and LYNCH entered the House and took their seats.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE DEFERRED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there should be a Select Committee prepared to report today - a Select Committee of which Your Honour was Chairman.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in entire agreement with what the hon. member has said, but that Report is yet awaiting the necessary processing by the Clerk of the House. We completed our labours after two long strenuous sessions at which we had 100% attendance; but I understand that the good offices of the Senior Parliamentary Counsel have been invoked to assist the Clerk in completing his labours.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That will only mean that at some stage later during the day's proceedings we might be able to receive that Report and perhaps act on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am hopeful about that so long as we continue to have the good offices of the Senior Parliamentary Counsel, Mr. Nicholls.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON the following Bills were read a first time:-

A Bill to incorporate the Caribbean Meteorological Council.

A Bill to amend the Evidence Act, 1905.

OBSERVATION re MINUTES OF 5TH NOVEMBER, 1968

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I think that personal explanations are still permitted. I was prevented from being here at the start of the House by traffic. It took me fifteen minutes to come from High Street into the House, due largely to a policeman not understanding how to direct traffic at the gate of the Public Assembly. Other Ministers were delayed; and I had to comment - I may mention in passing - that it is inconceivable that a policeman will allow people to cross the road in single file while two Ministers are waiting to drive into the House of Assembly - allow them to cross the road in single file for two minutes at a time, rather than gathering them up and putting them across in one lot. Therefore, I was not present when the Minutes of the meeting of the 5th November, 1968 were read.
12.35 p.m.

I, therefore, cannot object to anything in the Minutes, but I should say, in respect of an entry that appears on page 5 of the Minutes, that I feel called upon to make an explanation. I cannot, I take it, since the House has already approved the Minutes, object to what is in them, but I must explain that I did not withdraw any words complained of by the Prime Minister on the 5th November, 1968. I did not withdraw any words complained of. I withdrew the words which the Prime Minister did not complain of when I said that he was a lunatic. Those are the words I withdrew. I withdrew them before he could complain of them. The words complained of by the Prime Minister were that I said "he fell out with other Ministers", and I did not withdraw those words. I must explain that, Mr. Speaker, since the Minutes have been confirmed and I can no longer say that the Minutes are inaccurate. I never withdrew the words complained of by the Prime Minister, and reference to *Hansard*, in due course, will, I am sure, bear out what I have said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point under Standing Order 17, and it is to be borne in mind that no controversial matter may be brought forward on a personal explanation, nor may debate arise upon the explanation.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that you have dealt in the customary way with the illegal intervention of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. I am not really concerned about that since it has now been disposed of; but what I would like to support the hon. member on is the complete and utter disregard for all the normal rules about traffic by the policeman on duty today, who seemed deliberately to be holding up every single member of the House of Assembly that he could recognise. At one stage I had to wait several minutes, with no one crossing the pedestrian crossing, while he looked over the bridge and down Broad Street to see if he could find anyone to direct across the road. I immediately stopped and asked him whether he was playing some kind of game. I asked him for his name and number - I had already seen the number on his

lapels, anyway - and I immediately reported the matter to the Sergeant here.

Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner of Police has got to be told that we claim privileges from the Officer administering the Government of this country. One of the privileges which we claim is the freedom to enter and leave these Chambers without fear of apprehension or arrest for civil debts. But arrest can be arrest in another sense, too, because if you detain a Member of the House from entering the precincts of the House, that is as much an arrest as if you put your hands on him for a traffic offence. This is my own interpretation. There are different kinds of arrest.

I have never seen such a complete and utter disregard for the position of Members of this House as was exhibited out there today, where you had a young police officer looking around for people, and when he could not find people he stood with arms akimbo - no altercation or anything going on - just staring at the traffic waiting for pedestrians to cross. Normally, we do not like to be hard on junior officers, but members must be free to enter and leave the Chamber so that they can get here in time to take part in the deliberations which the people put us here to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is the feeling of the House, I shall write, by virtue of my office, a letter to the Commissioner of Police *à propos* the grievances which have been brought to the attention of this House.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to contribute something to this debate?

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually, it is not a debate, but let the hon. member make a point.

Mr. SMITH: I will make a point, Mr. Speaker. It is all well and good for hon. members to say here that they are being held up by the Police. I am going to prove an incident to you. Every policeman does not know the cars of members of this House. (ASIDES). Mr. Speaker, please ask the hon. senior member for the City to behave while I am on my feet.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the hon. member knows he must behave when any hon. member is on his feet.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when I tried to park my car in the Public Buildings' Yard today, a policeman came to me very politely and said: "My Gentleman, you cannot park here now; these spaces are for members of the House of Assembly." I told him that I was a member of the House, and he apologised. He did not know me, and that is a fact.

This is my view. If a policeman is doing his duty, regardless of whether it is the Governor-General or somebody else, he should be held up by the policeman in order to allow pedestrians to pass. If he is holding up hon. members unduly, or because he can do so, then it is a different matter. If he allows A to pass and B... (ASIDES.) It is not because I am a member of the House, or the Hon. Prime Minister or the hon. senior

member for St. Thomas, that a policeman must do something wrong to please us. It is a fact that the policeman on duty may not notice the cars of hon. members who were waiting. That is a possibility, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the other day an hon. member asked that hon. members of this House be allowed to use flags on their cars when coming to this House. Taking into consideration what the Hon. Prime Minister and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas are complaining of, by right, these members should have flags on their cars; but not I. I do not want a flag, but some distinction should be made to members of the House when they are coming here. I have been held up sometimes. One day if it were not a female policeman, I would have got out and handled her; but I love ladies. I do not know if she likes me, but she kept me by Nelson's statue for a considerable time - on purpose, I believe; but what could I do about it? Whether she was doing it wrongly or rightly, she was doing her job. If you do not want her there, then put somebody else.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us be careful now that we do not develop into a debate. A point was made by the senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. Prime Minister, and I am afraid the hon. senior member for St. Joseph really began to debate the matter.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am merely suggesting that some time ago I moved a Resolution that Your Honour declare what are the precincts of the House before members of the House. I suggest, with great respect, that when you write the Commissioner of Police you consider discussing with him what are the precincts of the House and suggest to him to give instructions to the Police that people are trespassing on the precincts of the House, if in any way they obstruct the members of the House who are approaching or leaving the House.
12.45 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to corroborate the statements made by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. Prime Minister because I myself today and on previous occasions have been subjected to the same sort of treatment, and, if I may say, abuse. Only today I indicated to the policeman at the gate that I wanted to get into the House. There was a block in front and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was behind me, and I indicated to the policeman that he had enough space to allow us to get in, but he ignored us completely. Then he allowed the car ahead of me to go ahead leaving clear space for me to pass and get into the precincts of the House. I accelerated and suddenly he stopped me and called one person - and I almost committed a traffic offence by knocking down this lady. This happens almost every week. There are some of the more elderly policemen who respect the members of this House and allow them to get in; but some of the younger ones find it extremely difficult to co-operate when we have to come in here and discuss the business of the people of this country, and I should like to join hon. members in the protests.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate that this is not generalising from the point of view that you do not find all policemen like this. I rise just to say that I have been informed by the Head of the Police Department that young policemen who are trained know the numbers of the cars of members of Parliament because they are displayed at the Training School. I hope you have not changed yours; I have had mine about 40 years. What the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has said is true. It is not a general thing, but you find one or two young policemen who are rather indiscreet, because nobody can tell me that a policeman did not know Lloyd Smith. If he does not know, he is not a policeman, and if he did not know the Prime Minister's car.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it the hon. member is not referring to any member of this House by name?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Certainly not, Sir.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, it is not what you take, Mr. Speaker. Lloyd Smith is sitting here and the hon. member is referring to me as Lloyd Smith in here. It is for you to rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly if the reference by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown is to a member of this House, I will have to do that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I withdraw that. I meant the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. By hearing his voice alone he would know that he is the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. Would you tell me that a policeman would not know the cars of the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister? I do not want a flag on my car, and I would say that I do not expect policemen to give hon. members of this House any better treatment than they give another citizen; but I have been in here long enough to say that when another set of people were in here, policemen treated them with high respect. None of us walk about asking for salutes; but I say that when members are coming to the House and a policeman is standing there, he has a right to see that members get through especially if he sees it is 12 o'clock. Fortunately, as I say, it is not a general rule; but when a policeman says he does not know the number of the Prime Minister's car or that of the Leader of the Opposition, they are posted up at District "A" and at the Training School. I hope, therefore, that this matter will not come up again for the simple reason that I am sure the Superintendents and Officers in the Police Force would never encourage a matter of this sort. None of us want to have greater privileges than the average citizen with a motor car; but when a policeman is standing there, we should be given the right of way to come in. Do you know how I had to come in? I had to get out of my car and walk in.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I had really intended when I came in today, before the House met, to draw this matter to your attention because of the experience I had had, but we discussed other things and we did not come around to that. Like hon. members, though in my view I think it was for a longer period, I was kept outside the gate for what seemed

to me to be a period of three or four minutes while one old lady passed, nobody else passed, then two young people passed across and then I was allowed to come in. But between the passage of the one old lady and the two people, I am sure that about three or three and a half minutes elapsed, and up to now I have no reason to suppose that the officer who was directing the traffic did not know me or my car, but he just stood there. It was a most incomprehensible thing, unless he had a black-out or a sudden seizure or something. I have never seen anything like it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say something since it was I that raised this point and hon. members have been explaining themselves on this. I do not ask for any greater privilege than any member of the public; but it is my opinion, in any case, Mr. Speaker, that pedestrians have no priority over cars at that crossing. This is not a zebra crossing. Zebra crossings are where pedestrians have priority over cars and, by stepping into the road, can make cars stop. That is a permissive crossing where the policeman's duty is to collect people on the pavement. It is not his duty to make cars wait for ten minutes while people cross in single file. Cars must have their fair part of the road at that point too. Let the people wait for two minutes if the cars have to wait for two; but he cannot keep the cars of ordinary citizens as well as our cars waiting for ten minutes while he looks for people. I can confirm what the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture said. I saw him turn his back and look for somebody to cross right in front of the Minister of Agriculture's car. I saw him looking about for people to bring through the crossing while the cars were waiting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I assure hon. members that I will take up this matter. Not only will I write the Commissioner of Police, but I will take the matter up very fully with him, in the light of what hon. members have said. I propose to do so this week.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 5 be taken as the first Order of the Day.

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

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

THE SUGAR WORKERS (PROVIDENT FUND) ACT, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Provident Fund out of which prescribed benefits may be paid to sugar workers and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, it is to be appreciated, and I think it is accepted that the sugar worker in Barbados is the most important worker in this country since the economy of the country hinges on sugar. Unfortunately over the

years little has been done for the sugar worker. It is true that the Barbados Workers Union has fought the cause of the sugar worker; but although the economy of the country hinges on sugar, there is not enough done by way of social legislation in favour of the sugar worker. However, I think it was on the 18th July, 1963, that the Cabinet took a decision that a Provident Fund should be established for workers in the sugar industry. At the same time we were giving consideration to the Social Security Scheme, and it was decided that the provision of a Provident Fund for sugar workers should be separate and distinct from the Social Security Scheme.

12.55 p.m.

However, it has been pointed out that the pensions under the Provident Fund Scheme and the Social Security Scheme be not made available to workers at the same time. Let me explain this. A person today who qualifies for a Provident Fund will not qualify for Social Security as well, because he would not have been contributing to Social Security long enough to qualify for a pension, according to the Social Security legislation. Anyhow, after the Cabinet made a decision on the 18th July, 1963, a Committee was set up to go into the question of establishing this Fund. This Committee, under the Chairmanship of the Chief Labour Officer, known at the time as the Labour Commissioner, made certain recommendations, and these recommendations were as follows: that the Sugar Workers' Provident Fund should be administered by a Statutory Board which should comprise representatives of the Barbados Workers' Union, the Sugar Producers' Federation of Barbados and the Government. They also decided or recommended that sugar workers for the purpose of this Scheme should be defined as workers employed in cultivating, harvesting and transporting sugar cane, manufacturing and transporting sugar and molasses from factory to warehouse and such other classes of persons as shall, from time to time, be deemed by the Board to be sugar workers. They also recommended that the sugar workers as defined in their second recommendation, who retired on or after the 1st January, 1966, qualify for benefits under this Scheme provided that they have worked for ten consecutive years immediately preceding the date of retirement and at the minimum rate of 60 working days per year in each year. In conclusion, they recommended that any year in which the service of less than 60 days is rendered, shall be excluded, provided that consecutive service shall not be regarded as broken if a person satisfies the Board that he was prevented from working for 60 days in the year because of illness.

In 1964, when they made the recommendations, they considered the question of the payment of sickness benefit, maternity benefit, funeral benefit and Widows' and Orphans' Funds to dependants within the definition of the Workmen's Compensation benefits instead of survivors' benefit, subject to the views of the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation. They also considered the question of retirement benefit, but after the National Insurance Scheme made provision for sickness bene-

fit for sugar workers and all workers in the country, maternity benefit, funeral benefit etc., and after having a look at the sum available to the Scheme, and having a further look at the statistics which revealed that there were some 1,500 persons of the age of sixty-five years and over who have retired from the industry between 1956 and 1966, and that there were some 300 persons under the age of sixty-five who had also retired during the said period mainly on grounds of ill-health, and in view of information which the Committee had on the financial aspects of the Scheme the Committee recommended that the amounts available would be inadequate to take care of these benefits like sickness benefit, maternity benefit, funeral benefit and Widows' and Orphans' benefit; they recommended, therefore, that pensions only will be paid from the Fund. The Committee recommended that the rate of payment of the pensions should be \$3.00 a week provided that, in respect of those workers who retired between January, 1956, and the date of the coming into operation of the Sugar Workers' Provident Fund Scheme in 1968, the maximum period of retirement on which retroactive pension should be paid should not exceed 260 weeks.

They also recommended that if a worker died before receiving his lump sum payment, the said benefit should be paid to his widow or dependants as defined in the Workmen's Compensation Act. They recommended that the age of retirement should be 65 years. They also recommended that if a worker is receiving benefits from Workmen's Compensation, he should also qualify for benefits under the Provident Fund Scheme. In short, the fact that he was receiving benefits from Workmen's Compensation did not or ought not to deny him the right to receive benefits under the Provident Fund Scheme. The Committee further recommended that service taken into account in assessing severance payment of displaced sugar factory workers under the Sugar Factory Workers' Severance Payment Scheme should not again be taken into account in assessing qualifying service for pension under the Sugar Workers' Provident Fund Scheme. Those were the recommendations of the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we come next to the question of the financing of this Fund. Now, it was noted that in order to pay arrears as envisaged, a sum of \$1,215,552 would be required. The amount available is \$3,225,492 and the average annual income is about \$300,000 and it is set out as follows:-

The accumulated funds of the Scheme as from 30th June, 1966, was \$1,054,492; the sugar levy of 1966 was \$171,000 and the amount to be granted from the Price Stabilization Fund was \$2 million.
1.05 p.m.

The total assets of the Scheme is estimated at \$3,225,492 and the estimated payments are \$1,215,552. The estimated interest would amount to \$140,000, and the levy on an average crop of 160,000 tons would be \$160,000. Therefore the average annual fund available to the Scheme is in the region of \$300,000. The Committee pointed out that it was of the opinion that

the estimated cost of administering the Scheme for the first year would not exceed \$15,000, and after the first year it ought not to exceed \$10,000.

As a result of the recommendations of this Committee, the Cabinet decided in May, 1968, that the Provident Fund Scheme for sugar workers should be set up and operated simultaneously with the Social Security Scheme provided that sugar workers who are eligible for a pension under the National Insurance Scheme should be entitled either to that pension or a pension under the Provident Fund Scheme, but should not be entitled to receive both such pensions. It also concluded that the Scheme should be administered by a Statutory Board comprised of three representatives each of the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation under the chairmanship of the Chief Labour Officer.

It was also decided that sugar workers should be defined as workers employed in cultivating, harvesting, and transporting sugar cane, the manufacturing and transporting of sugar and molasses from factory to warehouse, and such other classes of persons as shall from time to time be deemed by the Board to be sugar workers. All of these provisions are in the Bill before us.

Hon. members will notice that provision is also made in the Bill that sugar workers who retire on or after the 1st January, 1956, will qualify for benefits provided that they have worked ten consecutive years immediately preceding the date of retirement at the minimum rate of 60 working days in each year, and provided that the continuous service should not be regarded as broken if a worker satisfies the Board that he was prevented from working 60 days in any year because of illness.

Provision is also made in the Bill that benefits should be restricted to a pension of \$3.60 a week, and this is an increase of 60¢ a week on the recommendation of the Committee. I must say that on the Committee the workers' organisation was represented and the Sugar Producers' Federation was also represented, and they agreed that payment for a maximum of 260 weeks in respect of workers who retired between the 1st January, 1956, and the date of the coming into operation of the Scheme should be made to sugar workers; that the retiring age should be 65 years provided that the worker who retires through permanent inability to work, or through disablement, should receive a pension on the same basis as a worker who retires at the age of 65 subject to the completion of 10 consecutive years' service preceding the date of retirement.

The Bill also makes provision that a worker can receive benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Act and benefits under the Provident Fund Scheme simultaneously. There is also provision in the Bill that service which has been taken into account for severance pay should not also be taken into account for assessing qualifying service for a pension under the Scheme; but, if necessary, part of the capital provision should be used for payment of the arrears of benefits, and that the Scheme should

be reviewed after the first three years' operation.

The Bill also provides that the staff of the Board should consist of a Secretary/Accountant - the salary of the Secretary/Accountant would be in the scale \$4,860 to \$5,940 - a Clerk/Typist at a salary in the scale \$1,320 to \$3,420 per annum, and provision is made for temporary assistance, when necessary. I should like to point out that the expenses under the Scheme would be taken from the Fund. The cost of administering the Scheme would be taken from the Fund.

Mr. Speaker, this matter was gone into very carefully. Some hon. members may say, "Why not more than \$3.60?" I should like to give them far more than that, but because of the limited amount of funds available, this Scheme is supposed to operate on the interest of the money taken from the Price Stabilisation Fund, and there is provision that at the end of the Scheme - it is envisaged that this Scheme will come to a close at some time, because with the introduction of the National Insurance the average sugar worker, say, in a year or two from now, on retirement would not be qualifying for \$3.60 a week from this Scheme, but he or she would be qualifying for a higher pension of, say, between 40% to 60% of his or her notional weekly earnings from the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme. This Scheme will come to an end as soon as, I would say, the people now qualifying for benefits under the Scheme die out. There would hardly be additions to the Scheme.

We have had the advice of the Financial Secretary in this matter.
1.15 p.m.

I think in fairness to hon. members I should point out what was the advice given by the Ministry of Finance, so that they would be able to see that the amount of money available to the Fund could hardly meet a higher benefit. A Cabinet Paper was sent to the Financial Secretary and these are the comments.

"The Cabinet Paper which has been referred for this Ministry's comments seeks to request the approval of Cabinet to the details of the Sugar Industry Workers Provident Fund Scheme, and a Committee of which you and I" - this was to the Permanent Secretary - "had at one time or other been members as representatives of this Ministry had made certain recommendations. These recommendations I fully support. The proposed submission to Cabinet however rejects an important element in the Committee's recommendation, that is, the quantum of benefit, and seeks to raise the proposed pensions from \$3.00 a week to what was recommended by the Minister. Apparently even with retroactive effect this is a very important element of the Scheme - indeed, in my opinion, the most important, since it can make or break it. The Scheme can only work within the resources of the Fund, and based on the statistics and estimates which were made available to the Committee, a pension over and above \$3.00 recommended would mean that the Fund should be in receipt of additional funds to the order of \$ 1/4 million. It

would take an amount of approximately \$3.6 million invested at 7% to produce \$ 1/4 million."

What the Financial Secretary is here pointing out is that if on the recommendation of the Committee an increased pension is paid, it would take an additional amount of \$3 million invested. I hope hon. members on the other side are following us. I am not saying that it would take this amount for the \$3.60. I should like to point out that I would have liked to see the sugar workers receive a higher pension, and I tried to get it; but I am not a financial expert, and I can only go by the advice of the Financial Secretary. The Financial Secretary has represented that it would take an additional investment of \$3 million at 7% to give the amount which I recommended, because the pensions are payable from the interest on the funds available, as money is only borrowed from the Price Stabilisation Fund so that the Board can pay the pensions on the interest from this amount of money. However he pointed out that the Committee recognised that important point and clearly saw the difficulty in financing the solution, and that is why the Committee recommended \$3.00 a week in the first instance.

