

THE
House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 9th September, 1958.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P. (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER; Mr. C. E. TALMA; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor, Papers were laid as follows:-

Hon. M. E. COX for Premier: The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 19 Order, 1958.

Hon. M. E. COX for Premier: Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for four months ended 31st July, 1958.

Mrs. BOURNE entered the House and took her seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. M. E. COX, for Premier: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 19 Order, 1958".

Hon. M. E. COX: for Premier: A Bill to amend the Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) Act, 1937.

Hon. M. E. COX: A Bill to amend the Hotel Aids Act, 1956.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister of Education:

Is it the intention of Government within the current Session to introduce legislation for the purposes of -

- (a) providing free hot mid-day meals for children of public elementary schools in this island?
- (b) providing free secondary education for children whose parents cannot afford to pay for same, and who are likely to benefit from such higher education?

To enquire of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:-

Whether Government has made enquiries, since replying to Questions asked by me (No. 18 of 14. 12. 54, and No. 65 of 11.10. 55), relative to employment of Barbadians resident in the United Kingdom, in the Police Forces of England and Wales?

2. Will the Ministry make active representations in respect of the enrolment in such Forces of Barbadians who are now resident permanently in the United Kingdom?

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:-

A Bill to amend the Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) Act. 1937.

A Bill to amend the Hotel Aids Act, 1956. 12.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement.

"The Government proposes to institute an enquiry into the sugar industry of the Island with the following terms of reference:-

To enquire into the economic state of the sugar industry of the island, and to make recommendations as to-

- (1) the method of remuneration and the wage structure in the industry for (a) field workers, and (b) factory workers;

(2) the establishment of a provident fund for field and factory workers in the industry and the payment of severance pay in appropriate cases;

(3) the price to be paid to the grower for sugar cane.

2. The inquiry will be undertaken by Mr. A. F. Mc. Kenzie, Agricultural Adviser to the Federal Government, and is expected to commence on or about 26th September, 1958.

3. It is proposed, with the approval of the Honourable House, to meet the cost of the inquiry from Head XXXI, Item 18."

I should just like to say that the House will remember that a Resolution for \$2,000 came before it some time ago when we were getting somebody to enquire into the sugar dispute, and provision was made in that Resolution for this inquiry. In view of the fact that the Addendum of the Resolution did not set out clearly the purpose of the vote for this particular item, we just want to make it clear now that the inquiry will be paid for out of the \$2,000 voted by this House earlier this year.

PRIVILEGE re GOVERNOR'S SALARY

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Adjournment of the House, hon. members were debating a breach of privilege. The motion was moved by the hon. junior member for St. John who is not in his place. If hon. members desire to continue the debate on this motion, such a debate takes precedence over all other motions, and hon. members will be indulging in their right to continue.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, since the hon. Mover of this motion spoke on it, and since a very brief debate which took place in this Chamber on that occasion, hon. members will recall having read an explanation which was given by the *Barbados Advocate* in its editorial column, I think it was two days after the motion was made.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that this House generally speaking, cannot take Parliamentary notice of what appears in a newspaper, although there are occasions such as the one which now comes under our notice when some attention has to be paid. As I understand it, the Editor of that newspaper or the person writing for him in the leading column, set out quite clearly what that newspaper and its managers conceived to be the facts. They said quite clearly that the statement complained of came to them by way of a communique handed out from Government Headquarters and they mentioned specifically in that connection the Clerk of the Executive Committee. The story goes on and most of us are familiar with it. The *Advocate* accepted it in good faith as they might have accepted almost any other communique or Press Release coming from such a quarter. Some hon. members may feel, it is true, that in all cases due care and caution are to be exercised by newspaper editors in printing releases from Government sources, not so much because they doubt the authenticity of a particular communiqué, but merely because it is better to be doubly assured that the particular bit of information bears the impress and stamp of authority. In that connection it can of course be argued that the *Advocate* might well have enquired a little further from its own reportorial staff as to whether the statement alleged to have been made in this House had in fact so been made. I find it curious myself to see why an important statement like that - important because it comes from such an alleged source - should not have aroused some enquiry within the newspaper office itself as to why the Reporters on duty in this Chamber on that particular day did not carry it, and I think to that extent, and to that extent alone, the *Advocate* must take full blame.

If an item appears in a newspaper which says that the Premier of Barbados made such and such a statement in the House of Assembly, it is pertinent for the Managers of that paper to see what reason there could be for their staff not reporting it, and I do not think the *Advocate* can

hope to escape censure and blame for not enquiring long before this House made a protest why it was that the particular statement or the report of it was not taken, so to speak, from the Horse's mouth; I mean no offence, of course. If, Mr. Speaker, that is accepted by this House, you can see therefore, that part of the blame must lie there; part, but not all. I think the most serious portion of the blame must lie with the Government itself, and particularly with that Department of Government which has the duty of releasing statements to the Press. I do not know how it is done; I do not know whether it is done through the Chief Secretary, or whether an individual Minister directs his staff to issue statements; I do not think the method of doing it is very relevant here.

12.35 p.m.

What is relevant here is that the Cabinet is comprised - we are speaking of something which happened about two weeks ago - of six Ministers, five of whom at that period were members of this Honourable House. It is inconceivable that the Cabinet Secretariat which includes, as I must imagine, the Clerk of the Executive Committee and the Cabinet Secretary, even if it were instructed to issue such a statement and to pass it on to the Press, would not as a matter of routine check either with the Clerk of the House of Assembly or indeed with the Minister - and, perhaps, it might even also be relevant to the issue in view of what happened subsequently that the Cabinet Secretary or the Clerk of the Executive Committee, again as a matter of caution, would say to the Premier: "Well, Sir, I am instructed to issue the Statement made by you to the Press on Thursday. Would you just look it over and see if it is in order and whether it substantiates your views and whether it is the exact text of what you said?" If not to the Hon. Premier, it should have been done to the Ministers or Minister concerned.

The serious aspect of this matter is this, Mr. Speaker. It is not that the Statement was prepared for the Premier to be read by him and that he forgot, neglected or otherwise omitted to make it. We may have our private judgment and comment to pass on that and we might ask in passing, how did it happen that a statement of such importance which was prepared for him, perhaps by his own direction, should have been ignored by him? We can also ask this which gives more ground for our charges. You said that the Premier himself neglected to make the Statement. That was not drawn to the attention of the Cabinet Office or whatever Department it is whose duty it would have been in the normal course of events to release it to the Press; therefore you can forgive the *Advocate* for printing it in good faith although they cannot escape their share of the blame. You can also forgive the Hon. Premier for choosing not to make the Statement prepared for him if he judged that the statement was not propitious; but you cannot forgive everybody connected with him in the Cabinet Secretariat for not consulting one with the other to decide whether any check should not be made, and you certainly cannot forgive the Hon. Premier for not making it clear since he has not made the Statement that the routine publication of it was to be held up. I think that is the crux of the matter and when you take this aspect of it into consideration you can see that there is some reason for the motion that the House considers it a breach of privilege.

Look at the matter from the House's point of view. See what an unfortunate trend of events has been set into motion. Imagine the Government Printer seeing perhaps for the first time on Thursday or Friday of last week, or having it drawn to his notice, that statement made in the House by the Premier (assuming that this House or individual members had not noticed the discrepancy) and by its being published in the records of the newspaper as having taken place! Imagine the Government Printer receiving the transcript of the debates of this House of that date and feeling that that part of the debates or the record of that statement had been inadvertently left out and therefore deeming that it was his duty to put it in. That is a situation which could well have arisen. After all, he is not to know that there was inadvertence or wilful neglect on somebody's part; therefore you could not blame him for that. His sense of duty and zeal, if he had any, would

make him want to include it in the records of the House and he would be within his right senses to do so as nobody had said anything and nobody had raised any argument that it had been wittingly or unwittingly left out. He perhaps would have said to himself: "Here is my chance to put the records straight by including it in the debates," and he could not be blamed for it. It would not have been a rash act on his part; it would be quite within his terms of duty to see that the records have everything in them. Sir, had that unfortunate circumstance come to pass, the records of this House would have suffered distortion because they would have included an instance which in fact had not taken place, and that is the heart and substance of the breach of privilege - the fact that something was put in the records as having taken place in this House when in fact it had not taken place.