Now he continued: "Another point that may be borne in mind at this stage is the qualification used with a means test for Old Age Pension. I understand that at present the amount used in disqualifying a person from the receipt of Old Age Pension is \$4.00 a week."

I want to make it clear that if a person is working for \$4.00 a week, he does not qualify for Old Age Pension. It was \$3.00 a week at one stage, but has recently been increased to \$4.00. Every sugar worker who reaches the age of 65 years or through disability or what-have-you receives benefit under this Provident Fund Scheme will qualify for Old Age Pension; so the fact that he is receiving benefit under the Provident Fund Scheme does not deny him the right to benefit under Old Age Pension.

The Financial Secretary continued: "On financial grounds the amendment to the Committee's recommendations regarding the level of pension benefits cannot be supported by the Ministry."

I felt personally that the \$3 was too low and I told hon. members that; but he has cautioned that to pay a higher benefit the scheme will be exhausted. Yet we have decided that we would add an additional 60 cents to the Scheme, and make provision whereby the pensioners would qualify for Old Age Pension also. If what I thought the workers should have been paid to them, they would not qualify for Old Age Pensions.

He continued: "This Ministry could not recommend a scheme with a scale of benefits which the resources of the Fund could not support."

That was the comment of the Financial Secretary, and hon. members must appreciate the fact that in dealing with matters such as this, Govern-

ment has got to pay due regard to experts, and since there was not enough money under the Scheme to pay higher benefits, it was not considered wise, after paying due regard to the advice of the Financial Secretary, to go higher than the \$3.60 since this might result in exhaustion of the Scheme before it even got under way. Of course, it is going to be reviewed after three years' operation, and if the benefits can be increased, they will be increased. At this stage we could not see where any greater contributions to the Fund could come from, and I hope hon. members will appreciate the fact that we are offering by this Bill to sugar workers in this country something which was not available to them in the past. We are very conscious of their plight, and it is our endeavour to give whatever assistance we can to these people, who, as I said earlier, are very important to the economy of this country. Some of these retired sugar workers have been having very hard times, and my friend the hon. senior member for St. Joseph knows what I am talking about. We represent this type of person, because the majority of our constituents are sugar workers. We know their plight and are very concerned about them, and that is why I thought the recommendation of the Committee was too low, and that an effort ought to be made to increase the amount substantially. That is why we had to have long and drawn-out discussions with the financial experts on these funds.

1.25 p.m.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we have even been looking for ways and means to put further monies into this Fund so that we could increase the benefits paid to the workers. We could not find any other means.

Hon. members may wonder when this legislation will come into operation. They will notice that the Bill makes provision for its coming into operation by Proclamation. It depends on the Regulations. I want to say this, that in order to get this Bill here today, we have had to draw on the overtime of the Crown Law Officers and the Attorney General, and I must say that we had their co-operation. Mr. Speaker, after we received the recommendations of the Committee and the Cabinet made its decision, the recommendations have had to be sent to the Director of National Insurance, the Sugar Producers' Federation, the Barbados Workers' Union and the Financial Secretary for their comments. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that one could expect any greater speed than to have sent these recommendations to these people for their comments after the month of June and come back and have legislation drafted to be here today to deal with this Bill. That has been done because all of us were aware and conscious of the plight of these workers. Some of them make representation to me daily, and we would like to see them receive their benefits as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I may also say that we are considering the question of paying these people at their homes rather than asking these feeble people to come down to the Labour Department or to some place in the City in order to collect this money. We are con-

sidering paying them at their homes, or at some place near to their homes. We also feel that the payments should be made twice monthly rather than sending \$3.60 this week and \$3.60 next week. We feel that these people can see more to do with \$7.20 than they can see to do with \$3.60 and therefore, we feel that it should be, after the lumpsum is paid, that they should receive, whether it be by way of coupons, cheques or what-have-you, these amounts every two weeks because they will see more what to do with the \$7.20 than if they receive the \$3.60 in every week.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that there is anything controversial in this Bill. I think that all hon. members are happy to see that at last the sugar workers will be receiving their Provident Fund benefit. I know that all of us would like to see them receiving higher benefits but, as I was at pains to explain, the benefits depend purely and solely on the amount of money invested since these workers receive their benefits from the interest on the money invested. Mr. Speaker, I therefore take great pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to speak on the Bill, I would be grateful to the Hon. Minister if he would inform us as to what is the exact amount of money in the Fund at the present moment. I did not hear it over here.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. member has given way.

Mr. SPEAKER: He has given way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I should just like to remind the hon. member that I actually called out the figures. Let me give him the exact figures. The total assets are \$3,225,492 and I explained that the amount estimated which would have to be paid out for arrears is \$1,215,552 leaving a balance of \$2,009,940.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister has said that he did not expect that this Bill would raise any controversy. Of course, it is not going to raise any controversy on this side because the only thing which we could be quarrelling about would be the failure of the Government to introduce this measure which was conceived and planned during the regime of our Government. Sir, I take issue with the Hon. Minister and his advisers on a number of points in respect of the investment aspects of this money. As I understand it, Sir, since 1956 sums of money were being set aside for the establishment of this Provident Fund. It is obvious that this money was invested, if invested at all, in some of these institutions which call themselves banks in Barbados - these institutions which seem to cater purely to receiving deposit money at very cheap rates to the depositors and lending money at very dear rates to the borrowers. If this money had been invested at an average rate of return of 7% for this period of time, surely, it would nearly have doubled itself; it must nearly have

doubled itself even at simple interest. Money invested at 8% in twelve years nearly doubles itself. It seems to me that one of the difficulties under which the Government's advisers are operating is that they seem to have their minds mirrored to investments in banks in this country at the poor rates of interest that they pay to depositors in this country. Even under the terms of the Bill, it says that you can invest in licensed banks or such other securities as the Board may approve. The idea of investing part of any Capital Fund in this country in simple equities - I mean what one would call in the financial world blue-chip equities, and they have them here in Barbados - if you look at the shares and the share prizes in Barbados and the dividends that they pay out, the average rate is around 9% in Barbados. Having at your command a Fund in the vicinity of \$2 million or more, that is such an amount of money that you can afford to pay good financial advisers - investment advisers - and their rate of payment is derived upon a commission of the interest and not of the capital. Therefore, do not let us fool ourselves that we have to go down Broad Street all the time in this country when we have some money of this magnitude and say that we are begging the banks to let us take it at 4 1/2% and 5 1/2%
1.35 p.m.

When you invest the Provident Fund with them at 4 1/2%, they will lend it to you, me, and everybody else at 9% and make a 100% mark-up on your head in this country. I hope that the projections.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has given way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member heard me say that this money is invested at 7%.

Mr. St. JOHN: I say that that is a low average, too. Simple mortgage rate in Barbados is 8%, and, even if you have a proportion of your Fund in gilt-edged securities, it is possible to buy gilt-edged securities in the Barbados Government Bonds at the present moment in the market, as well as other good Commonwealth Bonds, and get more than 7% on them. I hope you do not have any in the banks on deposit accounts. You should not have any at all of this Capital Fund in the banks. The sooner this concept is got over in Barbados the better, because the banks in this country are having too big a mark-up between what they borrow money at and loan money at. This has to filter down to the masses in this country until the banks change their policy.

I hope that with this sort of Fund under your control, together with the National Insurance Fund - the Government has in the Savings Bank sufficient money at its disposal that it could pay good financial advisers and actuaries to look after this matter. You do not have to beg anybody to give you advice; you have the money at your disposal, and you can buy it and get a better rate of interest on your investment. It is obvious that if you can get more than an average

rate of 7%, your \$3.60 would be justified, and you would not have to look around for any money.

I would like to take these Funds and put them out for tender in the markets where you get advice which is available in the West Indian area and see what proposals for Pension Fund advisers would give you on this. There is a new concept coming into Barbados, and the idea that your Financial Secretary has the time to advise you on this is an idea which, I hope, you will get out of your heads. I hope that the policy of the Board is that it will pursue a liberal policy, and get itself familiar with the wide range of investments that are permitted. These banks could be used to help develop Barbados industrially and economically.

Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of this matter. There are a number of people who between 1956 and now are really waiting on this Scheme. I thought, originally, that the Scheme would also have covered people who lost their work as a result of liquidation, or bankruptcy, arising with their former employers. I know, for instance, in my constituency Fairy Valley Plantation and those other plantations which were acquired by the Government for public purposes. Now that they have nationalised the plantations, there are a number of people who have been put out of work through no fault of their own and they are not 65 years old. I thought, and I always understood, that this Scheme was intended to cover not only retirement, but also a certain amount of payments on severance. I see the hon. Minister shaking his head. It was never intended to cover severance. The trouble in these Schemes is that Parliament and the public in Barbados are not treated properly with the introduction of these Bills. This ought to have been preceded by way of a White Paper setting out everything here. It ought to have been preceded by a White Paper introduced concurrently with this so that we would be able to digest all the financial implications; we would have been able to come here with positive suggestions to put before the Minister to show where this Scheme could possibly have been expanded.

In addition to this, Sir, the hon. Minister says it has to depend on its coming into force by way of Regulation. I agree, and I can see that Regulations will be necessary. I hope that, having waited from 1956 until today or, at least, from 1962 until today to get a Bill passed, the Regulations are brought into force with much greater speed than we had the Bill coming before the House. Perhaps, if we could get the same speed as we had between June and now, the Regulations will come into force, at least, during the crop season this year and we will be able to have the payments made.

I hope, too, that the Old Age Pensions Officers in the various parishes will be made very familiar with the terms of this, because I get experiences all the time. You have Old Age Pension Officers who feel that it is not their duty to pay Old Age Pensions in accordance with the law. I hope that they are given copies of the Bill and it is explained to them that you are entitled to benefit under this Act plus Old Age Pension legislation.

I dare say, too, that the people concerned are also entitled to continue to benefit under the Public Assistance Scheme through the agencies that we have at the present moment. I do not see why they should be ineligible because they received this money under the Provident Fund Scheme and received Old Age Pension. In the event of circumstances justifying it, the Public Assistance benefits which were normally paid in Local Government time and which will continue to be paid now - I do not see why they should be prevented from getting a 25¢ or a 30¢ depending on the area from which they come.

Seven dollars a week, when you take into consideration the cost of living and rent, is not a level at which one can say that people are still not in need of some supplement to their existence. The hon. Minister must agree with that, because he said that he would like to see the benefits at a higher rate.

As far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, we on this side are in agreement. But I certainly have reservations as to the investment policy which is going to be pursued by the Board, and I hope the hon. Minister will see to it that good, competent advice is had by the Board. I want to assure him that this advice can be had and made available to the Board at no cost to the Board itself or to the workers.

1.45 p.m.

If the advisers cannot give you a better level of interest than what you are getting at the present moment, you do not hire them.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member who has just sat down has said, we are all in favour of the principle of the Bill. The Minister admits that there will be Regulations to come, but I am warning the Minister that when we pass a Bill here, it looks all right on paper, but with the Regulations it is something different. We passed the National Insurance Bill here, and now there are some things that are presenting themselves because of which I do not know when these people will be qualified, because the qualifications are so great. Only last week one of my constituents came to me with a letter from the National Insurance people turning down his application for sick benefits. I just could not understand it, and when I made the necessary inquiries, the National Insurance people wanted to find out, when the man took ill, whether he was working. I understand that to mean that if a person who was working for the last 20 years with me but did not work for the last month or two months becomes ill, he is disqualified from sick benefits. I do not know if the Minister knows that, but that must be in the Regulations, as I do not think that the people up there would take it upon themselves to do it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member give way?

Mr. SMITH: I will, Sir.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, according to the National Insurance and Social Security Act to which the hon. member agreed, there is a provision in the Bill which states that a worker qualifies for sickness benefits only if he has made eight out of thirteen contributions immediately preceding the time he has taken ill. If the worker was ill for three months and not making any contributions to the Scheme, he does not qualify because he would not in the past thirteen weeks have contributed eight contributions out of the thirteen prior to his becoming ill. So if he is not contributing for two months, it means there are only five additional weeks in which he would have contributed, and he is not qualified. I hope this helps the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not see where this can help me or even the people. You tell people that you are establishing a Bill, an Act or a Regulation to help them, and yet you have as many qualifications as if you were a lawyer or a doctor. These poor, hungry, starving people have to be qualified under the Act to which both they and the employers are contributing; and yet some of them take ill, come out, go back to work, and the people at the old Hospital building cannot see fit to give them their sick benefits! There are things existing that the Minister does not know.

Now the hon. Minister said that he recommended more than \$3.00 per week. He knows it is worth more, but the financial expert says "no". The Minister is so bright and may be thinking that I am so dull that he would not disclose how much he recommended they should get.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I recommended \$5.00 a week.

Mr. SMITH: This is the first time he has said it. If \$4.00 a week would disqualify these people from getting \$5.00 a week, raise the qualification. If the financial expert says that the Fund cannot carry it, he will have to take the time from him. But these are people who have reached the age of 65 years all the way back in 1956, 1957 and 1958 - old decrepit people who cannot work.

I must apologise for not reading this Bill because I was not at the office on Saturday, and it was there both Saturday and Sunday. You can tell that the 'flu had me; so I did not have any time to read it; and if I go into something that is in the Bill, I am asking the Minister not to be too hard on me. It is some twelve years that you had these old people knocking about, waiting. Would they be qualified to receive back-pay for twelve years?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the hon. member would give way, I explained in my introduction that they qualify for a maximum of 260 weeks' benefits as a lump sum; so those who retired between 1956 and now will get a maximum of 260 weeks at \$3.60 per week. I am not good at Mathematics, but you can work that out and see how much it is.

Mr. SMITH: I understand the Minister to say 260 weeks, but there are people who would qualify

for 300 weeks because they worked at a time when very little was paid to them. I am not talking about those who qualify now for the National Insurance Scheme; I am talking about those people who worked before the Minister was born. I do not know how some of these people exist. You are going to give them \$3.60 and end at that. They do not have one cent to repair their homes. I can remember the hon. Minister of Health saying that a sum was set aside to help certain old workers who were not able to repair their homes. I do not know how far it has been set aside, because I cannot see or hear of anyone who has got help yet.
1.55 p.m.

It might have been set aside very far, farther than even the Housing Authority can reach. Anyhow, Sir, be that as it may, these old people have nothing to put by; they could not make it. Imagine, you had people in those days who were working for 60 cents a week or five shillings a week! And those are the ones I am talking about. They had nothing to set aside, nothing to put down to repair their houses, and up to now they have nothing to set aside to bury them, if they should die. Now, Sir, the National Insurance provides for sickness benefits, maternity benefits and things of that sort. The maternity benefits for these old people have passed and gone along; you do not have to provide any maternity benefits for these old people. The Minister says that the Fund is to work on its own; in other words, the expenditure for running the Fund, the expenditure for the clerks and so on, will come from this Fund. At the present time, the Government is doing its part; but I am saying that, as far as the funeral benefits for these people are concerned, something should be set aside to help these old workers or their families to help pay the expenses.

Why do I say that, Mr. Speaker? They have nothing put aside and they are underpaid. They are responsible for the economy of this country, and we should do all that is possible to help them now. Since we are prepared to help them, I am saying that the Government should pay the expenses, the running costs. They should pay the clerks and so on, and the money which the Fund has to pay for the running costs will be accumulated to help these poor old people with their funeral benefits. I am not asking for too much, Sir; the Government should pay the running costs. Do you know why, Sir?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 2 p.m. of the clock and this sitting is now suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock.
2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time, Question No. 187 standing in the name of the hon. senior

member for St. James. That is, on page 8, left-hand column.

STATEMENT *re* ACTIVITIES OF
BOOTH AT EXPO' 67

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will the Minister lay or cause to be laid as soon as is practicable the long promised Statement of the Commissioner General for Barbados and Guyana as to the activities of the booth of which he was in charge at Expo' 67?

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

"Yes, Sir."

Mr. HINDS: When does the Minister propose laying this Statement?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, it has already been laid.

SERVICE OF SIGNAL DETECTOR PADS
AT ROAD JUNCTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 168, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, in respect of which it has been intimated to me that the hon. junior member for St. Peter will put the question.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas:-

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Is it a fact that most, if not all, of the traffic signal detector pads at road junctions controlled by traffic lights have been covered by the Ministry and that these detectors are no longer serviceable, with the consequence that the lights are now operating on a fixed time basis and cannot automatically adjust themselves to the volume of traffic approaching road junctions?

2. What liaison, if any, exists between the departments of Government responsible for maintenance of traffic lights and the departments responsible for controlling road traffic?

3. If the answer to paragraph 1 is "yes", will the Minister state on whose advice was the decision to cover the detector pads taken?

4. Will the Minister consider returning control of the entire traffic lights system to the Commissioner of Police who is still responsible for general traffic control?

2.35 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Replies are as follows:

"(1) The pad actuated systems became unserviceable because of deterioration and the ingress of water. The pads were accordingly removed or covered and the traffic lights placed on a fixed time cycle. It is proposed to install new loop detector systems which will be more durable and efficient, to replace the pad actuated system.

(2) Close liaison exists between the Electrical Inspection Department which is responsible for the maintenance of traffic lights and the Police Department which is responsible for controlling traffic.

(3) Does not arise.

(4) No, Sir."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that during the period when the Police controlled the servicing of these traffic lights, the public was better served than during the period when the Government Electrical Inspector has been doing the servicing?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that; neither do I believe it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister one of the road users in this Island?

Mr. SPEAKER: If that is a question, I do not deem it to be a supplementary.

No. 214 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, page 9, right hand column.

GOVERNMENT'S SCHOOL MEALS SCHEME

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Have examinations of the Scheme and Record Books kept at Schools receiving the hot lunch provided in the Government's School meals Scheme disclosed any number of lessons or teaching periods lost to pupils through teachers and pupils being engaged at school meals during hours detailed for the teaching of classroom subjects?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government take steps to remedy the situation by having meals served punctually and not late lunches as now occurs at some schools?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Replies are as follows:

(i) "There has been some loss of teaching time in some of the schools receiving hot lunch, especially during the early stages of the Scheme. At present, all schools are able to make adjustments to offset the results of late delivery.

(ii) The Government has already taken steps to remedy the situation."

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 216 also standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, and it is to be found at page 11, left-hand column.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR RECRUITMENT TO THE TEACHING SERVICE

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

In view of the fact that possession of four subjects at "O" level G.C.E., instead of five as formerly, is the academic requirement for recruitment to the Teaching service of this Island, will Government seek without delay to make the necessary adjustments in respect of Relief and Supernumerary teachers who thus qualify for promotion from List "B" to List "A" of the Ministry of Education?

2. Will the Government, upon regularising the anomalous situation created by adopting this new qualification standard seek to place teachers transferred to List "A" in the corresponding salary scale without delay?

3. Has the reduction of the academic qualifications for entry into the Teaching Service shown any appreciable increase in the number of persons applying for entry into the Service?

4. If the answer to No. 3 is in the negative, will Government investigate to determine if lowering the academic standards or inadequate commencement pay is responsible for the poor response from persons seeking to enter the Service?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:

1. The necessary adjustments are at present being arranged and will be implemented as soon as all the consequential salary changes have been calculated.

2. The adjustment of salaries is an inherent element of the change from List "B" to List "A".

3. Yes, Sir.

4. Does not arise.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell me if any of the steps that he has announced today were initiated before these Questions were tabled?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I see nothing here to indicate any time at which specific changes were introduced. It is a fact that there has been a reduction of the entry qualifications, and this has caused an appreciable increase in the number of persons being permanently appointed. Specifically, I have nothing here to indicate any time at which this matter started although it does seem to have been going on for some months. I am sorry I cannot assist the hon. member any better.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can tell me how many teachers are involved in this transfer?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, 289 teachers.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, as a last supplementary, I wonder if the Minister can tell me how many of the 289 cases now remain to be processed?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This I cannot say. My information is that work on this matter is still continuing. It appears that there has been a change in salary from S 12 for List B to S 11 for List A and, consequently, the salaries of each one of the teachers concerned had to be revised. I think the hon. member will appreciate that it is an individual re-arrangement, but I imagine that they must nearly be finished by now.