The motion therefore is based on this consideration. It is not enough for the Government or for the *Advocate* to say that they are sorry although both parties might have quite possibly a good excuse for the inadvertence, because this kind of thing is the sort of thing that, first of all, should not happen at all; but even if it happened it should certainly not happen more than once and it should serve as a warning both to the newspaper and to the Cabinet Secretariat and to the Ministers both individually and collectively, to challenge for its authenticity everything which is to be published in the newspaper or to be issued over the broadcast to see whether such statement is based substantially on anything that has taken place in this House.

With respect to the Statement itself, there is another aspect of it which is equally serious. At the end of the Statement, the Premier is reported as having said that the change foreshadowed in the particular bit of legislation would involve an amendment to the Letters Patent. May I remind you that in the Statement that is stated; but to do the Hon. Premier justice, and to keep the record straight, at no time during that debate when the Hon. Premier took part in it did he mention anything at all about possible changes in the Letters Patent. It was the hon. junior member for St. John, the initiator of this motion, who made mention of the fact that the particular proposed legislation could not in fact become law because of that constitutional difficulty. You get the second distortion arising out of that statement. The first is that the Hon. Premier made the Statement and the second comes at the end of the Statement when ideas and opinions are written in the alleged statement which in fact had never been spoken by the person alleged to have made the Statement to the House. That is a very serious thing. The *Advocate* cannot be blamed for that except of course to the extent of wondering whether they did not feel it strange that their Reporters carried nothing about that at all.
12.45 p.m.

How can a Statement be prepared to be issued - it has not been issued, but released - with that distortion incorporating in it an opinion which was never in the mouth of the person in whose name the Statement is being issued? Here again, that would distort the records of the House, because a Statement issued on the date on which it was alleged to have been issued would have been issued after the debate had taken place, and had it been printed in the *Official Gazette*, it would have given the impression that the Government had had its own mind made up about the particular issue and had reached its conclusions apart from anything which had been previously said. In my opinion, that would have constituted a distortion of the records.

A breach of privilege of this House or indeed of any Legislature, is a serious matter and hon. members would have been doing less than justice to themselves if they regarded it as being a routine party matter on which the House should be divided, the majority holding one view and the minority holding another view. By its very nature, Mr. Speaker, a breach of privilege must affect the whole House. It may well be that last week it was a Statement released alleging that it had been made by the Premier in the House; and a little time from now we could easily have a similar case occurring in which the Government

or any Minister or member of the Opposition, or Your Honour or any member of this House, for that matter, could very well be involved. Our attitude in any such case should always be the same. I can quite see that the Ministers of the Government may feel a little uncomfortable about supporting this motion, because they may argue that, in some way, it reflects upon them. If the truth must be told, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid it does reflect upon them.

There is a part of the blame which they cannot escape, however lenient a view we may take of it. Their part is just this: the whole issue discloses quite clearly that there is apparently no firm guiding principle existing in the Government Secretariat itself as to the principle on which public statements are issued, especially statements which deal with high policy.

For the future - they should know their business better than anybody else - but it would be the best thing for them if some firm rule could be laid down that the Clerk of the Executive Committee must not, on any account, even in routine matters which involve this House, do anything or issue any statement unless he first consults with the relevant Minister or with the Premier himself. Any statement which is issued by a Minister of the Government, however controversial it may be, so long as it does not involve the House as a House, even if it is inaccurate, cannot possibly affect this House; it may affect individual members of the House, but not the House so long as that statement is not alleged to have been made in the House. We do not say that the Government need do anything more than they do about their general policy statements which can be made without affecting anybody in here, but policy statements reflecting Government's point of view when the House is involved, ought to be scrutinised very, very carefully indeed.

The third thing which I want to say is this: the newspaper made great play, as I understand it, of the fact that the Opposition did not wait for the facts before moving the motion. I think that it is the greatest impertinence on the Editor's part, even to suggest that. No newspaper should be able to tell us how to do anything and to what degree any hon. member should conduct his parliamentary business; but in this particular case, the impudence is even more startling. The nature of the facts or of the case was such that we had to move the motion of privilege; we had to do that, in order to get at the facts. Neither the Hon. Premier nor any of the Ministers was in a position last Tuesday to shed any light on the matter, and I feel that, although I detected a certain unnecessary apprehension on the part of the Premier and I believe of the Minister of Trade, yet at the same time, they could not know the facts until they themselves found out in their own offices how the Statement had been sent out. Therefore, neither the Opposition nor the Government in this one instance could be blamed for speaking without knowing the facts, because the facts could not be given from any quarter in the House. The facts had to come from the office of the *Advocate* and the text of the motion was that the Editor be requested to explain the source of the Statement; therefore, to argue that the Opposition should wait for the facts is to beg the same question which we are setting out to prove. That is why we reject emphatically and categorically the suggestion that we should have waited for the facts before moving the motion.

Finally, in supporting this motion, I should like to draw to the attention of all hon. members of this House how very careful we ought to be or how much we ought to guard the privileges of this House. Some hon. members seem to think that these matters are small; they may think that since the *Advocate* has published what it calls an explanation showing how they came to publish that statement, that that suffices. I do not take that view. You can overlook, if you wish to do so, individual negligences and omissions because, individually, they do not amount to much; but taking the matter together, you cannot escape the conclusion that this House has been very wrongly served and very roughly used when it appears in print that something has taken place in here when, in

fact, it has not taken place, and each hon. member must ask himself or herself how best we can avoid a repetition of that unfortunate and disreputable episode.
12.55 p.m.

Where the blame lies, let it lie; but I think the whole House, as a House, ought to make sure that it does not happen again. So strongly do I feel on it that I find myself standing and speaking in support of the motion moved by the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when we debated this matter, one of the Ministers moved an amendment, and in moving that amendment, the Minister justified it by saying that he was not going to be caught in a trap. Now I should like to say

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I should like the hon. member to quote me correctly. I am not a rat to be caught in a trap.

Mr. WALCOTT: Maybe a trap is the most applicable thing to describe you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot be addressing hon. members. I distinctly heard the hon. member say "maybe a trap is the most applicable thing to describe you". When he used those words, I could not imagine he was speaking to me as Speaker of this House; he must have been addressing some hon. member in this Chamber. The hon. member must not address hon. members in that way, but must always only be addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, from you now, when the hon. member got up and made the statement he made, what you said as to the accuracy of it. What did you say when he crossed me?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will sit. I had no reason to say anything when the hon. member rose to make a correction; so if the hon. member thinks he is censuring me, he is sadly mistaken. The hon. member will now continue to address the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the censureship of any member of this Chamber comes from the electorate. The hon. member rose to deny something he said on the last occasion and ended by saying he was not a rat to be caught in a trap. If the hon. member says he is not a rat to be caught in a trap, my reply is that maybe a trap is applicable to the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to make it clear to the hon. member that whenever he is addressing the Chair, he will confine his remarks to the Chair, and if he uses the second personal-pronoun "you" after an hon. member has spoken, I must naturally take it that he is addressing that hon. member and not the Chair. That is all I am trying to make him understand and nothing else.

Mr. WALCOTT: I appreciate your lessons, Mr. Speaker, on how I should address hon. members. I started off by addressing the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member need not try to get away from it. When the hon. member said "you", was he addressing the Chair? This House knows that he was not then addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get away from anything. Thieves have to get away from things. If you rule on something, I bow to your ruling; so it is not a question of getting away from anything. What have I got to get away from when the privileges of the House have been abused?

I repeat that on the last occasion when this matter was being debated the hon. member said that he was not going to be caught in a trap by voting for something he did not know. Those words were used by the hon. member whether or not he likes them.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I again state emphatically that I never said anything about being caught in a trap, and I am definitely sure that the records of this House can show that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to prevent an hon. member from getting up subsequently and denying which he thought he did not say; there is no Rule against that; but what I am saying is that when the motion was made, the hon. member said that he was not voting for the motion made by the hon. junior member for St. John because he did not know what was written, and he was not going to be caught in a trap. What did he mean when he said that he did not want to be caught in a trap? It is quite an understandable phrase; if something is done and you are not clear about it, you should not support it until it is made clear to you; but if someone takes offence at what I regard as ordinary terms, it does not matter to me. What matters to me now is that a statement was made with the allegation that the Premier had made it in this House. Whether or not the Ministers like it, or whether it was a statement they would have liked the Premier to have made, is beside the point; the fact is that a statement was made in the newspaper to the effect that the Premier had made it in this House. Hon. members felt that that was not a true statement and the communiqué stated that it was made in the House, which is not true.