Mr. HINDS: Thank you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 234, standing in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas.
2.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, the Question reads as follows:

To enquire of the Minister responsible for Development:

Will the Minister take steps to have the accounts of expenditure incurred in respect of the Barbados Guyana Pavilion at Expo'67 published as soon as possible?

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

"Yes, Sir."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will the Minister state how soon is "as soon as possible"? Merely saying "as soon as possible" means nothing.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the Reply was laid last Tuesday and is "Yes, Sir."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister states that the Report will be laid as soon as possible, he is stating so today. We are asking how soon after today would be "as soon as possible."

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Last Tuesday.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is normal for a Question to be phrased as this has been phrased, but it is equally normal to answer that "I propose to answer in a month" or "a year"; and judging from the length of time that some of these Questions take to be answered, it will be at least a year.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister say whether it is the same Report to which he has replied "Yes, sir"?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Yes, Sir. That is the Report. The Reply was only given today. I had the Reply about two weeks prior to the laying of the document.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition caught my eye.

Mr. CRAIG: But he gave way.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Oh, no. Does the hon. member fail to remember that this Question was asked in August?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if I may interject, what has really happened in respect of Questions Nos. 187 and 234 is that some two or three weeks ago - it may even be three weeks ago - I recall we did give notice of Replies being ready, but for some reason which I cannot now recall, we did not do Question Time on that particular day; so they just remained. Meanwhile in the ordinary course of events the document was laid, and I do not think that the Minister kept check on the laying of the document to see that it came before the Question was answered.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking a further supplementary. Isn't the hon. member aware that the answer should have come much earlier? I ask for this reason. The Minister or the person responsible for drafting the answer would know that it might have taken some time to prepare the answer. I am asking more directly whether any attempt has been made yet to get these accounts in order.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph knows that this Pavilion was run jointly by Guyana and Barbados and the accounts would have to come down. When we said "as soon as possible", immediately we received the accounts from Canada of Expo', the document was laid. It was a week or two ago that we received the accounts; so we did not withhold them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 220 stands in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for Christ Church.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I understood in a general way from the hon. senior member for Christ Church that he wanted this question put, I did not specifically ask whether he wanted any supplementaries. If it is in order, I am asking that you hold this Question over.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 223 is also in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for Christ Church, as well as Question No. 227.

When the hon. member left this Chamber, he mentioned to me that he was on the way to the High Court, but in any event so far as he knew there were no answers ready to any Questions today. I did not know then; otherwise I would have made him aware

that there were Replies to his Questions, and in view of the lack of awareness, I am prepared to allow these Questions to remain for the next meeting. In view of the exceptional circumstances, because I did not tell the hon. member that there were answers and I did not tell him because I did not know - I will allow them to stand over.

QUESTION re BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 121 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. How many clients or customers of the Barbados Development Board who have established business here or who have received loan capital through the said Board, in each year since 1964 to date, were given the opportunity of alternative banks in this Island with which to deal?

2. If there was no alternative suggestion or arrangement or provision of banking services in respect of negotiations by the Board with a commercial bank or banks concerned, will Government explain the reason for this practice?

3. Does Government not consider such action to be reprehensible and against the best interest of long-term relationships between commercial banks in this Island and the Board?
2.55 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"1. Customers and clients of the Barbados Development Board are free to choose the commercial bank with which they may wish to do business.

2. Does not apply.

3. Does not apply."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister in a position to say whether these customers are free to choose after suggestions have been made to them by the Chairman of the Development Board?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have said that they are free to choose the commercial bank with which they may wish to do business. No question of anybody's suggestion could here arise.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Minister saying that the Chairman of the Development Board has not made suggestions to customers of the Board as to which bank they should transact business with?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: All I am saying is what I have said, that is, that the customers and clients of the Barbados Development Board are free to choose the

commercial bank or banks with which they may wish to do business.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister tell us when they are free - after they have secured the loans or before?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: At all material times.

BUSINESS OF BANKS WITH BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT BOARD'S CUSTOMERS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question is Question No. 122, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. That is on page 5, left-hand column.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Which commercial bank in Bridgetown received in terms of money, the most business of the Barbados Development Board's customers in each year 1964, 1965, 1966 and the year 1967 to date?

2. If any one bank enjoyed business to any considerable extent over the other banks, would Government state which bank, and what is the volume of business over other banks in terms of East Caribbean dollars?

3. Do any officers of the Barbados Development Board or Members thereof act in any manner as canvassing agents for any commercial bank or banks in this City?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

"1. The Development Board does not and has no authority to examine the business done by its customers with the various commercial banks. I am not therefore in a position to answer this Question.

2. Does not apply.

3. No, Sir!

Mr. HINDS: Do I understand from the Minister that he is in a position to answer Question No. 1?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister does not know what the hon. member understands.

Mr. HINDS: No, I am asking him if my understanding of what he said is correct.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Perhaps, I may repeat the Reply for the hon. member's benefit.

"The Development Board does not and has no authority to examine the business done by its customers with the various commercial Banks. I am not therefore in a position to answer this Question.

2. Does not apply.

3. No, Sir!"

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the answer to part 3 of this Question is "No, Sir". Will the Minister be able to say whether or not he has investigated this matter so as to be able to arrive at such an answer?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Sir.

Mr. CRAIG: Will the Minister be able to say which of the commercial banks he can assure us that no one canvassed for?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I could only answer this if the Development Board had authority to examine the business done by its members with the various commercial banks; but, as I have already said, it has not got that authority. Consequently, I am not in a position to answer the supplementary Question asked by the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister say if it is in the interest of the Development Board to know at which bank a particular customer is dealing?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I really do not know.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that he does not know if it would be in the interest of the Development Board to know the bank with which its customers are dealing? Did he say so? Is the Minister aware that in many cases monies belonging to the taxpayers of this country are involved in matters of this sort?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I do know this, because this House appropriates a sum of money every year for the running of the Development Board. Yes, I do know that the taxpayers' money is involved.

Mr. HINDS: In view of that fact, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister still saying that he does not know if the interest of the Development Board runs so far as to know whether a customer of the Board is dealing with a bank or whether he is keeping the money in his pockets? Is that what the Minister is saying, Sir? - that the interest of the Board in its customers does not run far enough as to know whether a customer of the Board is depositing his money in the banks, living up to his obligations or whether he has some long knap-sack in some corner of his house, and puts the money into it?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Surely, Mr. Speaker, the problem is not what interest the Development Board has; the problem is what authority it has. It has no authority, as I have said, to examine the business of its customers with the various commercial banks. It may conceivably have an interest, but it certainly could have no authority over it.

Mr. HINDS: Does the Board receive an annual statement in respect of the turnover of any of its customers at any time, in view of the fact that there are customers who have been assisted through the Board with loans on more than one occasion?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that customers of the Development Board are required to furnish the Board with information - it may be annually, I do not know; and I would not like to be specific on this point about their transactions and the general state of their business enterprises; but that is a different matter from the point that the hon. member is raising. The hon. member is raising the point about transactions with the commercial banks and I want to emphasise that the Board has no authority to guide or direct or, in any way, influence those transactions between its clients and the banks of their choice.

Mr. HINDS: Let us leave out the question of the influencing. If these customers of the Board are required to submit annual returns to the Board, is it not then, or ought it not then, to be within the knowledge of the Minister that the Board would be empowered to examine the returns made by such customers to the Board?

3.05 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Naturally, Mr. Speaker, the Board will examine any document or documents that come before it. There is no question of that, but that is not what the hon. member had originally asked. He did not ask whether the Board has authority to examine Financial Statements or other documents which come before it in the course of its operations. He is asking whether it has authority - or so I understand him - to influence the decisions of its clients or people with whom it does business in respect of the commercial banks with whom they operate. I said that the Board had no such authority.

Mr. HINDS: That is the reply to a former Question. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us if in their Annual Returns customers of the Board must show their financial transactions with banks?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid this Question does not appear to me to arise supplementarily from any in No. 122, and it might well be the subject of a substantive Question at the next meeting of this House.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to rephrase it, so to speak, the Minister has said that he is of the opinion that these customers make Annual Statements of Returns or Statements of Accounts to the Board. My Question arising from that is whether in these Annual Returns the customers do not show their financial transactions with various banks.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, let the hon. member repeat the latter part of that Question. I am afraid I did not hear him.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, my Question is: When these customers of the Board make their Annual Returns to the Board, are they not expected to disclose in those Statements their financial transactions with various banks?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I answer the hon. member as I answered him before. The Board has no authority to request that kind of information

from the people with whom it does business. I imagine that the people doing business with the Development Board would know that the Board has not got this authority.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I have not asked the Minister anything about what the Board can request. I am asking the Minister a supplementary Question arising out of a Question he answered me earlier. I want to know if customers of the Board make Annual Returns to the Board and whether the customers disclose their financial transactions with banks in the Annual Returns.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not know, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, with regard to paragraph 2 of Question 122, the Minister said, "It does not apply." That was the answer given. In view of the fact that the Minister said that Returns are to be made to the Board, then the Minister can easily determine from the Returns made which bank enjoyed a greater extent of business over the other banks. He said that this does not arise, but yet he says, Mr. Speaker, that the firms make Returns to the Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I have the supplementary please?

Mr. CRAIG: That is a supplementary.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I have the supplementary?

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister then be able to disclose, in view of the fact that Returns are made to the Board, which of the banks enjoy a greater volume of business over the other banks?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, does the Development Board have any authority to examine Statements of Accounts submitted by its members annually?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I do not regard that Question as arising supplementarily from anything in No. 122.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister's reply to my Question No. 1 was that the Board does not have authority to examine the business done by its customers with any commercial bank. I accepted that. The Minister admitted that they submit Annual Statements of Accounts. I call it a Statement of Account, but the Minister calls it business. I am asking the Minister now if the Board, on receiving these Statements of Accounts, has any authority to examine them.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that if a document comes before an individual or a body of individuals, as long as they can read, they should examine it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is an Annual Statement of Account entitled to be considered the business of a company or whatever concern it is? Is it not a statement as to the business transactions of the company, or the customers of the Board in this particular case?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is so.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister still maintaining that the Board has no authority to examine the business transactions of its customers?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I still maintain it.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister still maintaining that, even when a customer is in arrears of his payments, the Board has no duty to investigate his affairs fully with a view to securing its repayments?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid this is a different question. The Board may have a duty, but it may not have exercisable authority.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that, under the terms of the mortgages or debentures granted to secure the loans, the Board has full power to appoint a Receiver or Accountant to go into the affairs of any business person who is in arrears, including the St. Lawrence Hotel?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This has nothing to do with the original Question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: The hon. Minister knows absolutely nothing about the affairs of the Development Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I can hear absolutely no more supplementaries, it being a quarter past three.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, do hon. members object to another quarter of an hour more for Question Time? We have some more Questions. 3.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is an agreement on both sides, I will bear in mind that there are two Questions in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for Christ Church, which I allowed to stand over, which may be dealt with. Whilst not encouraging undue supplementaries, I wonder if 15 minutes would be enough or should it be 20 minutes.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now extended by 20 minutes.

QUESTION re SOUTHERN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 220 stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for Christ Church.

Mr. St. JOHN: To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

1. Will the Minister state what sum of money was received from the Southern District Council in respect of licensing fees for motor cars and other

vehicles licensed in the parish of Christ Church in respect of the financial years 1966-67, 1967-68?

2. Will the Minister state how much money is estimated to be received from the said parish in respect of the said licensing fees for the financial year 1968-69?

3. Will the Minister state how much money was expended in the construction, maintenance and/or upkeep of roads in the parish of Christ Church in the financial years 1966-67, 1967-68 in respect of those roads which were taken over from the Southern District Council by the Central Government?

4. Will the Minister state how much money is proposed to be expended in the parish of Christ Church on roads taken over from the Southern District Council by the Central Government in the financial year 1968-69?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Replies are as follows:-

1. The following sums of money were received in respect of licensing fees for motor cars and other vehicles registered in the parish of Christ Church -

1966-67	\$178,343.95
1967-68	\$247,714.75

2. It is estimated that the sum of \$248,000 will be received in respect of the financial year 1968-69.

3. It would be extremely difficult to extract information relating to the amount of money expended in respect of the construction and maintenance of roads in the parish of Christ Church and taken over from the Southern District Council since no separate records for these roads have been kept.

4. This information is not available since expenditure on roads is not planned on a parochial basis.

QUESTION re TENANTRY BETWEEN ST. LAWRENCE SCHOOL AND HARMONY HALL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 223 stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for Christ Church.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is the Minister aware that there is a large tenantry situated between the St. Lawrence School and Harmony Hall and abutting on the St. Lawrence-Bridgetown-Oistin main road in which there are no proper roads or drainage?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. No, Sir. The lands in the area are rented out in lots to householders. Consequently these roads do not qualify for repair at the expense of Government."

I should like to add before I sit that I have been seriously considering doing some of these roads, for reasons best known to myself.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister consider using the powers under the Public Health Act to call upon the owners of the land to repair and pave the roads?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I was thinking of using that Act, but I feel that to use this Act is still going to create a burden on these people; so we are thinking seriously, since we are all Barbadians and live here, of doing something to the roads, and I assure the hon. member that we are going to do something to these roads whether they are public or private, since the people there pay taxes like anybody else.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 227 stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for Christ Church.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that Question has already been answered.

Mr. SPEAKER: I apologise to the hon. member if that should not be on the Order Paper. I find it difficult to have to do the work of the Clerk and myself.

QUESTION re STAFF MEMBER OF GOVERNMENT SCHOOL MEALS SCHEME

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 259 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is it a fact that between September, 1965 and March, 1966, a staff-member of the Government's School Meals Scheme received from the Treasury an amount of \$291.33 in excess of any sum due to the said worker?

2. What is the name of the worker who received this excess money?

3. Is it a fact that Government waived payment of \$253.33 of the said sum, leaving the worker to repay a mere \$38.00 of the said \$291.33?

4. What influenced Government's decision to waive so substantial an amount of the over-drawn money?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"The letter of appointment to Miss Norma Jackman as a Supervisor in the School Meals Service inadvertently fixed her salary at \$1,800 per annum in a scale that was designed for the post of Supervisor at a centre other than the one to which she was appointed. She was informed by a letter of 25th March, 1966, that the salary originally stated was incorrect and should have been \$1,344 per annum. Government was advised that since Miss Jackman drew her salary during the period 11th September 1965 to 31st March, 1966, in good faith she should not be required to refund any amounts which were erroneously paid to her during that period. However, since she received notification of the re-adjustment of her salary by the end of March 1966, a refund to the extent of \$38, the overpayment in the month of April, was demanded and has been recovered."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister tell us who advised the Government that Miss Jackman had drawn it in good faith?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say this.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister say if other persons in the same category overdrew and were made to repay every penny?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I can remember what I said of other cases in the whole of the Government service in my time. Certainly this has happened to other people.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what is the Minister's interpretation of "good faith" if it means that she cooks in good faith or supervises cooking in good faith, and if so, for whom?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir. It just means she received the salary in good faith.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, if Miss Norma Jackman did not receive it in good faith, what would have been the position?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: She would have received it in bad faith. *(Laughter)*

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, since we are fortunate to have such hilarious laughter, I wonder if the Minister would be able to say if this has been the only case in this particular School Meals Centre where a person has drawn such a salary in good faith and did not have to pay it back?

Mr. HINDS: I asked the Minister what was his Reply to Question (4).
3.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: So far as I know, yes, in the Department that the hon. member is asking about; but as I told the House a few minutes ago, I have recalled other cases - there was the case of a Sergeant-

Major connected with the Regiment who was paid at a certain salary scale by mistake. Hon. members may recall this case, and the money was recovered.

Mr. HINDS: What was the hon. member's reply to Question No. 4?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I gave a composite reply. If the hon. member would direct my attention to that aspect of the question, I will do my best to answer.

Mr. HINDS: The Question about influence.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, that is easy. The Government was advised that after the period between 11th September and 31st March, she drew the overpayment in good faith and it was only after the notification came to her in March, 1966, that she was deemed then to have known at that stage that she was overpaid. Therefore we requested the overpayment for the month of April, which, of course, the Government has received.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us if the Government was not influenced by Party affiliation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This I categorically and emphatically reject. I cannot conceive of a case of this sort coming before the Government which would not be adjudicated on its merits.

Mr. HINDS: Would the Minister tell us if the merits could include Miss Jackman's provision for feeding Ministers - I will ask the Question again. Can the Minister tell us if the merits could be taken to include Miss Jackman's provision of meals for Ministers of this Government?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, it would not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRAIG: Would the Minister be able to state if it is now going to be the policy of the Government that whenever someone should draw in good faith money which he should not have drawn, it is going to be waived? Is that going to be the policy of the Government as from now?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I really do not understand the Question. This could not be a matter of policy for the Government. If a case similar to this were to arise, the Accounting Officers of Government would be the first to be aware of it, and they would have to give their judgment on it. They are responsible; a recommendation would come from them to the Cabinet, and not the other way around.

Mr. HINDS: Then is it the Accounting Officers who advised the Government to waive this amount, in view of the fact that it was drawn in good faith?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Conceivably.

Mr. HINDS: Now that the Minister has replied and he states "conceivably", does the Minister re-

member that he could not tell me a few moments ago who had advised the Government?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I recall this.

Mr. HINDS: Does the Minister still say that he does not know who advised the Government?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I do.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Minister saying "yes" he does not know that the Accounting Officers advised the Government?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: What is the Minister's reply to the Question as to who advised the Government as to the waiving of the substantial amount that was waived?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Its Officers.

Mr. HINDS: Are the Accounting Officers the advisers in this particular respect?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Conceivably, Mr. Speaker. (ASIDES)

Mr. HINDS: No, I am not going to sit down; this is a pay off. I am going to ask a very embarrassing question and I am sorry that the Prime Minister is not here. I should have allowed this to wait until he was here. I was going to ask some very embarrassing questions about this same thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I did not realise that you were calling another Question. I particularly warned the Minister that I was going to ask some very embarrassing questions as supplementaries. I gave notice of that and then the hon. senior member for Christ Church was engaging Your Honour's attention and I just waited.

Mr. SPEAKER: Only my left ear. (Laughter)

Mr. HINDS: What is the position as regards time, Sir?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: We are finished with that.

Mr. HINDS: You would like to be finished with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the extended time has expired.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Sir, I am asking Your Honour to be good enough to allow this Question to remain on the Order Paper so that I can ask the necessary supplementaries.

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect of that Question, it was my clear understanding that supplementaries were completed. Let the hon. member prepare some

Questions and hand them in by Friday of this week for next Tuesday - further Questions and on the same subject matter, which I do not deem to arise as proper supplementaries.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, you will appreciate the fact that I warned the House - and I am assured that only Your Honour's left ear was engaged with the hon. senior member for Christ Church, so that the right ear was available to the Hon. Minister and myself and Your Honour would have heard from an hon. member, who was on his feet addressing the Chair, that the member who had been addressing the the Chair had an embarrassing question to ask the Minister as a supplementary.

Mr. SPEAKER: All I heard was the hon. member saying that he hoped or wished that the Prime Minister had been present.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Sir, you certainly did hear....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. When the hon. member said that, he had already asked eleven supplementaries, and he sat down.

Mr. HINDS: It is not true to say that I had asked 11 supplementaries and I sat down as if concluding the asking of my supplementaries. I was on my feet when I warned the Minister earlier, and it was after your left ear, Mr. Speaker, was engaged with the hon. senior member for Christ Church that I said that I am sorry that the Hon. Prime Minister is not here, and that I did not leave the whole thing until he was here. I am asking, Sir, that you let the Question remain on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have noted the hon. member's request, but I am making him no promise. He will be communicated with by the Clerk, that he might put further Questions at the next meeting; and, in any event, I cannot make it now because we have passed Question Time. It is now time for Private Members' Business.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Your Honour's position in the matter, but I see that Your Honour was still allowing the Hon. Leader of the House to rise and discuss the matter with you.
3.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I understand, and the other side will confirm this, that it is not their intention to proceed to Private Members' Business. If this is corroborated, perhaps, we may resume Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House is seeking corroboration from the hon. Leader of the Opposition if there is any objection to Government Business being now proceeded with.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have already told the Leader of the House that the Whip of the Opposition Party should be approached in such

matters. I understand that there is no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then I assume that he has your corroboration.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have already, although it does not seem to be generally known, stated that my colleague, the senior member for St. Joseph, is the Whip of the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will have that officially noted by the Clerk-at-the-Table.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time that I have tried to draw attention to the fact that he is the Whip of the Barbados Labour Party. I am drawing attention to it now, though I certainly did inform the House that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is the Whip and he arranges these things, certainly as regards Private Members' Business, as to whether or not we intend to proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member. I did remember the hon. Leader of the Opposition say that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was the Chief Opposition Whip, but subsequent to that the House was informed that the hon. senior member for St. James was also a Whip. Not wanting to be caught between two Whips, so to speak, this side has refrained from approaching either. But now that the senior member for St. Joseph is the authoritative spokesman for the other side, certainly I will consult him in the future.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. Leader of the House will inform the Leader of the Opposition as to the opposite number of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on the Government side.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Whip did not discuss the matter with me or my Leader. I have Resolutions here to do.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has spoken, and, if there is to be discipline on that side, he speaks for all of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: We will revert to Government Business.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, a Motion will be required that Government Business be now resumed, which I do now move.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is accordingly resumed. When the sitting was suspended the

House was discussing the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Provident Fund, and the hon. junior member for St. Peter.....

Hon. MEMBERS: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry; I can explain that. The hon. junior member for St. Peter caught my eye a fraction of a second after the senior member for St. Joseph; so I have written him down as the next speaker. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph may continue his speech.

THE SUGAR WORKERS (PROVIDENT FUND)
ACT, 1968

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when the time for adjournment was reached, I was trying to make a point. I will continue to say that when the Government was thinking of a Bill of this sort, it was thinking in terms of helping poor people - people who cannot help themselves financially or otherwise. Believe me, Sir, there are too many qualifications in a Bill of this sort - more qualifications than if you were sitting an examination for medicine, law, engineering and so on. It is plain and simple that it is our intention to help those people, and wherever we can see that hardship will arise we must eradicate it as quickly as possible.

Now, Sir, the Minister knows this himself; deep down in his heart of hearts he knows that it should not be less than \$5.00 a week for these people. I had intended to say \$10.00; but if the Minister knows how much money is in the till and he recommends \$5.00, I will have to go along with him. If the Financial expert or the Financial Secretary is saying that the Fund cannot stand it, then we must find ways and means whereby these people do not suffer. In truth and in fact, when we are helping poor people, we cannot stick too closely to dollars and cents. The money will come. A lot of money will soon come to be spent on Roebuck. Money enough has just been passed to spend on the B.M.C. down the Harbour Road as well as for Overseas Representation. Are you going to tell me now, Sir, that when it comes to poor people, the Financial Secretary can say that it cannot work because the figures would not allow it? If the Financial Secretary cannot get it to work, let him come to me and I will tell him how to get the money.

3.45 p.m.

I am not afraid of the Financial Secretary, and I would tell him where it can work and how he will get the money. These are poor, hungry, starving people who were working for 8 and 10 cents a day, sleeping nowhere and living nowhere, and now they have come to the afternoon of their days at 65 and 70 years, you are telling me that \$5.00 a week is too much to find for them! You may say they are not exempt from National Insurance or from Old Age Pension, but what can an Old Age Pension of \$3.00 a week and \$5.00 do for them? This can do nothing, because the older you get, the more you want the best to eat and drink. They should get half a gill of brandy every night before

they go to sleep instead of a naked "nay-nay" rum. They should get a bottle of stout to keep them alive because they have merited it.

I am sorry that the Leader of the House is going out now, because he would be able to tell you about it. If I had remembered, I would have asked him to bring up the knapsack that he brought from St. Lucy some time ago with the lard-oil bottle and the butter tot. \$5.00 per week is not too much to give to these old people. They are not entitled to maternity benefits because they have passed that stage, nor are they entitled to sick benefits; but I am sure that if the Government cannot see fit to give them \$5.00 a week, they should be entitled to funeral benefits, because at the present moment the National Insurance is providing funeral benefits for workers and these were workers who had no chance. The workers of today have a better chance than these people. I am saying now, as the Hon. Minister said, that it will take about \$10,000 per week for the staff to run this Scheme, and the Fund will have to provide it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said that I said it would take \$10,000 a week for the staff to administer the Scheme. I said \$10,000 per year.

Mr. SMITH: I cannot remember what I said, but I could not mean \$10,000 a week; I meant a year. Do you mean the Minister is catching at straws? The Minister suggested \$5.00 a week and they did not take him on. But if I were in his shoes, knowing deep in my heart that the people I represent need \$5.00, if the Government or the Financial Secretary, whoever he may be, did not see fit to listen to me and let me show them where the \$5.00 a week could come from, I would resign from my Ministry as a mark of protest, and go to the public and let them know why I came out. In that way he would never lose his seat in St. Andrew; even if they could bring 80 million candidates for St. Andrew, he would still be the boss, whether with single or double member constituency. If the Fund cannot give \$5.00 a week, what do you have a Government levying taxes year after year for? We have just passed as much money for the Barbados Marketing Corporation. Departments like the B.M.C. and the Transport Board are throwing away money minutely, and this must stop. Do you know that if the Government turned the B.M.C. over to private people, they would get just as much as is thrown away in income tax and Local Government Tax? You would then be able to pay these people \$5.00 a week. Let us open our eyes. It is time to think. This is not the time to come in here and ask for money because you have a mouth, and then people are in truth and in fact suffering. These old people do not have anywhere to live, because some of them live in homes that I am sure the Hon. Minister would not put his racehorse in. I would not put a good milch cow in some of the places in which these people live. They are disqualified from making a loan at the Housing Authority, and now is the time that all of us should be willing to help them. You are just throwing a little \$3.00 a week at them, and they are living somewhere in which a pig cannot get a comfortable rest. Since the Fund cannot

carry more than \$3.60 per week; let us find the necessary funds to repair their homes.

At one time, Mr. Speaker, they would have been able to go to the almshouse if they had nowhere to live; but now there are no almshouses, because a person who lives in St. Joseph has to pass through many parishes to find an almshouse. The people from St. Andrew have to go to St. Lucy, and those from St. Joseph go to St. Thomas. The drive is so long that if you take them up suddenly, they are liable to die on the road. Now is the time, therefore, to provide aid for these people by repairing their homes and providing something for them by way of funeral benefits. \$100 are paid to a person who passes away now under the National Insurance Scheme; what are you going to do with these people for whom we are preparing now? This is a Provident Fund. The word "provident" explains itself. You are providing for them now; so do not provide half-way. It is a fact, as the Hon. Minister said, that the agricultural workers are very important to the economy of this country.

3.55 p.m.

You know that they have done their job; they have provided the wealth of this country and now is the time to help them. Now is the accepted time in this Bill that, instead of taking out \$10,000 per year to pay the staff, let the Government pay the staff and that \$10,000 can be set aside to pay the funeral benefits to these people. That is what I am saying. That is all I am asking the Minister to put up to his Government. Here it is; funeral benefits are provided now by the law under the Social Security Scheme. Let us provide funeral benefits for this same type of worker. It is the same type; the only difference is that it is a weaker and a more helpless type of worker; but let us provide the same facilities for these workers under this Bill. This amount of \$10,000 per year would pay out a lot of funeral benefits at \$100. Sir, the sum of \$100 is being provided under the National Insurance Scheme for the workers. I am not saying that that is sufficient, but that is what is provided. The Government does not want to pay anything for this Fund. Would you believe me, Sir, that the National Insurance has as much money accumulated in it already that this National Insurance could pay the funeral benefits, even if you were to take it out of the National Insurance? The National Insurance can carry it, apart from this same Fund; but I am not asking you to go to the National Insurance as yet. You have the money there being piled up, and the same National Insurance people are suffering.

Mr. Speaker, I hate to hear the words "National Insurance" being called. I believe that this National Insurance is taking a leaf out of the book of these other insurances. As to these other insurances, their hands are out to take yours; but when they have to pay you, you have to go and look for a lawyer and a solicitor so as to get it sometimes. That is what is happening, and the National Insurance seems to me that it is setting the same example. They are going to give you sickness benefits for four, five or six

weeks; you are at home ill and not one penny you are getting. The Almighty helps you to get back out to work, and you are working again and they still cannot see fit to pay you your sickness benefits. And, Sir, a worker who has been working at a particular plantation for the last forty or forty-five years, before it was even thought that you would be getting any kind of benefits at all - now the Regulations are telling you that in order for you to be paid, you will have to pay up at least five or eight weeks out of the last thirteen weeks before you can get sickness benefits! Sir, that is a first-class way to steal people's money out of their pockets. How on earth is it that I have been working for so long at this plantation and nowhere else at all? Suppose I were to take time off to go on holiday, as the present Government had promised to put up resort houses to which workers could go on holiday but they have not got there yet - suppose a worker's father or his sister or some other relative takes him to their home for five or six weeks for him to breeze off! He is not working; he is resting himself. Down comes sickness, and the National Insurance will tell you that you did not pay up five weeks out of the last thirteen weeks and therefore, "No can do, you cannot get anything." That is highway robbery; that is stealing people's money out of their pockets. Yet you are going to tell them that you are going to help them. How on earth are you going to help them? Do you mean that I am going to help you and as soon as the time comes for help, I have gone through the eddoes?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I should like to get the record straight. I never said that the worker has got to pay five weeks out of the last thirteen weeks; I said that he must have made eight of the last thirteen contributions immediately prior to his becoming ill. I do not like this way of twisting it to five.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I want the Minister to understand me here and now; I am not listening to him any more because his colleagues are not listening to him. He says that the people are worth \$5, and he still brings down a Bill or Regulations for \$3.60. I repeat, Sir, that I am not listening to him any more; his word does not carry any weight with me. It is not carrying any weight with his colleagues, and I am not going to let it carry any weight with me. He can jump up on a point of order as much as he likes. I am saying that with these people, at the same time when they should get help, they are not getting that help. Something is wrong. Let the hon. member get up and defend this part. A man is taken ill and he goes to a doctor. He cannot work; and then are you going to tell this man that prior to the last ten or thirteen weeks or the last forty weeks, there is nothing for him? That is not helping that man. The man wants help and at the same time that the help is needed, you are turning your back on him! What kind of helper are you? One might take this that I am attacking the Government; well, Sir, I will attack my mother when I am out for my rights. I will attack her when I am representing poor people. This is the time when these poor people want help, and this is the only place to remedy it. If I were to

sit here in this chair and allow this to go on without saying anything, what use would I be? I am asking for assistance (ASIDES) Qualifications what? Are you going to be a doctor or lawyer or Judge? These are poor people who cannot help themselves; if they could help themselves, they would not worry. For the trouble they have in order to get a few "nay-nay" cents, they would not worry. You have so many barriers, so many brick-wall Regulations and everything else against these people as if they are criminals or murderers.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, in this little country you have some people creating trouble by getting on platforms and telling people how to make bombs. I have not heard anything about that yet. Why do you not put up barriers for them and make Regulations to put them behind the walls at once? These poor, defenceless people qualified themselves before any of us in here were born. They qualified themselves by working for starvation wages.

Mr. Speaker, listen to the radio at night and you will hear about "Fifty Years Ago". Fifty years ago a plantation advertised for a Manager at \$15.00 a month. What do you expect the man with the hoe and fork would get? An under-Manager was getting \$12.00 a month in those days. Old Poppy Jordan was a "Quartermaster General" at an estate looking after cows at 2/- a week. Are you going to tell me that if Jordan was alive now he would be asked to qualify for a pension? You still have people who are now suffering. You are now dealing with the 65-year-old, and you must understand that these people were working for very little money years ago, despite the fact that things were cheap.

Mr. Speaker, you may be surprised to hear that there was a time when I had a wife and children and I could not raise \$20.00 a month. I will tell you how I got \$20.00 a month. To be a registered voter in those days you had to be working for \$20.00 a month. My employer, in order to get me to vote for one of his colleagues, raised my wages to \$5.00 a week. Are you going to tell me that a Minister or the Government is going to bring a Bill in this House to give those people \$3.60 a week and call upon them to qualify: otherwise they will not be entitled to any benefits?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I said nothing about qualifications in respect of these people at \$3.60 a week. The only thing in the Bill dealing with qualifications is that they would have had to put in six days a week, which is accepted and which is reasonable and which their representatives agreed to. It was agreed that the qualifying age for pension would be 65 years unless the worker was incapacitated or suffering from some sort of ill health.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point duly made.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am going to let the Minister know here that I am not going to agree to

any 260 days, not 10 days' qualification or anything. The employer knows his worker, and so long as he can say that this man was working for me for such-and-such a period of time, then cut out this 260 days or 10 days qualification. I would not agree with it. It is a matter for my colleagues above here. These people were qualified long ago. I cannot make the Government give them \$5.00 a week. I could move a motion for that, but the members on the other side would outvote me. I am not going to say "Aye" to this, and when the Regulations come down to penalise the people the Minister will say that I agreed to it. He cannot throw that at me now; he can say that I agreed to the National Insurance and Social Security with all the pitfalls and everything, but he cannot throw anything more at me.

I have already admitted that I did not read the Bill. The Minister says that the worker will have to work for a certain number of days per year. It is quite possible that some books cannot show how many days the people worked. Are you going to tell me that a man can bring books to show how many days some people worked at an estate fifty years ago and so on? This is the money that the people have provided for themselves. This money is being taken from the sugar industry. This is the people's money, and not the Government's money. This money was being accumulated for years. It is their money. Are you now asking the people to qualify themselves again in order to get it? You must pay these people without any kind of qualifications. The Minister says that a man must work for 60 days, but I am not even agreeing to one day. I will repeat that a million times.

Sir, I am appealing to the Minister to see to it that provision is made for funeral benefits for these people. They are not in a position to bury themselves if they should die. I know that there are some in here and outside who would say that I am an undertaker and I am seeing for myself. I would not get a chance to bury all of them, but those in my parish I am not going to penalise; I may have to bury them for nothing. Our people in this country still have a big mind, and they do not want to hear that the parish has buried their relatives. The type of coffin that is provided - what we would call a pauper's box - is such that you would turn away if you were to see one of them, Mr. Speaker.

4.15 p.m.

Sir, if you see it, you would turn away. It is one black, rough thing that you would not bury a good dog in, and they drag them down to the City or somewhere and drop them in a grave. These people do not want that. They would prefer to credit a coffin and not pay for it before they would allow their father, mother, brother or sister to go along in that stage. I am appealing to the Minister and the Government not to allow this to continue any longer. These people are responsible for our presence here. The people who can have themselves buried are too few to send us here; but if the other people did not vote for us, we could not get in here. The hon. member should know that no Government can put him in here; the Prime Minister or no Minister can put him in here. It is the

people outside whom he knows deep down in his heart of hearts are worth more than \$3.60 that can do that. Be firm and strong. If you do not get it on the right side, try and get it on the left. See that funeral benefits are paid to them, and show them out where they can get the money from.

I was never a Minister; but the first thing a Minister of Finance, whoever he may be, generally says is: "Where are we to get the money from?" The Leader of the Opposition had to find himself saying so when he was there; but as soon as anything is running down the drain, they come in here and put up a dog fight to get more money to run down the same drain. This must stop. You must levy and get money, but you must spend it in the right direction; you can never spend too much money on the poor of the country, because you never lose it. Do you know how you will know that you are doing a good job? On the night or the morning when the Sheriff declares that you are on top, then you will know that you did a good job. Some of them are so smart that they call the name of the person who comes last first, and when you hear your name called you think you are on top; but when the results are given, your heart gives such tugs that if you were not strong, some undertaker would get you. This is something that will cause anybody to lose, especially when I go on the platform and talk until I am hoarse telling the people how I pleaded with the Minister to carry this back and have it amended to include funeral benefits for them and he would not do it. I am appealing to the Minister. You may laugh at me, but the time is coming when I will laugh too - and hard. These are the very oldest people you are dealing with; so let us treat them right and fix them right, so that when their prayers go up for you, you will be in line because their prayers will be heard. When these old people pray for you, their prayers will be heard. When a person's belly is full and he prays, his prayers are not heard. Some people do not pray until they are drunk and you cannot take them seriously. Some do not know they are living until their bellies are full; but when you hear a hungry person praying, it is from the heart, and God will hear him. It is up to the Minister. I say you should provide funeral benefits for these people. Apart from the \$3.60 a week they will get another \$3.00 Old Age Pension, making \$6.60, and they may get 50 cents or \$1.00 from the Public Assistance Board, which will make it \$7.60. This is no use for old people. They should be getting at least one egg per day and at least half a pint of milk. They are merely eking out a living. The Minister would be able to tell us how many people he has to pay pensions to now, and he should know the ages of them. If he did not tell us, he withheld it from us. I am not accusing him for not telling us, but he knows how many they are, and that will tell him that these old people should be treated right because there are some of them living at their son-in-law, son, daughter or daughter-in-law. There is a lady living in St. George who had to expense herself by crediting lumber from the Cotton Factory to build a shed roof to take her mother from St. Thomas to St. George so as to care for her, because her house was falling to pieces. She took her out about three weeks ago and the house fell in last

Saturday night. Do you know that if she had not moved her, the house would have fallen in on the old lady? These are the people for whom I am asking for aid. I think, Sir, that this Bill should go to Select Committee, and without further ado, I beg to move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill has to pass the Second Reading first.

Mr. HUSBANDS rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter caught my eye a long time ago.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to deal with, perhaps, some of the very poorest people in our society. I can also say that it deals with our hardest working people. The type of work they do is what is termed back-breaking, and when we take a survey or a look at these people at work, or just picture in our minds what is commonly known as the first-row man on Maynards estate in St. Peter, wielding his bill "coming down", or with his fork as in days past, breaking the soil, digging the cane holes, so to speak, our hearts must go out to them, Mr. Speaker, and we ought, each and everyone of us, to admire them for the reason that they have been able to weather all these storms especially since 1956.
4.25 p.m.

Since 1956, those who have been labouring in the hope of reaping something at some later date, now come to find out that all they can look forward to, if they live on, is a mere \$3.60 per week by way of pension. Sir, there is one thing that I am glad for in this Bill. It sets out in no uncertain terms who are sugar workers, because it must be recalled that two parties who have been very instrumental in making suggestions on which this Bill has been drafted, are the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Barbados Workers' Union. They are the two parties who signed the Agreement, I think it was in January, 1966, or thereabouts, which excluded from any benefits under that Agreement, those workers who were employed in transporting sugar and molasses from the factories to the Bulk Sugar Plant at Bridgetown. Those are the parties which excluded those workers; they did not classify them as sugar workers.

I am glad to see that this Bill takes those workers into consideration, and that they are sugar workers under this Bill. But, now Sir, one dangerous thing in this Bill is this; it seeks to establish here that the Barbados Workers' Union is the only Union that can represent the sugar workers in the Sugar Industry. That is what this Bill has done. It seeks to give the Barbados Workers' Union a monopoly for representing workers in the sugar industry; but I am sure that the Minister must have been advised that there are numerous workers in the industry employed at various sugar plantations in this Island, who have never been members of the Barbados Workers' Union and it is dangerous, I am to say, to ask us here to pass this Bill in its present form, seeking to lay the foundation for the Barbados Workers' Union to have

a monopoly in representing workers in the sugar industry. We know that there are other Unions and we also know that there are numbers of workers in the industry who are members of another Trade Union in this Island; so that one has got to guard against this, because who knows that tomorrow every worker in the Industry who is a member of the Barbados Workers' Union, may lose faith in the Barbados Workers' Union and seek representation in another Union. What is the position, then, when the Barbados Workers' Union by this Act holds licence for representing workers in the sugar industry? What is the position of those workers? I feel that it is not fair to the workers and it is not fair to us. There is one thing, Mr. Speaker; you have heard many a criticism levelled at the anomalous situations which have crept up from time to time in the National Insurance and Social Security operations. I am to say that one reason for that is that when Bills of such importance come before this House, we often find ourselves having to rush these Bills; in other words, we become parties to hasty legislation, and it is often long after a Bill has been passed that we find that if we had had time on our hands, we could have spotted something which is not in the interest of the smooth working of the Bill or in the interest and to the benefit of the people whom the Bill intended to benefit in the first instance.

As to the question of paying a pension of \$3.60, why is it that the Government sees itself rushing, so to speak, to the rescue of these workers and always approaches it in a half-hearted manner? This is a half-hearted approach for the simple reason that while I am willing to admit that there are not all sugar workers or all workers on estates who now benefit on retirement from the estates, I can say that there are some sugar workers who are receiving more than \$3.60 per week by way of a pension from the estates on which they have been working for many years. I can say that in my own constituency and in the constituency of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, there are some workers who, on retirement, are receiving more than \$3.60 per week from the plantations on which they worked. I am not saying that every worker on these estates gets this pension, but what I can say is that there are some workers who are already receiving more than \$3.60 per week. When we legislate for workers to get \$3.60 per week, what is going to be the position of those estates who are already paying more than \$3.60 per week to the workers? What is going to be the position with them? Will those estates continue to give the workers such as they are now giving them and will the workers then, under this Provident Fund, receive this \$3.60?

Those are small points, Mr. Speaker, but I merely feel that they are points which are very worthwhile considering, in view of the fact that the people who are destined to benefit from the legislation which might be passed, are people who are a defenceless lot, so to speak. They cannot defend themselves. They have got to go from place to place seeking things and asking questions, and very often they are turned away without any explanation being given to them.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, you represent an agricultural community and you know the suffering of the poor people in your constituency. You know how beastly hard it is for those workers toiling in the cane fields and doing other chores. When we find that on their retirement at 65 years of age - there is no reason why the Minister would have to hide that he favoured letting these workers have \$5.00 a week. The Minister very well knows the physical condition of some of these men on the estates. He knows that their health is impaired; but, despite that, they still have to present themselves because they hope by so doing to collect enough at the end of a week to help to keep their home fires burning.

Mr. Speaker, in this Island we have some workers, and particularly old men and old women, who have been doing a type of work called "weeding farm ground." Some of these workers are expected to keep clean 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and sometimes 10 acres of land during the course of a week. What do they receive for that work? Some of them are being paid less than 75¢ per acre for doing this type of farming.

Now, a worker who has to work in the cane fields in the broiling sun, when he reaches the age of 65 all he will receive for working since 1956 is \$3.60 a week. I think the Minister would be well advised to urge upon his Government that, when it is considered that the workers have to qualify by reaching the age of 65, the qualifying age should be reduced for Old Age Pensioners as well. I feel that the Minister could do something in this respect.

Now, the situation is also going to arise where people employed on these estates are paid as sugar workers, but they do not perform the actual duties of sugar workers in their day-to-day work. I feel that the Minister will have to exercise some sort of sympathy with these people. The Board will have to be directed to give due consideration in considering the claims of these people, because you will find at some of these estates that the Manager is allowed to have a worker to serve in his household doing domestic duties, but that worker is still paid by the estates as a sugar worker. I am hoping that these people will not be barred when the time comes for their years of service to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to hold up their Bill any longer due to the fact that a motion is expected to be made that it be sent to a Select Committee. I feel that there is the place where the opportunity will present itself for some of the things which appear to be mountains to be hammered out. Much emphasis has been made upon the advice that the Minister, or the Cabinet, received as to what and where the Fund could be invested, what would be the returns, and what should be utilised for the benefit of the workers. Nobody can, for a single moment, be unwilling to lend support to this matter, but we must make our position abundantly clear that we support the Minister's view that the workers should have a minimum of \$5.00 a week as a pension.

We feel, further, that because of the laborious and back-breaking type of work that the sugar worker

has to perform, having to reach 65 years to qualify for a pension is too high. We would like to see something done so that at an age earlier than 65 these people would be able to benefit from this Provident Fund. A sugar worker reaching the age of 65 is an achievement, especially when we consider that some sugar workers go to work every day and they are fed on very little. How they exist, God in heaven knows.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the fact that if the age is reduced from 65, then it would bring a greater number of people in the fold who would be receiving this money; but, nevertheless, we are willing to meet the Minister half-way to accommodate him on behalf of the workers concerned.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I have long been waiting for the introduction of this Bill. The Minister himself will remember that time and time again I have been clamouring for a Bill of this nature to come down to the House. I think that just about a fortnight ago I raised my voice in that connection. Today I am happy to see the Bill because I know that those who will benefit from it have been waiting for some long time, and at long last it does seem as if their burden will be in some way alleviated. Although I am in agreement with the Bill, I must point out to the House that in some respects I take objection to certain of its Clauses. The House is not in Committee and I am not going into detail; but speaking broadly and generally, I must point out that I am not happy at all as to the constitution of the Board that is to administer this Fund. This is the second occasion that I have had to make the sort of objection that I am now making. Now this Board is to represent agricultural workers and in more than one section of this Bill reference is made to the agricultural worker, and the specific words "any worker" are used in more than one section. "Any worker" means any agricultural worker, quite apart from his Trade Union affiliation. I do not think there is a member on the other side who would attempt to gainsay that "any worker", the words specifically used in this Bill, refers to any worker whether he has any Trade Union affiliation or not.

Now in the Objects and Reasons and elsewhere on page 10 for instance, Section 13 subsection (1) and elsewhere - we see that there will be three members to be appointed by the Minister on the nomination of the Barbados Workers' Union. Now this is a free country. The Barbados Workers' Union is a registered and well known and long established Union, but it is not the only Trade Union in Barbados representing agricultural workers, and indeed there are many agricultural workers on almost every plantation in Barbados who belong to no Trade Union at all. We have no law on the Statute Book of Barbados that compels a man to join a Union. Here it is: we are constituting a Board to administer funds that will concern agricultural workers in this Island, and we by direct legislation are empowering only the representatives of one Trade Union to administer this Board. What is the position there? Are we to understand that the Barbados Workers' Union is go-

ing to represent workers who belong to the Barbados Sugar and General Workers or any other Trade Union that will be registered in Barbados? According to the law of this country, it does not take a great number of people to form themselves into a Union and have it registered. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it does not take ten by the law of Barbados, and here we are quite seriously, with our eyes wide open, knowing that no worker in Barbados is obliged to join any Trade Union, giving authority that the Minister on the nomination of the Barbados Workers' Union can appoint three members, and no other Union or no other individual to represent those who are not or may not be members of that Union. I oppose that. We cannot compel anybody to join a Trade Union. More so, we cannot compel anybody to join a particular Trade Union, and how is it then that only this Trade Union is mentioned? As a matter of fact, some other individual or some other group of individuals should also comprise this Provident Fund Board, and I think it is quite unfair.

If I look at page 4 of the Bill itself, Section 2 subsection 3, it says: "three members to be appointed by the Minister on the nomination of the Barbados Workers' Union". Some time ago we got into some legislation drafted in a similar way. We were taking it for granted that every agricultural worker is a member of the Barbados Workers' Union. That is not true, and every member of this House knows that. The Barbados Workers' Union itself knows that.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have been sitting and listening to the hon. member on this Bill. We are speaking on the principle of the Bill, but from what he is saying, he is discussing this Bill in detail.

Mr. HUSBANDS: If I am speaking on a Fund to be administered by a Board, I am entitled to say that I am opposed to the constitution of the Board as proposed in this Bill, and nothing but a tyro could cross me at this stage. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Why don't you sit down? You are wasting time!) Mr. Speaker, we are accustomed to noises made by some people who, if they had never on popular vote entered this Chamber, would never be heard in places of respectability. That could never apply to me, because long before I entered this Place, my voice could be heard in respectable places. I am saying quite seriously now, that we should not attempt to appear to be one-sided, or to appear to be ignorant of the law and of the social conditions prevailing in Barbados.

4.55 p.m.

We know that there are workers - and in this very Bill we see that it purports to benefit any sugar worker without any qualification. I would say that the Board has limited its members to people who have a certain qualification; the nomination to the Minister must be made by members of one particular Trade Union, and I cannot agree with that. When the Chairman comes down later, then we will know who has sense and who has no sense, and it is going to come. Some time ago I got up on my feet and I was a lone voice in this Place on a similar occasion, and we

had trouble. A certain piece of legislation came down too, and something was to be administered by the Barbados Workers' Union only. I have not forgotten yet; certain hon. members were not in here at that time, but others were here. Again, I am going to beat this lone horse; I am going to sing a "Swan Song"; my voice must be heard that I disagree with this composition. I know I am talking what is fair and right, I believe, for all agricultural workers who are members of another Trade Union and for the agricultural workers who have no Trade Union affiliation.

Let me continue, Sir. I am glad to see that in this Bill those who are engaged in the transportation of sugar and molasses have been included. They are workers who are functioning in our major industry, and I am glad to see that they have been included in this Bill - the transport workers, the workers at the Sugar and Molasses Terminals and people like that. There is another principle in this Bill. Some people do not understand what principles are. This Bill has for its aims and objects, the benefit of sugar workers in the line of the Provident Fund which will provide a pension for agricultural workers in respect of whom, with the best intentions in the world, a lot of mistakes can be made; and I would not like it to be said that we have got here today and done certain things completely wrong, and we have to come back here every now and again to amend this Bill.

I do not agree with what I see here in Sub-Section 10 of Section 3, that is, "Any member of the Board other than the Chairman may at any time resign his office by instrument in writing addressed to the Chairman, and upon the date of the receipt by the Chairman of such instrument that member shall cease to be a member of the Board."

I think that that is going to need a very early amendment because this Board is one which will have a lot of work on its shoulders in the very, very near future, and if members may resign without due notice, although provision is made for acting appointments to be made, I think that this Board may become embarrassed if this Section is allowed to remain as it is. That is on page 5. There is nothing to prevent more than one person from resigning at the same time, as the Bill stands now. I think that the draughtsman is not as important as the Minister who has got to keep his eyes open. (ASIDES) Sir, I was pointing out that I think that some difficulty is going to arise here, and serious difficulty may arise. That is Subsection 10 of Section 3, and I think that this Section will have to be altered completely because there is nothing to prevent more than one member from resigning at the same time. If that happens, the work of the Board can be seriously hampered, and we would not like to see that happen with a Measure like this.

Sir, I am glad to see that - and I think the Minister must be responsible, at any rate, for much of the meat of this Bill - ordinary sickness will not deprive the worker from acquiring his benefits under this Bill. I am very glad that a Section like this, embodying this principle, is being retained. That is something to the good and it is very praiseworthy. As far as the amount

of money is concerned, this amount of \$3.60 per week, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has already spoken at length on this matter and I can say that I entirely agree with him. In everything there is a business. We know how this money is being allocated; we know the sources from which it comes. The very Bill tells us that. I must remind hon. members of this, that for a long time, for a very long time now, the sugar factory managers and the sugar plantation managers have said that they have done everything in their power, everything that they could possibly do, in order to hasten this Bill before the House. Well, we have had, as I have said, an extremely long time to wait, but it has come; and now that it has come, it is here for our examination.

We agree wholeheartedly with the principle, but I disagree entirely with the Minister getting his nominations from one particular Trade Union. I am not saying that you should exclude one Union, but I do say that you should include every Trade Union which is representing agricultural workers. As far as non-Union agricultural workers are concerned, I should suggest to the Minister that an individual or a trustworthy group of individuals be included to represent the non-Union group of workers, because human beings being what they are, they are going to be partial to bodies of their own affiliation. Everybody knows that; that is sheer commonsense. Human beings being what they are, they are going to be partial to their affiliation groups.

5.05 p.m.

It is not right; it is not fair; it is not equitable to expect that the representatives of one Trade Union are going to impartially administer this Fund for the benefit of those of another Trade Union affiliation, or for the benefit of those of no Trade Union affiliation at all. With those observations, Mr. Speaker, I will sit and, of course, in Committee I shall go into more details.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am rising merely to support the motion by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that it be sent to a Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: That motion can only be made after the Bill has passed its Second Reading.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I just want to say that I am going to support the sending of the Bill to a Select Committee when the time comes, and the Bill has passed its Second Reading. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph has been talking sense, and I need not go over what he has said. Having regard to the value of money today, who, poor, rich or middle class, would oppose the payment of \$5.00 a week? (ASIDES) I would not like to use an unparliamentary word in here, Sir. Nobody can oppose this; therefore, I am going to support the sending of the Bill to a Select Committee when the time comes. I hope the Government will see the wisdom in sending the Bill to a Select Committee. Mr. Speaker, \$5.00 a week today is like 60¢ a week just before 1939. Anybody who has a family to care for knows what \$5.00 a week can do.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I should be very short, and I am merely emphasising what has been said by the two last speakers. I was rather surprised at what the Minister said when he mentioned that he knew, or felt, to himself that \$3.60 was too little and \$5.00 was his figure. But surely, when the Financial Secretary informed him that the Fund could not afford \$5.00, pronto he should have asked him: "What sum should there be in the Fund in order to afford \$5.00?" He should not adopt the attitude that he thinks it should be \$5.00, but the Financial Secretary says "No". What sort of Minister is he? What sort of argument can be used before this House - (ASIDES.) The hon. member says that I should not criticise the Minister. He feels it is fair that the workers should get \$5.00 a week, but he changes his mind because the Financial Secretary says "No". That is a most appalling thing to say. I shall have occasion to refer to what I am about to say now later.

Mr. Speaker, for that to be said on a day when we hear through the Press and the Radio that Barbados is about to put more than \$4 million now in United States currency into a Bank - (INTERRUPTION) That came over the air this morning, and you can read it in the *Advocate*. I have something else to say later on about that. We members of the House of Assembly, let alone the general public, can hear something only at the same time when the rest of the world is hearing of it. That is an appalling thing. Over \$4 million (U.S.) - roughly \$9 million or more than \$10 million plus of our currency, and we do not have money to pay Old Age Pensioners \$5.00 a week!

The moment the Financial Secretary said that the Fund could not afford \$5.00, the Minister should have asked him what sum could afford \$5.00, and the matter could have been brought to the House. They are quite ready to come to the House every time they want a jaunt to Ottawa, Quebec, or some part of Europe. Latterly I see they are falling back on the West Indies and just running to Jamaica, but that is by the way. They can always come here and get the money because they outnumber us and can always say this is necessary.

Look at what is about to follow this evening - \$300,000.00 and they do not know if they will ever get back the money from the Transport Board and so on. I would be out of order if I proceeded further than that because it is coming up later in the debate. That is my first point in supporting the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for the City that we can find the \$5.00 and we ought to find the \$5.00.

My second point is that the Minister cannot say that I have not drawn to his attention here something which caused me to remind him that there was a Sugar and General Workers' Union, and yet they brought down this Bill. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has put it eloquently and forcefully enough, so that I need not say anything more than that which he did not say. I myself have been to factory after factory to discover whether those individuals were serious who came to me and said: "We are fed up

with the Barbados Workers' Union; we want you to start another Union for sugar workers, and you will get sugar workers throughout the Island to join it."

That is why the Sugar And General Workers' Union is in existence. The average sugar worker is finished with the Barbados Workers' Union. The hon. member knows that, but down comes this Bill because Frank Walcott is their greatest problem in the next election - (ASIDES.) That is pure Party politics - putting in the Barbados Workers' Union and not the only Union that exists for sugar workers. This is a sugar workers' Bill, and the sugar workers' Union is left out! One of the Unions that sugar workers have turned their backs on is put in. Could you want anything more damnable than that? I will not say more, Sir.

I repeat that the Sugar And General Workers' Union would never have started. It was months before I agreed to get together some people and start it. Before that I went around to factories and talked to people some of whom had come to us and some belonged to no Union. I wish to agree and to stress the point made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that some sugar workers belong to no Union. Surely, somebody can get those sugar workers, who belong to no Union, to come together and say: "We would like a voice on this Board." The Legal Draftsmen that the Government have at the moment are good. It is not beyond their ability to redraft that section in such a way that any Union in which there are sugar workers, or any Union fighting the interest of sugar workers - and I digress to add in a short phrase what I said just now - any Union that is fighting in the interest of the sugar workers, and the Barbados Workers' Union - from my personal experience of what I have been told and as a consequence got people together in this Union - it is registered and everything, and everybody knows that or should know it, and it is active.

We added "And General Workers' Union" so that people should not think we were only fighting for agricultural labourers. We find the same thing. A division of the Union is composed of people - in some cases every single employee in a particular industry that is fed up with the Barbados Workers' Union has left it and come to us. I am not saying anything unknown to the Government, but they dare not fight Frank Walcott because he would pull away too many votes from them. That and that alone is the reason for this situation. No man with commonsense with the knowledge that a sugar workers' Union exists with more sugar workers in it than the Barbados Workers' Union, or no Government, could possibly have brought down this Bill worded as it is. That is all I desire to say, Sir. Everything else that has been said on this side we all approve of.

5.15 p.m.

As the hon. senior member for Christ Church said, we started this since 1956, and we could not expect the Barbados Labour Party to be willing to kill its own child....

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is.....

Hon. A. DaC EDWARDS and Mr. HOLDER rose.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, there were questions.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. James caught my eye simultaneously with the hon. member, but of course the Hon. Minister has his right of final reply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I was hoping the hon. member would speak, but I heard you about to put the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did begin to put the question. The hon. junior member for St. James may now speak.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, when I rose, the Minister rose also. I waited on him and I noticed he did not sit down; so I took my seat. Since he has declined I will speak, but I do not intend to be long on this Bill. There are certain things which when the Bill goes to Committee will be threshed out, but for all we have heard this afternoon, I do not think there is any hon. member sitting around this Table who has a better idea of the poor agricultural labourer than I do. I was exceedingly glad when Mr. Smith went all out.....

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the second time that an hon. member has had that drawn to his attention.

Mr. HOLDER: You will pardon me, Mr. Speaker. I meant the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. I suppose this is due to the friendship, respect and love which hon. members have for the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. He dealt heavily with the whole situation. As one who knows about plantations from the early days when only twenty cents a day was paid to a female and one shilling for a male, and cutting canes only brought 8 cents or 10 cents a hundred, I would prefer to sit and listen to what others have to say. I am exceedingly glad that this Bill has come before the House, because as the hon. senior member for Christ Church said, it is long overdue, and it covers the sugar workers. The words "Sugar Workers" mean all. Some time ago you know there was a big thing when certain changes came with the agricultural worker, and they had it that certain people were not agricultural workers; but once you were employed whether in the factory or the plantation, you were connected to the industry of the sugar cane. For instance, the horse days are going out and pick-ups and jeeps are used on plantations, but in the days when the horse was ridden and the grooms had to get out the horses for the overseer and manager, they wanted to say that they were not sugar workers. I say that was wrong. I hope that the points regarding this Bill to help these poor people will be hastily got through.

I learned by different questions asked by other hon. members that they are going to get \$936. I am very glad to hear of that, but you must understand

that this money is going to the very poor people whose homes are in very bad condition. This \$936 will be a filip, but it should be more even in my estimation. You must know, Sir, that I am not accustomed to thinking of poor people because I am around this Table. I grew up in a district where I always knew about the poor, and I was taught that way, and worked with them all my life actually, except for these latter days. I am very proud to see that this Bill has come down. I am not going into the details this afternoon. That will be threshed out in Committee. Four or five years ago, wherever you turned, people would turn to you and ask when the Provident Fund was coming down. It is here this afternoon at this stage, and I am sorry that I am not seeing the Regulations also, because they must come soon after you pass the Bill, and if they are not to your liking, you cannot get out of them.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, there are one or two points raised by hon. members on the other side during this Second Reading debate that I would like to reply to. In the first case, I want to reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph jointly. Some time ago we discussed the question of representation by the Unions in this country, and I made it crystal clear to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that if ever and whenever the Union that he represents is able to command authority for sugar workers or any workers in this country, and is in a position to be recognised by the employers of any category of worker as the accredited representative of that category of worker, instead of my making any representation to the Barbados Workers' Union or any other Union, the representation will be made to that Union. Both the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph came in here this afternoon talking about representation by a General Workers and Sugar Workers' Union. The only Union I know in this country that is the accredited representative of sugar workers and is accepted by the Sugar Producers Federation, the employers of sugar workers in this country, as the accredited representative of sugar workers is the Barbados Workers' Union. I want to make it abundantly clear that that is the reason why the accredited Union which represents sugar workers in this country is given authority to nominate members on this Board; and as I said, if tomorrow the Union which they have formed is given recognition by the Sugar Producers Federation as the accredited representative of sugar workers in this country, I shall make no further representation to the Barbados Workers' Union as long as the Sugar Producers Federation advises my Ministry that the General Workers and Sugar Workers Union is the accredited representative of the workers and that they recognise them as such. Until that happens I shall continue to refer any matters relating to the sugar industry to the Union that is recognised by the Sugar Producers of this country as the accredited representative of the sugar workers in this country. 5.25 p.m.

I do not see the point of raising the issue because when they can make their presence felt, they will get

the same recognition that I am giving to the Barbados Workers' Union. As a Minister of Government, I am impartial where representation is concerned. The hon. member referred to a member of the Other Place as Frank Walcott; it is not a question of Frank Walcott or anybody being afraid of Frank Walcott; it is a question of principle. It is a question of which Union is accepted by the employers. How can you call in a Union that has not been recognised, that has no means of contact, has not been given any means of contact between an employer on behalf of a worker? Earlier this year, we had an impasse in this country; we had an issue in the sugar industry concerning the same sugar workers in the industry. I never saw the Union which the hon. member is talking about. The Union which came to my Ministry and the Union which the Chief Labour Officer referred to me as the accredited representative of sugar workers in this country, was the Barbados Workers' Union, the Union which the Sugar Producers accepted as the accredited representative of sugar workers in the country. We did not deal with.....

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the same sentiments which I expressed on the occasion which is now being referred to by the Hon. Minister - at that time there was no Barbados Sugar and General Workers' Union - I expressed the very same sentiments and I stood alone and made the very same speech. Hansard will prove it. I made the very same speech and the *'Advocate'* newspaper will prove it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Now, Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, when we were discussing the crisis in the sugar industry, hon. members got over there and said that their Union was the accredited representative of the sugar workers in this country, and I pointed out that when.....

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. In January this year I do not remember saying any such thing as the Barbados Sugar and General Workers' Union being the accredited representative of sugar workers. I have absolutely no recollection of that, Sir.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said that they tried to make out a case then that their Union was the Union representing sugar workers in this country. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has got up here today and said - you can go and look at the record - that the sugar workers have thrown the Barbados Workers' Union behind their backs and that they have been recognising the Barbados Sugar and General Workers' Union as their representative. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I said "some"). Today if this were the case, the sugar workers who are currently having discussions with a Union on the question of in-crop wages for the sugar workers, would have been negotiating with that Union.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. As Minister of Labour, is the Minister unfamiliar with the fact that throughout the West Indies, sugar plantation owners have shown themselves

more willing to deal with a non-representative Union than a representative one? How can Frank Walcott represent the people of Vacluse Factory when not one of them is a member of his Union?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order and cannot be referred to or dealt with as such.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is this, that as far as I am concerned, I am aware, my Ministry is aware and the Government of this country is aware, that the Barbados Workers' Union is the accredited representative of sugar workers in this country, and until your Union is strong enough to make its presence felt..... (ASIDES) (MEMBERS: What about the non-Unionists?) I am not denying any Union its right to speak for the people as long as the employers accept that Union as the accredited representative of the people. As I have already said, if tomorrow the hon. junior member for St. Joseph or any of the other hon. members on the other side can satisfy me that they are negotiating with employers and the employers have accepted them as the accredited representative of any particular group of workers in this country, they have the same access and the same right of access for these workers, and the same right of recognition by my Ministry as the Barbados Workers' Union is having today. I do not want to go over that point again. I have gone over it already, and I have assured hon. members that there is no question of partiality. It is a question of who or which Union is recognised by the employers as the accredited representative of the particular group. (Asides.)

On the question of the age of 65 years raised by the hon. member. (A MEMBER: What about non-Unionists?)

Mr. SPEAKER: There are indications of disorder; I trust it will not become grave.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Only a village idiot would.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to remind hon. members sitting of the appropriate Standing Order in respect of the behaviour of members sitting.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, only an idiot of the highest ranking.. (A MEMBER: A village idiot?) Only a village idiot then, would come in here and suggest that when the Union makes representation for a group in one particular industry which is organized, every worker does not receive the benefit. What I am trying to say is that for years, ever since there was a Union, not every sugar worker in this country was a Unionist and perhaps, in many cases, not even one half of the sugar workers were Unionists; but the position is that a certain Union was recognised as the spokesman for the sugar workers, and when representation is made on behalf of one who is organised, all will receive the same benefit whether they are organized or not; so that only a village idiot would get on with some of the things that we hear people getting on with.

On the question of the age of 65 years, the hon. junior member for St. Peter said that we should give consideration to reducing the age below 65 years. I do not understand the contention from the other side at all. At one stage when we said that they should qualify for National Insurance at the age of 65 years, members on the other side said that people who have passed 65 years should be able to go on. This is in respect of those people who did not qualify, because they only came into the Scheme last year when it was started. We were told then that we should be paying National Insurance or that National Insurance should be extended beyond that age. What I was saying is that if you make people eligible for National Insurance at 65 years - the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has pointed out that there are people, and Hansard can prove it, in the sugar industry who are 70 years old and who are still working today. That has been pointed out. The point is that it is a question of what funds we have available.

5.35 p.m.

It is a question of what funds are available; it is a question of striking a line to make this Scheme compare with or fit in with the National Insurance Scheme; it is also a question of the availability of funds. I want you to understand that the same people who are now shouting to reduce it from the age of 65 are the same people who want to get the kudos and say that they started the discussions on the Provident Fund and were the people who felt at the time that the age should be 65. Because we have brought this in, do not say that you want a reduction of age, because if you were in power you would not have brought down the age lower than 65.

When we asked you to reduce the age for Old Age Pension from 68 to 65, you did not see it fit to do so. Today you are talking about the reduction of the age...

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I could not allow the hon. member to get away with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when the Barbados Labour Party was running the Government of this country it was only paying \$1.80 a week for Old Age Pensions. The then Government was asked to reduce the age from 68 to 65 but nothing was done. Now that we are doing something for the people they want us to reduce the age from 65 years when they did not see fit to reduce it from 68 to 65 years.

On the question raised by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I wanted to state that the Scheme would be reviewed in three years' time. It is not right to use funds from the National Insurance Fund for this Scheme. There are two separate and distinct Schemes. I am in sympathy with the two points raised by the hon. member. One which I did not mention before I will mention now, and it is the question of funeral grants. I, personally, feel that the worker ought to be entitled to a funeral grant, and I am promising hon. members that I will have provision made in the Bill for a funeral grant for the workers.

Mr. Speaker, if I wanted legal advice on an issue, I would go to you, Sir, as a legal practitioner, or to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, although I do not know if he is competent enough to advise me now, and I may have to go to his son.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would prefer experience.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I would prefer that. I would go to a legal practitioner and seek legal advice. I could not decide a legal matter myself, and I would have to depend on advice. On the other hand, if I needed agricultural advice, I would go to my adviser in that field, who is the Chief Agricultural Officer; if I needed advice on respect of a Public Health matter, it is my duty as a Minister of the Government to seek the advice of the Director of Medical Services; if I needed advice on an Establishment matter, it is for me to seek the advice of the Chief Establishment Officer; therefore, if I needed advice on a financial matter, it is for me to seek the advice of the Financial Secretary. Mr. Speaker, the question is that I needed advice on the financial aspect of this Scheme. I said what I thought should be paid, and I was advised that the Fund could not carry it. (ASIDES.)

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind hon. members, who are sitting, of the relevant Standing Order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I still say so, and I still have to pay due consideration to the advice of the Financial Expert. The matter may not end here. I suppose that with nagging and nagging, I may be able to find some means of doing better in the future. The members of the Cabinet were forced to accept the advice that they were given on the question of financing the Scheme.

On the question of eligibility for Public Assistance raised by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, I should like to advise him that the receipt of a pension under this Fund does not debar a worker from Public Assistance just as it does not debar Mr. Speaker, a worker from Old Age Pension. (ASIDES.) I am saying that this provision does not debar any worker who currently receives Public Assistance from receiving that Public Assistance and/or Old Age Pension.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. I am not going to sit here and allow the Minister to make that statement, because he would put a lot of people in trouble. As far as I am concerned, the people could get \$10.00 or \$20.00 a week if they have a lot of children. You are saying now that if a pensioner is getting \$5.00 a week there is nothing to prevent him from getting Public Assistance. The hon. member for St. Joseph will tell you that that is not true. If it is known that you are getting \$5.00 a week, you cannot get Public Assistance too.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MOTTLEY: It does not prevent them from possibly getting Old Age Pension although the Old Age Pension is only \$4.00 a week. If you carry it to the logical conclusion you cannot even get \$4.00 a week.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: You cannot carry it to the logical conclusion. I am saying that any one of these workers who is now currently in receipt of Public Assistance - it is not going to be denied him because he is benefitting from this Fund. This will be an administrative direction.

5.45 p.m.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now sent to a Select Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I invite the following hon. members to serve on that Committee.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph; the hon. senior member for St. Andrew; the Hon. Leader of the House; the hon. senior member for St. George; the hon. and learned member for Christ Church; the hon. junior member for St. Peter; the hon. senior member for St. Philip; and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am asking, Mr. Speaker, to remove the hon. senior member for Christ Church and include the Parliamentary Secretary.

A VOICE: He has been invited.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those members whom I have invited to serve, do I understand that they agree so to do?

Accordingly I declare those members invited to serve on the Committee.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. senior member for St. Peter be put in my place.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. senior member for Christ Church decline to accept?

St. JOHN: Yes, Sir.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, because of the urgency of the matter, I would like arrangements made for a meeting of the Select Committee tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: By our Standing Orders, it is the duty of the Speaker to cause all Select Committee meetings to be summoned, and I take it from what the hon. member has said that it is necessary to summon it with the utmost despatch.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I realise, of course, that Your Honour needs a slight respite, but I am asking leave of the House to give supplementary Notices which I could not do earlier because I did not have the papers available.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, the Hon. Leader of the House will give notice of these supplementary Notices which were not, as I heard from him previously, available at the beginning of this meeting.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: No objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am obliged to hon. members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$3,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, in Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 46 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$23,150 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, in Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 48 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Trade, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to approve the borrowing by the Natural Gas Corporation of an amount not exceeding \$250,000 from a Commercial Bank to carry out extensions and improvements to its distribution system.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$111,400 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, in Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 47 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$532,200 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, in Part II Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 49 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$485,662 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, in Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 50 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I believe Your Honour would welcome some respite. I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for ten minutes.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

5.55 p.m.

On Resumption:

RESOLUTION re ABANDONMENT OF
ACQUISITION OF LANDS AT
SAND STREET

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister: To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

A Resolution to approve the abandonment of the acquisition of certain lands at Sand Street, Speights-town, St. Peter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the leave of the House to take charge of this Order in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking the leave of the House to take charge of this Order in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. *(A Pause)* There being no objection, leave is granted. The hon. member may proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution asks the House to approve of the publication in the *Official Gazette* of the notification in the appropriate Section of the Land Acquisition Act declaring the abandonment of the acquisition of a parcel of land at Sand Street, in the parish of St. Peter, a property which is no longer required in the public interest. I think the House will remember that earlier this year the Government compulsorily acquired an area totaling 12,130 square feet of land on the seaward side of Sand Street, St. Peter, in order to protect the land from further erosion by the sea, and owners of spots and property in the area had agreed to accept compensation. No such agreement had, of course, been reached in respect of Dr. Sugarman's property which represented an area of 3,670 square feet with an abandoned house. However, of immediate concern to the Government was the fact that this particular property had a dilapidated gallery which overhung the street and which appeared to be on the verge of collapse. This overhanging gallery has since been removed. The other houses adjacent to the property have been removed and resited elsewhere. The Technical Advisers of the Government have advised that the erosion is well under control and, consequently, there is no need or no further need for the acquisition of this property. Since, however, the original notice had been

published in accordance with the terms of the Land Acquisition Act, and since the law requires that abandonment should be handled in precisely the same way by the publication of notice in the *Official Gazette* with the approval of the House, the House is now asked to approve the publication of the notice of abandonment. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, there is one thing which worries me about this Resolution. The Hon. Leader of the House has just said that one problem surrounding the acquisition of the land in this area was the protection of further erosion - this is set out in the Addendum to the Resolution - by the sea. The Hon. Leader of the House has told us that in the case of Dr. Sugarman's property it was "erosion" by an overhanging gallery.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Not erosion by an overhanging gallery.

Mr. HINDS: That is why I put it in inverted commas.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, this was a traffic and pedestrian hazard. This was a special aspect of this property; it is not that the gallery was the erosion. *(Laughter)*

Mr. HINDS: The Addendum to the Resolution makes mention of a property, and I know that there is a property involved. The Resolution in itself makes mention only of 12,130 square feet of land, but we know that only 3,670 square feet of this land concerns Dr. Sugarman's property. We do not want to hold up the passing of the Resolution at all, but surely, the Hon. Minister knows that we ought to know that there is some other reason that has driven the Government into deciding to let Dr. Sugarman retain the property. What is important is to know whether or not there was erosion by the sea to that extent at the point where this property stands. If this erosion is still continuing, why do you allow Dr. Sugarman to keep the property?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member who wants to speak on this Resolution, the Hon. Leader of the House may exercise his right of final reply.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to detain the House at great length on what is a relatively small Resolution; but I would be happy to think that the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works and the other responsible Ministries were undertaking a serious survey of how to go about beach protection rather than attacking it in a piecemeal way here and there without any serious study of what is actually involved. Some months ago, I remember mentioning in the House that once I worked for an oil company and the geologist made an investigation - I

worked in the Department and I heard him say this - of the entire problem of erosion on all coasts. He found that, in fact, there was not a great deal of coastal erosion on the sea coast; but what was happening is that there was a continual tendency towards land slides. It was he, in fact, who told me that all the big rocks in the sea at Bathsheba had come ultimately from Hackleton's Cliff and places like that, and that they rolled right down the hill as the years went on and, apparently, there are still rocks in St. Joseph which are on their way to the sea. But he said that the West Coast did not have any erosion problem at all, that all that has happened on this coast is that the sand moves up and down the coast in waves and it can be arrested in certain places. If you arrest it in one place, however, you are naturally depriving somewhere else of the benefit of that sand at some time in the future. The free movement of sand at the beach, the free shift of beach up and down the West Coast of Barbados from Chancery Lane up to Maycock's Bay, has been interrupted by a number of things one of which is the development of Bridgetown and, particularly, the development of the Harbour which has frozen it into two North-South movements. Perhaps also you will find that at the Hilton, on the works which are now being carried out even further - I know about the Hilton - there is the sort of thing which has another effect; but up North I would imagine that what causes erosion at Sand Street at all are the groynes at Heywoods. These groynes are there and the natural distribution of the sand from Half Moon Fort southwards is interrupted by those groynes which may not look substantial, but which are, in fact, fairly substantial structures, that break up the free sweep of the beach. The sand which has gone from Sand Street, nonetheless, is going to come back at some stage. Sand does not go away permanently in Barbados. I am sure that the Minister of Trade, who must be as familiar with the movements of the sand as anybody else, can confirm that beaches come and beaches go.

6.20 p.m.

Anybody who lives in St. James where the movements are, in fact, greatest will understand what I am talking about. Mr. Speaker, the beach at the back of your house, as a little boy I, perhaps knew better than you. Those beaches along there I myself have drawn charts of their movements. I refer to the land at the back of your house and adjoining properties where you get an interplay of rock, beaches and everything moving. I think the Government should be taking a look at this. It may well be that the reason why Dr. Sugarman's house does not now need to be acquired is that at the time when it was first looked at the situation at Sand Street was worse than it is now. Things are getting better in Sand Street.

If the Government has in mind a plan for making Sand Street safe - I think what they mean is that when the sand goes away from Sand Street it would go further away. I think they have arrested some of the sand that would normally come into Speightstown and have taken away some of Sand Street's sand.

What the Government should do is not take temporary advantage of the beach coming back to abandon some of the acquisition. The Government should lay down a plan for all of the threatened areas to carry an Esplanade or some concrete structure that does not go away.

I see work being done at Oistins now. They are draining something, but I do not want to steal the thunder of the hon. senior member for Christ Church. I think that although the fluctuations are not as wide as some I have known, you will get them very suddenly. Every month the beach changes in Oistins. If you do not go to Oistins' beach for three weeks, when you go back at the same low tide, where there was good beach sand before, you will have to walk over moss-covered rocks and you cannot get an easy swim. I am sure that it should not be beyond the Engineers' ability to put down an Esplanade there having the rocks as a foundation. There are so many of these cases of what look like shifting sand on which there is, in fact, a foundation of rock on which to build. I hope that when the Beach Control comes into operation, one of the things it will do is to employ an expert who would be able to advise on the effect of groynes.

The final point I am going to make is to return to the Hilton. The groynes have gone out of the Hilton and, apparently, the water is too rough for the tourists; so I see the Ministry, where there is a big breakwater, creating little paddling pools. The next thing I hear is that one of the expensively-built groynes - all of the concrete will be torn up, I hear, and they will just rely on the breakwater. Having got the beach by means of a groyne, they are going to tear up some of the concrete!

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that does not apply to Sand Street.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Minister has any re-assurance he can give us on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be entirely out of place now.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to you, but what I am saying is that the piecemeal Sand Street policy appears to have been followed at the Hilton. The effect at the Hilton is to destroy the beaches to the south. All of the beaches to the south of the Hilton, Mr. Speaker - no doubt this Sand-Street mentality is prevailing over those responsible for taking care of them. They have all lost their sand to no particular advantage. The coconut trees at the back of St. Anns Fort have fallen down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there a St. Anns Fort in Sand Street?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I believe there is.....

Mr. SPEAKER: We are concerned with St. Peter; we are leeward now.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that St. Peter has any connection with St. Anns Fort, but if you are talking about the leeward, Mr. Speaker, let us hear something from the Minister indicating that they have this whole problem in mind, especially the business of sand movement. In a certain area the sand will be roughly of the same development in 8-year periods and 20-year periods.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, no doubt the contribution made by the last hon. member was very valuable. I listened to it myself with great interest, but he really dealt with a field which is considerably outside of my knowledge and experience. I shall have to take his word for it and hope that one of my colleagues will, in due course, advert to that field and give him the information he seeks.

May I just say briefly, on the point under discussion, that the Government received technical advice on this matter first from Mr. O'Byrne, a Civil Engineer, who said that the property - referring, of course, to Dr. Sugarman's property - is not in need of immediate protection from the sea as is the beach on either side of it. He went on to say that the gallery overhangs the road by two feet past the curb line, and that the floor of the gallery has been extensively attacked by termites; it was sagging and would collapse under its own weight at any time.

Then Mr. Pat Brown also said the site is not needed for the protection of Sand Street and its acquisition may be deferred; but, of course, he also drew attention to the fact that the building, particularly the verandah has been since removed as a threat to public safety. I believe it is true that the condition of that area is better now than it was before, and this may have induced the technical experts to advise abandonment.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Resolution stands in the name of the hon. and learned Prime Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I had spoken to the hon. Leader of the Opposition earlier on these two Resolutions, and he had said that he did not think they were in any way controversial. I want to know from the other side whether they wish to proceed with the second one, which is a much more important one. (Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We do not mind it.)

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it is a question of time. We would like to do the Resolution on Human Rights, which would not be relevant after today, and it is a question of whether both can be done before seven o'clock.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Let us do the one about Codrington.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Do you think we can do both?

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND TO SUN FARMS LTD.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has leave to proceed to move the passing of a Resolution in the name of the hon. and learned Prime Minister to approve the lease to Sun Farms Limited of certain lands and buildings at Codrington, St. Michael.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval of Parliament for the lease to Sun Farms Limited, a consortium, if you may call it this, which consists of the Commonwealth Development Corporation, Messrs. DaCosta & Musson Ltd., and Radcliffe Manor Ltd., of the United Kingdom. This consortium wishes to lease from Government a parcel of land together with buildings described in the Schedule at Codrington for the purpose of producing vegetables, potted plants and flowers primarily for export.

It is proposed, if Parliament approves the terms of this lease, that this should be done for a period of 10 years, in the first instance.

6.30 p.m.

There are, of course, certain other matters connected with this which the House should know about. It is also proposed that this new company should be allowed access to water on certain conditions. From Well No. 1 at Codrington they will be permitted to draw up to 20,000 gallons per day, and half million gallons per day from Well No. 2 for the initial ten year period of the lease, and any water rights which may be given to them are, of course, subject to overriding national needs. If there are any questions, I will answer them from the information I have here.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more information that the House would like to know, and I am going to be critical of the Addendum to the Resolution and say that though the Hon. Minister did give the House the information about the water, the Civil Servants who prepared this Memorandum ought to be told clearly and plainly that they have a duty to be honest to Parliament. It is the height of hypocrisy and dishonesty of the first variety to come here before this House and in an Addendum to a Resolution fail to disclose that one of the terms and conditions of this lease is that Government agrees that water can be used by this particular farm to the tune of 500,000 gallons a day from one well and 20,000 gallons a day from the other. What is more, am I to understand that Codrington House is included in this? It does not say that; it says "together with the dwelling house". Why is it that they did not think it necessary to make it clear that Codrington House, the house formerly used by the Director of Agriculture from time immemorial, is included at \$10,000 a year rent? You are leasing Codrington House with 74 acres of land, with water rights of 500,000 gallons a day for

\$10,000 a year when in this country today, in Christ Church and around, for instance, if a small farmer puts on water in the area to grow his vegetable gardens, the totality of which is no greater than anything that Sun Farms will produce in Barbados, he is hounded down by the Minister of Communications and the Waterworks Department saying that he must not use water for growing things. What are we coming to now? Because they come from abroad, you can come here now and say that they can use 500,000 gallons of water a day! The implications of this are serious, and this is a deception that you want to practise on us! Civil Servants want to practise deception on us because they do not want to disclose the terms of this as people would investigate it. I do not know about the lease coming here; I know that these people have been granted other privileges. Isn't it a fact that they asked for duty-free privileges for the importation of their seed and so on? Isn't it a fact that other promises have been given to them? We will soon hear that this is a pioneer industry in this country. They have not come clean on this. It smells.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree on the floor of this House to one company being allowed to draw 500,000 gallons of water for irrigation purposes when there are thousands of small farmers in Barbados who are persecuted and prosecuted for using water for the purpose of growing the same vegetables for consumption by people like you and me, Mr. Speaker; but these vegetables are for export!

I think our farmers ought to have first priority. If you tell me that you can afford to allow one company to use 500,000 gallons of water, I say, Mr. Speaker, that that land should be used for the production of vegetables to raise the total amount of vegetables available for consumption in Barbados. Tomatoes were sold at \$2.04 per pound in Barbados in the supermarkets last week, and you are going to tell me that because they come from abroad we must give them special concessions? I have nothing against them coming here, but they must come on terms not more preferential or more beneficial to them than the ordinary people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, there is too much concealment and embarrassment in the way in which this was presented. There is something more behind this. They have not disclosed all the terms to the House. You are leasing 74 acres of land including Codrington House for \$10,000 a year - less than \$1,000 a month. It is a big two-storey house that could be cut up in flats right now, and the Minister could tell you that you could not get less than four flats out of it at a rental of \$200 a month. They are bringing down their horticultural experts from abroad. They are going to get the house rent free! They are getting the land for nothing! What are the terms of the water? Are they going to pay 80 cents per thousand gallons for that water like every peasant farmer in Barbados? Are you not depleting your very water reserves? You said that nobody can cut up land around that area because it is a water area. You prevent people in that area from doing certain things, and now you say you are going to give them access to 500,000 gallons of water a day! I am not in favour of this Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, there are certain points which I will explain which perhaps may allay the fears of some hon. members. I am not in charge of the Resolution and I have a right to speak like anybody else. Mr. Speaker, on the question of the use of the water, they are permitted to use a maximum of 500,000 gallons a day, but this does not mean that they are going to use that amount. (A VOICE: Are they going to pay for it?) The position is that they are responsible for extracting the water themselves. They have their own pumps and so on; so the Government is not pumping water for them. Just as if you were putting down irrigation on your land, these people are responsible for all the equipment used in pumping this water. The restriction here is that they have got to record the amount of water they use. It must be metered and must not exceed so much per day. Another condition attached to this is that they must supply the National Stadium with all the water they need.

6.40 p.m.

On the question of duty free importation of seed, the seed is duty free, at any rate, and any agricultural implement is duty free now. This is no innovation. The other point which hon. members do not know is that we have a high incidence of unemployment in this country and this consortium is going to employ initially 300 people. (A MEMBER: Why did you not put that in the Resolution?) The incidence of employment in this venture - and that is why it was supported by the Ministry of Agriculture, because it is going to employ 300 people who would normally be out of work. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Don't you think that we should have this in the Addendum?) I am not saying that this should not be given. I am telling you that in this operation we are growing mainly horticultural plants for export. The incidence of employment is great. People will be having their five days' work a week or what have you, and some of the women who are not working today for half cent can be employed in this venture. Do you mean to tell me that an industry which is going to provide employment for 300 people initially, you should close your eyes to?

Hon. members may be a bit worried about the fee to be paid for the lease. As it stands now, how many people do you have employed at Codrington? As I told hon. members, I think it was last week or the week before, the area at Codrington for the amount of experiments which we are carrying out for the Ministry of Agriculture, has become too small and therefore we are removing the work to Graeme Hall. We have to find something to do with Codrington, and putting it back into sugar or something in which you could only make a maximum of about \$90 an acre, if you did make it on the 74 acres of land at Codrington - you multiply that \$90 for a whole year by 74 and see, if you had it planted in sugar cane, what you would make. Go and ask the plantation owners of this country how many of them get \$90 an acre in any year, and in a year like this, they could not even make 90 cents. Go up there and see some of the sugar cane on the Waterford Plantation where there is shallowness of land and you will see clearly that it is not land for sugar. (Mr. St. JOHN: Put it in

vegetables). All right, it is going into vegetables. It is going in crops which will bring back currency to this country, and it will improve the economy of this country, teaching people into the proper means of horticulture and so on.

Mr. Speaker, this was discussed already. We had several meetings on it and it is about two or three years that it has been hanging fire. It is about two or three years that the people were looking for this and we have not gone into it with our eyes closed. We have gone into it with our eyes fully opened. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Is Calvin Sides in this?) No, Calvin Sides is not in this. We have honest people in this. I can appreciate the fear of my friend, the hon. senior member for Christ Church. He is always discussing agriculture with me, and if he had told me that he did not like the smell of this Resolution, I am in a position to explain what it is all about. I am sorry that the hon. member did not discuss this matter with me; otherwise he would hardly have raised those points. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You mean the Opposition.) I said I am sorry that the hon. member did not discuss this matter with me. He is always discussing things agricultural with me. He knows that he can be free to discuss with me any matter which I have anything to do with, and this is not said in respect of the hon. senior member for Christ Church alone. If something comes in here which is anything to do with agriculture or anything for which I am responsible, hon. members are free to discuss it with me.

If the hon. member did not like the Resolution, he could have said: "I do not understand this." What I am saying is that the benefit which will accrue to the country from this is that you have money being brought into the country rather than money being sent out of the country. You have a high incidence of employment, you have more knowledge given to the people who are unskilled; they are taught skills in horticulture; and therefore it was on those grounds that we were willing to meet these people half way. As I said before, you could not make \$10,000 a year on the 74 acres of land because it is poor land for sugar and if we had it in sugar, we could make it.... (ASIDES) Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get this straight. The Hon. Minister has moved that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown has caught my eye. Did he rise to address the Chair? (ASIDES)

Mr. HINDS: When the Minister rose to speak, it was that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member for helping me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not risen to second the motion for the postponement. I am not speaking on the postponement.

Mr. SPEAKER: But it has not been seconded.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have been doing some figures. The trouble with this Resolution is that if some of the things which the Minister said to us had been explained to us in the Addendum, nothing could have arisen with the hon. senior member for Christ Church. It is not for a member of the Opposition to try to find out something; who would try to oppose... (A Pause) I am talking and I wish that the Hon. Minister would listen and stop carrying on conversations when I am speaking because I will abuse him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Outside, of course.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, right in here, but it will be parliamentary abuse. Would that be in order, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, it can be done very neatly.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, it can be done, Sir. If what the Minister has said had been put down here in the Resolution, then the hon. senior member for Christ Church would not have had to say what he said. Who would oppose any scheme which was finding work for 300 people?
6.50 p.m.

Up to now I have not found the Minister deceiving this House. Who would oppose a scheme that would find work for 300 people? Now I want to ask a few questions. You must try and get your Permanent Secretaries, or those responsible for preparing Addenda, to pay respect to the Opposition. This is a democratic country, and we are entitled to know certain things. The members of the public are entitled to know certain things as well as the back benchers.

Mr. Speaker, I could ask a lot of questions on this matter. Those of us who know Codrington well will understand the position. I think \$10,000 a year seems a reasonable amount to start with. I can ask the Minister a lot of questions about this lease. He tells us \$10,000 a year, but the lease can say that after the first five years the rent can be reduced or increased. These are things we are entitled to know. Where is the lease?

I have been to Codrington several times when I wanted plants and so on. If the Minister of Agriculture would just listen to what I am saying I would be glad. (ASIDES) The only way to make him listen to me is to say something harsh against him. Can the Minister tell us whether this land includes land on both sides of the road?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the hon. member will give way, I will explain something.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You did not put it in the Addendum; you let the people responsible for sending the Addendum down here write all sorts of things and so on. This is wrong; anyway, I am not sitting down now, and you must make your notes and reply to me later. I am making myself clear; I am not opposing it; I would not oppose something that could find work for 300 people. (ASIDES) You must make your notes

and, as Minister of Agriculture, you can ask permission to reply later.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, he cannot explain what the hon. member is saying.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture would be given permission to reply again. I have made my position clear. Why must I sit down? I am not doing it, and if you do not want this House to be in disorder, kindly rule. I am not sitting down.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen on a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It appears, Mr. Speaker, as though.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I object to that. That is not a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is only for me to decide, and I have to hear him. I have not heard him. Will the hon. member make it as concisely as possible?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. It appears as though the hon. member is branding the Civil Servants in the Ministry for.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Why do you not sit down and rest your legs?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS rose.....

Mr. MOTTLEY rose.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I was making a point of order, but I was disturbed by two hon. members.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member said that it appears that I have branded Civil Servants. You should have stopped him there. (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: I hear an hon. member, who is not on his feet and is sitting, disobeying the Standing Order relevant to members' debate. I will not call his name now.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The impression I got is that Civil Servants in the Ministry of Agriculture are accused. The point I have got up to make is that the question of land acquisition is with the Ministry of Home Affairs. The holding of Government land comes under the Ministry of Home Affairs and that is the Ministry responsible for leases, but the mechanics of this scheme

have been worked out by the Ministry of Agriculture as well as the Paper on the scheme.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I crave your protection. Let the hon. member know that this is not a point of order. (ASIDES)

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the appropriate Standing Order, this sitting now stands suspended for three quarters of an hour.
7.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended by the reason of the appropriate Standing Order, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown was addressing the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think I made my position quite clear because I figured it out, and from my experience as a real estate broker, the price paid per acre for rental of land today is \$50, and I am very happy to see that the Plan is laid before the House. I do not think it was withheld from the Opposition. I am satisfied that the area runs up to a cul-de-sac, so to speak, going down by Combermere on the left side from Codrington, but there are one or two questions which I think the Minister should answer. I am satisfied with the \$50 a year per acre for the 75 acres of land. I know when this land was bought. This is land on the right coming across from "Tyrol Cot" on the same side. This was Waterford land that was sold out.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer, but I know sufficient about real estate to know that if you are leasing some place, you must have somebody responsible and who is worth something so that if the lease is broken you can collect from him, and as I see from this, it is DaCosta and Musson, and I do not think that DaCosta and Musson will sell out overnight. I do not know anything about the Commonwealth Development Corporation or anybody else, but there are things which we ought to know, and among them is who is responsible for the repairs to the house during the lease. Is there anything said that if they do not succeed, there can be three to six months' notice on either side?

You said that there will be 300 people employed but if I knew of a Minister who deceived this House, I would get up and say it. I am not looking for any favours, and when the Minister says there will be 300 people employed, I think I know a little about this. Even if there were 200 people employed, you cannot treat the Opposition with contempt; so when the Minister of Agriculture says that we seem to brand Civil Servants, it is not branding Civil Servants. Nobody expects a Minister to sit down and write out his own Addendum to something, but he must let the persons responsible for writing it know that this is a democracy and that we are partly responsible as the members of the Government are responsible, for the government of this country, and whether it is selling, leasing or letting land, they

must see that we are satisfied that it is done the right way. You know that in this area prisoners have for years cut stones which were some of the best in the island. Does this carry the right to let them cut stones? A copy or a draft copy of the lease ought to be before the House, but while this is so, I still maintain that you should have all these things set out in the Addendum stating whether it carried the right to cut stones or to sink wells. Do you know why I have to ask these questions? This is less than a mile from the Belle Pumping Station, as the crow flies. Is there anything in the lease to say that if they use the well it should only be used for certain purposes and should not be polluted because the stream there is only 400 feet deep? All these things we are entitled to know. Mind you, I am supporting it because I believe that \$50 an acre is reasonable. But who is responsible for putting the house in a good state of repair? In the interest of the public, how do we know what kind of wells they are going to put down? Are they going to dig fresh wells? Are they going to use the pipes which we have laid down? The Leader of the House knows that when I was in Opposition I would not stop until he produced the lease, and even when they were putting down standpipes, they had to bring a map to show me where they were being erected, and this is the law. I do not want to waste any more time. The Minister of Agriculture says that while the Ministry of Home Affairs is responsible for sending down this Addendum, his Ministry is responsible for the mechanics, then the two Permanent Secretaries should get together and treat the Opposition with that amount of respect to which they are entitled. You did not see a wheelbarrow bring those members in here. I am satisfied with the price, Sir, but could the Minister not have stated in the Addendum that they hope to employ 300 people? The reason why I am going to support this today is because I feel that now that you have got around to the point of encouraging local capitalists to invest in these particular schemes, you should encourage it. I do not subscribe to this hulla-baloo as I saw recently about a million dollar company being opened at the Deep Water Harbour. I want to make it abundantly clear that this is a huge joke just with a building and a few machines. I have my friends too. What million dollar scheme could this be with a few machines making paper bags and so on? When these people run from one country to another, I am not supporting them against local people who want to come along and put up capital for these things. Now that you have DaCosta and Musson willing to grow hot house tomatoes and so on, I hope that you will be able to close the Marketing Corporation. I do not think I will say anymore, but instead of getting up and quarrelling with me, the Minister of Agriculture should have got up and apologised for not putting these things in. I know it is the duty of the Minister to defend Civil Servants, but.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is not my duty to apologise for something for which my Ministry is not responsible. The point is that this Paper was prepared in the Ministry of Home Affairs as I tried to explain to the hon. member but it was the fault of the Permanent Secretary to the

Ministry of Home Affairs not to refer the matter to my Ministry.

Mr. MOTTLEY: And therefore he admits it is the fault of the Permanent Secretary. I do not go up to the Permanent Secretary. If the Permanent Secretary made a mistake, I do not want to kill him, but you cannot say that this was properly put before us. Now that you have explained it, it is a different matter and I will support it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I learned from the hon. member who has just sat down that it is the mere mention of DaCosta and Musson that has won his support for the other side.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I will explain to the hon. member something he does not know.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk tells me that the hon. junior member for St. Peter has already spoken on this Resolution, but I have no record of that.

The Clerk now agrees that the hon. junior member for St. Peter did not speak, and I know the hon. member did not speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member says that the mention of DaCosta and Musson has won my support. What I am telling him now is that you can have a lease, and the people you are leasing to can be birds of passage. If you lease a house to somebody who has nothing, the lease is worthless unless he has a backer to put down a substantial sum of money; but everybody knows DaCosta and Musson in Barbados, and if DaCosta and Musson are part of this, we are satisfied.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is made. I will now hear the hon. junior member for St. Peter who has not yet spoken on this matter.
7.55 p.m.

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown was on his feet before the interval and I asked the hon. member if he was seconding, after the motion for the postponement had been duly made. The hon. member said that he was not seconding it and he remained on his feet. Therefore, the motion was not seconded.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am now seconding it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I rise to withdraw my motion for the postponement.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member cannot rise, at this stage, to withdraw a motion.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: One cannot, on a point of order, rise to withdraw a motion. The motion for the postponement has been duly seconded.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, from the time that I have been a member of this hon. House, I find that a very easy way to win the support of hon. members, particularly of the Opposition, for Resolutions or Bills or anything else of this sort, is to trot out that you are going to employ so many people. That is a catch word. All I am saying is this, that all we find is a promise to employ these people; but the Ministry of Labour does not, and I repeat, does not try to see that these people live up to any of their agreements to employ the number of people that the Minister comes to this House and makes the promise to us that an industry intends to employ. On no occasion at all can they get our votes. The people go and set up this venture, or these ventures; they promise to employ 300 people in the first year; and when they are ready, after the seven-year period is out, they have gone! And that is not all. What we are particularly concerned to hear from the Minister is what wages they intend to pay these 300 people. (Mr. MOTTLEY: That is the Trade Union.) It is all very well to say that that is the Trade Union, but the Trade Union is not here before us now. We want to know what type of wages they are prepared to pay to these people. They are employing 300 people on 74 acres of land, but I do not believe that at all. You will find, Sir, as has happened with these industrial estates all about here, you are told that this industry is going to employ so many people, but what do you find? I have here before me that girls, young women in this country, after they have been employed for 18 weeks in some of these firms, they receive \$8.09 and \$9.10. I have it here before me, Sir. People, after they have been employed for 18 weeks with a firm, receive \$8.95 and \$11.80; but you want our vote from this side because you are going to employ this number of people!

Sir, there is another point which I would like to make. I would like to know what is the Government's plan as regards building a school at Codrington. I would like to know that, because in their Capital works carried over from 1967-68, the Government had a plan for the building "Ellerslie" and to start a new school at Codrington. It is said that it is proposed to construct a new school in the area to relieve overcrowding at St. Leonard's and to take seniors from St. Matthew's Mixed, and a total provision of \$5,000 was included in the Estimates. I want to know if this 74-acre lease is going to interfere in any respect with the building of this very necessary school for the area.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has given way. The point is that this area which is being leased is in Zone 1, and you cannot build a school in Zone 1. You cannot build anything in the Zone 1 area and this is definitely Zone 1 area. The point is that you cannot go and build a school in this area since there have been Zones. (ASIDES) There will be a high incidence of waste of water and so on, and you cannot risk polluting your underground water there. The part of this area that we are leasing now is in Zone 1. There is Zone 1 and there is Zone 2. I am dealing with the 74 acres which we are leasing. Over on the other side by the Stadium is differ-

ent; but on this side you are in Zone 1. A small portion of it is in Zone 2 and this is not where the high incidence of population is. That was more down in the Codrington area. When you speak of a school at Codrington, you are dealing with a school in the Codrington area, and perhaps you may want to acquire the property owned by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to build the school.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Hon. Minister who has just sat down. He tries to point out what is Zone 1, what is Zone 2 and the like, but that is not my concern at the moment. The Government, in the 1967-68 Estimates made provision for building a school at Codrington to relieve the congestion at these other schools. Did they know then about Zone 1 and Zone 2 and all of this? I want to charge hon. members on that side with acting in a manner which is not in strict consonance with honesty in dealing with this matter. I am very serious about this. They have begun to tell us one-half the truth about this Scheme. They know that 40 years from now they are not going to employ these 300 people at all. That is mere eye-wash - and remember, Sir, that these flowers which they are going to grow, are for export. We have not yet learned from the Minister of any Training Scheme from which our boys and girls are going to benefit. There is nothing like that at all. There is no teaching of horticulture to them in the Scheme.

8.05 p.m.

I am saying that all of these people are coming to this Island, and the Government is encouraging them to come here and rape the nation! They say they are employing 300 people. What wages are they going to pay the people? Three hundred people on 75 acres of land! I do not mind what anybody says about \$40.00 an acre for a year; I do not mind what expert knowledge is brought to bear on this. The hon. senior member for the City has made it clear that he is not supporting the Resolution, but he is supporting DaCosta & Co., Ltd. He also made it clear why he was supporting Musson and DaCosta; they are not going to be sold out tomorrow night; they are not birds of passage, and they are not fly-by-night investors. It shows quite clearly that the hon. Minister is not satisfied within his heart of hearts that this is a worthwhile project with which we should agree.

Mr. Speaker, is it a case where Government now finds it much more advantageous to rent out this 75 acres of land with a big house? If this Government had come here tonight with the suggestion that Codrington House be renovated to make provision for relieving the congestion in schools, it would have had our ready support, Government is not concerned with the overcrowding in schools, so long as it can get \$10,000 a year from a project like this!

Mr. Speaker, it is our duty to press the Government to get all the information we possibly can on this. Is this a case where the Government is afraid to deny a request from the Commonwealth Development Corporation? Who are they? Our Minister of

Education, or at least one of them, has gone up and down and about the various schools, and now we are having experts to come here to advise us about overcrowding in schools and all sorts of things that we could very well get our local people here to advise us about.

Government now seems to be abandoning a lot of things. What has happened since the Government in its 1967-68 Estimates made provision for the building of a school at Codrington? What has transpired since then to cause Government to change its mind? I understand that this Scheme had been pending for three years. I do not know if the Minister has said so. Mr. Speaker, we have quite a lot of land lying waste about here on which this project could be launched. The same Musson and DaCosta have sold estates about here. I am now in a position to say that there are now some 19 plantations, including two sugar factories, in this island that are for sale with thousands of acres of land. Why is it that the Government is so ready to accommodate these people? All the argument the Government is advancing is that they are going to employ 300 people. Employ 300 people doing what? Picking grass? Packing pots? Picking weeds? Is this Government only looking for people to pick weeds?

Mr. Speaker, after these people work for 18 weeks in an industry, are they going to receive a mere \$11.80 and \$8.95? Now, if this is the way that the workers in this country are to be treated by a Socialist Government like this... (ASIDES) This Government has absolutely no concern for the working-class people in this country. Any little thing that it hopes to get votes from in the long run, the Government will run to this House with it.

Mr. Speaker, not one hon. member from this side of the House can lend any sort of support to this Resolution without having the lease and all the particulars. Remember, we must have some sort of guarantee as to when the 300 people will be employed; what will be the minimum wage to the particular category of worker; and we must know in what categories workers will be employed in this new industry. It is as serious as this, Sir. (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind hon. members on both sides about Standing Orders?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the occasion is going to present itself for me to reply tonight to what the Minister has just said in an aside. I am a proud man. I came here on the floor of this House and tabled Questions for the protection of workers in this country, and it is the same Minister who got up and defended the employers against the interests of the workers. This same Minister defended the interests of the employers against other workers. I believe the occasion will present itself later this very night for me to make a statement to that effect.

We view this matter very seriously, Sir, We want to hear Government's plans; we want to hear

what information it has at its disposal; we want to hear more about the laying of the lease in this House, and particularly we want to know that the workers are protected. We do not want to know that when two or three workers up there break a pot or two, somebody will hold them up there and start beating them just as how the I.S.L. people held workers and beat them, and then had to pay them money in the Law Courts. We do not want that to happen to our workers in this industry. I am asking the Government to let us hear, see and know everything about this project.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfair to us. It took Government three years to bring this matter before the House. We desire some time to consider this matter. In the light of the revelation and things that have been revealed here tonight, we need time to investigate them further ourselves. We should know more about this Scheme. Not many weeks ago the Minister of Communications and Works in reply to a Question tabled here by me with respect to running water mains at Storey Gap - despite the fact that his Ministry had promised people from Storey Gap in a letter to lay water mains, after a well had been sunk or a reservoir put up in Lodge Hill, the Minister said that he could not have mains in the area.
8.15 p.m.

Everytime you open the newspaper, you see that you should conserve water. It seems as if the Minister does not try to drink water. I take my bath in Massiah Street. When the Minister calls on mornings, I will be there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member ceased to address the Chair?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I think in my own constituency a girl fell under the Minister's observation while bathing her feet under the pipe, but the case in point is that water as a social necessity is lacking somewhere, and we are to urge upon the Minister responsible for water not to be led away even by his colleagues in a matter of this sort. This Scheme is going to demand much more. If they start the industry today and intend to employ 300 workers, do they not intend to expand as years go by? Don't we understand then, Sir, that their water consumption is expected to rise? The Minister has not given us any guarantee of new sources for tapping water, because in the Mount, Benn Hill, Lonesome Hill, and Indian Ground in St. Peter, the people are crying out for a water shortage. They only get intermittent supplies. We do not want in any respect to obstruct the Government from proceeding with any worthwhile scheme if it is to the benefit of the nation, but if they are moving, like the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, to support DaCosta and Musson.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, it is not true to say that we are moving to support DaCosta and Musson.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I never accused the Government of moving to support DaCosta and Musson. I had not completed my statement. I am saying that

if they are doing so-and-so, what else they should do. It is when you find these members crochety that we have to be more than vigilant on this side. We have got to get behind these Ministers to know what is behind this Scheme, and above all, we want to hear from hon. members on that side what are Government's plans as regards building a new school at Codrington to relieve the congestion at the St. Matthews and the St. Leonard's schools. These are very important points.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister, the Introducer of this Resolution, put the subject matter before the House, I sensed that there was some lack of enthusiasm on his part for the subject. It could be seen and felt, and as I read the Addendum it became clear. I am not a businessman; I am not a learned economist; I am an ordinary Barbadian, and when I am told that on 74 acres or thereabouts of land at Codrington there is a hope outstretched to us of gainful employment for 300 workers in a project that has for its purpose the export of off-season vegetables, pot plants and flowers, I somewhat marvel. I may be too dense and, maybe, I do not know enough of business, but if I am to understand that on this lot of land, dealing plantation-wise, provision is to be made and the hope extended to employ 300 of our agricultural or other workers, I have a lot to be taught.

As my colleague said in his opening remarks, this employment-bogey is something that has been over-done. Everyone knows that we are an over-populated country and we can easily fall for such bait. Some *entrepreneur* comes and discusses a project at Government or Cabinet level, and pointing out that we have a high unemployment rate, offers to relieve the situation. We are asked by the Minister how we could oppose a measure like this, and told that if we opposed this we were opposing the very people who hoped to benefit, the very people we hope to represent honestly. We have to think and we have to scrutinise. Like my colleague who has just sat down, I find it very hard to be convinced, because speaking not so long ago to someone whose name I will not call. I said to that individual: "You know, you may say it is no concern of yours; it is no responsibility of yours to see that 300 people are employed. Somebody told you so, and of course you told me so and therefore I must take it. I am not such a dud to swallow that."

These people hope to export off-season vegetables, pot plants and flowers to the United Kingdom and Europe. If somebody is coming to Barbados to do that, soon you can bet your bottom dollar that a lot of people will start doing that. I asked this particular individual whose name I am not going to call to embarrass him within the Chamber whether he enquired about the marketing cost of these projects. I said: "Here again you need not answer, because you can tell me that is not your responsibility."

Apart from other issues concerning it, for the annual rental of the dwelling house which, as the senior member for Christ Church has pointed out,

they are getting at a rather economic rate, we are told and have had it repeated that this is a Zone I area and you cannot build there because it is in the sheet water area, and if this is a method of its being utilised and it looks profitable to Government in the interest of the people, they come down with it and are now trying to convince us that it is a worthwhile plan and project.

8.25 p.m.

Now, Sir, someone is going to speak after me as touching this water business. I do not touch on points which I do not know enough about in detail. I am going to sit down and I know that some other hon. member who is more knowledgeable than I am will talk about it, and I am very sure that from what I have had disclosed to me already, it is not as economic and profitable to Government as it has been made out. As to this water business at Codrington.....

At this stage, it now being 8.30 p.m., of the clock.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the Moment of Interruption has arrived. As this matter appears to be controversial, therefore no further discussion upon it may proceed; but any other business being unopposed may now be disposed of between now and 9. o'clock p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, my difficulty would be this; it is true that the other side intimated to me that they would be willing to support a Resolution honouring Human Rights Day, but I would have to ascertain from them now whether they think that that is controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition assure me whether a Resolution in connection with Human Rights is deemed by the Opposition to be controversial?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I do not think that anybody would vote against the Resolution. The hon. member showed me the draft of the proposed Resolution and I approved of it; but what I am going to say is not going to be pacific. Perhaps, I should be speaking simpler English. You could hardly call it controversial, but I am merely going to say that it is unfortunate. (ASIDES) It is not going to be opposed. If the Resolution is going to be carried, I think we could go on with it. Not only that, Sir with great respect, if today is the day proclaimed we should act today and not put it off until some other day.

Mr. SPEAKER: So I correctly understand the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that he will not be opposing this Resolution?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: No, Sir, I am going to second the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not therefore deem it to be controversial in view of that assurance.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, all I can say then is that I would be prepared to support the Resolution in these terms if moved by the other side.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is it not difficult to take the hon. member seriously? The hon. member told me that he proposed on this day, as the date appointed for it, to move the passing of a Resolution, and he asked me if I would second it. I said: "Yes". He has shown me the draft or the wording of the Resolution and I have only added one word to it with which he agreed. My language would be different from his; that is all. It is not that I do not believe; I believe utterly. I believe utterly that that Resolution as worded should be passed.

RESOLUTION re HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of the following Resolution.

"WHEREAS this tenth day of December, one thousand nine hundred and sixty eight, has been requested by the United Nations to be universally observed as Human Rights Day,

AND WHEREAS this House is ever ready to reaffirm its faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal right of men and women, and of nations large and small,

BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its heartiest congratulations to the United Nations for its continued struggle for universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, colour, sex, language, or religion."

Mr. Speaker, I think that the terms of this Resolution are such as would commend themselves to all sections of this House and need no embellishment from me. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to second that. As I intimated, I have some remarks to make which I think are most fitting to be made. I will frankly admit that when I first spoke with the hon. member it did not cross my mind to make use of this opportunity to say what I am going to say; but on further reflection, I felt that this was the moment to make the observations I am making. I do not think that the wording of this Resolution could be improved upon. I think that the Hon. Leader of the House has, as would be expected from him, used very fitting language. I only suggested to him that the word "colour" was not in. We have "human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." I merely remarked to him that race could be of two whites, two yellows, and so on and that if he did not specifically put in the word "colour", you would not be drawing to the notice of the people of Barbados and the world generally what the United Nations Charter really aimed at, and what all those who believe in it and believe in carrying out its principles firmly stick to.

Hon. members will appreciate, even those who are inclined to sneer at me or to criticise or oppose me - the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will be pleased to know that I admit that I am an old man; but I do say this, that for all of my life I have been abused and vilified and it has never really worried me. I would not be in politics if I had ever been worried. Also, as I am one of those people who are always attacking people's views strongly and politically, why should I complain if people attack me? But I could not fail - even although it is with some hesitation naturally to anyone in my position, because I am going to have somewhat to speak of myself - to repeat what I said when a Resolution came down here for celebrating this Day. Hon. members will remember that it was a paltry sum of \$3,000. I pointed out then that we were having put before us the sum of \$70,000 to celebrate Independence Day and that it was necessary for the people of Barbados to know what the Charter of the United Nations and Human Rights was, and that not enough was being done. Hon. members will remember that the Minister of Health and Community Development replied that there was a Committee and that what he had mentioned then was not all that was going to be done, and he promised some other things. I make no apology for quoting myself on that occasion because the position is, if anything, worse since then - the position, that is to say, of our giving lip-service to the ideas of the Charter of Human Rights and doing exactly the reverse in its celebration.

8.35 p.m.

I pointed out then - and I do not ask leave, because I am sure I am entitled to quote from the Official Record - that I had asked the Minister who was in charge of that Resolution certain things and suggested to him that we should spend more money and so on for the celebration of Human Rights Day. He promised that he would have brought the matter to the notice of this Committee. The Committee was a big Committee. He pointed out to me that it was a big Committee, and he mentioned who the members were. I drew his attention to the fact that no member of the Opposition was on the Committee, and that if we were celebrating the anniversary of the coming into being of the Charter, at least, we should appear to be acting within the principles of the Charter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition is not in any way attempting to contravene Standing Order 26 (ii) where no member is to allude to any debate of the same session upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: This is the same question, Mr. Speaker. We were then considering as part of an omnibus Resolution a Resolution for \$3,000 to celebrate the anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights, and one of the means of celebrating that the Minister mentioned was what we are now doing tonight. As a matter of fact, he said that there would be a Special Meeting of the House of Assembly on the 10th December to celebrate the anniversary. This is not a Special Meeting, but I am not criticising that. At any rate, this is the 10th December. I am speaking

on the same subject. Mr. Speaker, I said then, after the member had promised (*ASIDES*) I wish - even though it is only an aside - before certain people try to correct others, they will know their subject and know what is what. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas hardly ever interrupts a speaker without making, at least, what should be obvious to other hon. members as a mistake as regards alleged knowledge of procedure.

I have been in this House for so many years, and I have learned more and more in the last session than I have ever learned in the past how dogmatically and how often people can urge absolutely wrong things. A part of what I said then was:

"Mr. Chairman, I thought that even at this late hour some reference would have been made especially when the hon. Minister was reading out the names of the Committee of the intention of

It was a suggestion I was putting to them -

"of, at least, consulting the Opposition with regard to some of their proposals."

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind the hon. member of Standing Order 26(12) which states:

"A Member may read from the authorised report of the debates, the report of any speech made in the General Assembly during any previous session."

Is the hon. member reading from a report of any previous session?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is one Order. A member may read anything he has in his hand, and, if it is not a document of the House, he makes it a document of the House by reading it. If I had not said what I had said, but merely come in here purporting to read - there is such profound ignorance about procedure that arises day after day in this House that I am amazed that Your Honour sits here and does not correct it. If I had not said that, and hon. members thought that this was a speech I had written out, then who could object? The only thing that could apply to this is to make it a document of the House. It is already a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is my Ruling. "An hon. member may read from the authorised report of debates, the report of any speech made during any previous session," and which I interpret to mean and deem it to have been intended to mean that he may not read from the authorised report of debates, the report of a speech made during the same session.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: This is not the authorised report; so much so corrections are going into this; this is not the *Official Gazette*. These are notes by the Reporters which, eventually, become the *Official Gazette*.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would deem any report made by the Official Reporters to be the authorised report of a debate.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: What is the *Official Gazette* then, Sir? Is that something different from shorthand notes translated and written out? Your Honour, we on this side of the House have controlled ourselves considerably at some Rulings from the Chair. How long do you think this sort of thing can continue and the House get any respect? What is the meaning of the words "authorised report" but the *Official Gazette*, and nothing else but the *Official Gazette*?

Mr. SPEAKER: The *Official Gazette's* report is the report of the Official Reporters, and that is the only report which should be in the *Official Gazette*, that is, the report of the Official Reporters of the House. That I deem to be the authorised report of the debates.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: So what does Your Honour rule?

An Hon. MEMBER: Go-ahead.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid an hon. member on the floor, seated or otherwise, is not entitled even to attempt to rule by saying "go-ahead."

My Ruling is that neither *Hansard*, which is the printed report, nor the typed report of the Official Reporters comes outside the authorised report of the debates.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: These are Shorthand Reporters' notes, Sir, and nothing else. This has not been published by anybody. How could the word "authorised" be applied to shorthand notes? Suppose I had sat down today and told one of the Reporters: "I think this is what I have said; remind me if I have left anything out", and I had jotted it down and come in here and picked up the paper, are you going to tell me that it is an authorised report?

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course not; but if the hon. member says, as I well and truly understood him to say, that that was the Official Reporters' report, that, so far as I am concerned, is on all fours with the *Hansard*.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: All of this is going down in *Hansard*, and one of these days I am going to quote it to you, Sir. I am going to make an admission now. I have checked up a lot of things in the House of Commons - Rulings in here - and I am going to bring them out in public to show how often things have gone wrong in here uncorrected.
8.45 p.m.

I have spoken to the Clerk of the House of Commons and pointed out to him that the Speaker did so-and-so and asked whether that was right, and it was even pointed out to me that the same thing hap-

pened in the House of Commons and what the ruling of the House of Commons was. I wonder if hon. members of this House think that after all my years of politics and my years in this House, I come in here to say something for the fun of it. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: This is not the House of Commons.) I waste my time when I take notice of a thing like you who has never got over the astounding shock of rising to deal with people on a term of equality whose shoe laces you are not fit to undo. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has never got over the shock of finding himself in the company of people whom he would never ordinarily meet or have any conversation with. Imagine me having to take notice of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas! It is my fault for being in the same House with him! (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You do not understand what it is all about, and you are wasting time.)

I will speak from memory. I pointed out to this House that for the last three months of 1948 I was at the United Nations and took part unfortunately - I use the word "unfortunately"..... (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member for St. Thomas allow the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to proceed? Everything is now in order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, this is non-controversial and the hon. member is making a speech. If he does, I will get up and make a speech also.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may rise and make a speech, but there will be no duet in here. Will the hon. member proceed to make his speech seconding the motion.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is a pity there was no compulsory education when the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was young.

I pointed out that for the last three months of 1948 - this is personal and therefore I regret having to say it - I was at the United Nations unfortunately - I use the word "unfortunately" - as a British delegate and not as a West Indian delegate, and I took part naturally in the British discussion on Human Rights. I did not then remember whether I was present at the actual signing, but on later reflection I thought I could not have forgotten a thing like that, and I realised that I had left a few days shortly before 10th December. "I have seen this long list of names and no member of the Opposition is on it. I am not - I regret because it is somewhat personal to speak like this - asking to be on it. If asked, I would not accept the invitation to be on it, but here are we," I said then, "discussing human rights and not acting in the spirit of the Charter of Human Rights." I make that point even stronger today. Although that was done, no attempt was made.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order,.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If the hon. member does not speak on a point of order, I am going to get up and ask Your Honour to tell the hon. member to sit down; that it is not a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Even the suggestion that, if the hon. member may not be speaking on a point of order the Chair may not realise it is not a point of order, is disrespectful to the Chair. I cannot hear the hon. member for the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have not suggested that. It is notorious that until the Speaker or Chairman hears something, he does not know whether it is a point of order, and that is frequently abused.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would have to hear the point of order and determine whether it is real or alleged.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was making the point that in 1948 he went to France addressing some organisation. I would like to know if that was the time when he went selling out negroes.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. It is in fact fraudulent.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I thought he would have said he went making a sale.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled that that is not a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is not a question of a point of order. That is one of the most insulting, offensive, apart from being unparliamentary, remarks that could be made by any man to another, let alone in an Assembly. I object strongly and call on Your Honour to call on the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I asked a question. I asked if that was the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, will you get the exact words that the hon. member used?

Mr. CLERK furnished to Mr. SPEAKER the words from the Reporter.

I have received from the Official Reporter what he took down as the words used by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, the hon. Minister of Communications and Works. I quote:-

"The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was making the point that in 1948 he went to France addressing some organisation. I would like to know if that was the time when he went selling out negroes."

Now, objection has been taken as being offensive, and in respect of the last sentence "I would like to know if that was the time when he went selling out

negroes", I regard the objection to that as being valid, and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the House. I asked if that was the time.

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order,.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Do you want to take the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER: Aspirants to the Chair may take it in due course, In respect of the words "the time when he went selling out negroes", being offensive, I am asking the hon. member to withdraw that expression.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, if you as Speaker of the House feel that it is offensive and ask me to withdraw it, I will withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I feel it is offensive, and the hon. member has withdrawn. I deem it to have been withdrawn and completely finished with. The debate may proceed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is not completely finished with because if Your Honour accepts that sort of thing as a withdrawal in future, I will strongly object. If you call on me to withdraw, I withdraw. If

you want me to apologise, I apologise. But that is not a withdrawal.

8.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I so rule for either side.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Exactly Sir, that is the point I am making. You have ruled, but you must not do it in future.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Leader of the Opposition understand this; that he may not, he dare not, tell me what I should do in future.

(Cheers, Laughter and Asides).

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. Am I to understand in future that I will see Your Honour shouting at hon. members in the way you are now doing?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am now speaking loudly enough to make it unmistakably clear what I am saying. When I am in the Chair, I rule, and both sides have to obey.

ADJOURNMENT

At this stage, it being now 9 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 9 o'clock p.m., this House now stands adjourned until next Tuesday at 12 o'clock (noon)
9.00 p.m.