I agree with the hon. member for St. Lucy that what has aggravated the matter is that the same newspaper in its editorial columns, did not apologise for making the statement, which in truth and in fact was not made in the House; but if there is anybody who is hiding behind anything, it is the newspaper hiding behind the communiqué which came from the Government purporting to be a statement made in this House and that the Editor of the newspaper is duty-bound to publish it. Unlike the hon. senior member for the City who spoke on the last occasion, I do not care how high up or low down it came from; as long as I am a member of this House, I do not care who is offended by anything I say in here; it is absolutely immaterial to me who is offended by what I say. If the amendment was made by the Minister to shelter them from blame, I am not going to be party to that especially after their impertinent statement to the effect that we have no right to discuss something in here which in our judgment is a matter of privilege, as if when we come here we have to wait on the *Advocate's* columns to decide what is a breach of privilege. It may suit Government to wait until such time, because it is like Fascist Italy where you have a system of the people getting together to form a coalition to perpetuate their own power.
1.05 p.m.

I do not want to tell any person how to utilise their powers nor am I attempting to usurp the powers of anybody, but as a member of this House I have a perfect right to discuss this matter. What has been proven to be a fact now is that this thing has reached the stage where some person in the Government Department has asked some member of the Government to make a Statement and that shows the type of people whom we are dealing with in this island. That Statement which was supposed to have been made in this House was not made but was published in the *Advocate*. It shows that the type of people with whom we are dealing will go to the extent of lying and making a statement which they know was not made in the House of Assembly at all. I do not care who the Government Official is. Whoever is that Government Official that can take orders to send something to a newspaper when he knows that its substance is not true, he can commit a criminal offence too. No public servant is in duty bound to carry out something which he knows is not correct. Can you tell somebody to do something which you know is wrong and compel them to do it? Here is a public servant saying that something was done in the House of Assembly which he knew did not take place. Along with that, the *Advocate* or the controlling elements of the newspaper did not check with their Reportorial Staff to see whether such a thing had taken place. Sometimes you hear the remark in here that you are talking to the Press or to the Gallery. If the Ministers would not

talk for the Press or the Gallery to hear them, then you can say that it is unfortunate that the Press did not hear what was said and, may be, if you put somebody on oath it may be proved that the Statement might have been made but the Reporter of the newspaper did not hear it. You can very well see that one can go through a long examination on the point that one did not hear it. You can get these things happening if you go to court.

Sir, what we in this House know is that no such statement was made at all and the Hon. Premier himself said that no such statement was made by him. What is very regrettable is that on the front page of the daily newspaper you have in very bold print that this statement was made. So far as I am concerned, as an individual it would not matter to me if something was printed afterwards in the Press which was not spoken in the House but I am not in here in the capacity of an individual. I am here to represent a constituency, and in this General Assembly it does matter if a Statement purported to have been made by the senior Cabinet representative in the person of the Hon. Premier appears in print, but really in truth and in fact such a Statement was not made by him.

What the hon. senior member for St. Lucy said is something with which anyone must agree and that is that such a Statement is likely to have found its way into the Hansard of this Island and nobody would be able to say how it got there. I too can see that the independence of people who work in the Public Service is challenged. In this very Chamber attempts are made by Ministers to do things in this House with respect to its administration which happen not to be their business whatsoever, and when you get a situation like that, you do not know what else is going to happen.

I will go further and say that the Statement which was alleged to be made by the Hon. Premier and the last article published by the *Advocate* on that matter were more or less adding insult to injury. Not only has the *Advocate* not apologised for making the Statement which they know was not true, but in that leading article they have gone on record saying that we have no right to discuss it, which means that they are free to publish anything as long as these statements come from the Government and that there is no breach of privilege as far as this House is concerned.

Sir, I think the time has come when this House being a separate part of the constitution of this island should be indicated. This House is one part of the constitution of this island, the Other Place is another, the Cabinet in recent times is another and the Governor another, therefore, if anything takes place at the Government Headquarters, Bay Street, which infringes on the privileges of this House, every hon. member of this Chamber has a right to get up and speak on it.

I feel today that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy did not go as far as he should when he was dealing with the *Advocate* and I am speaking as regards what they published in the leading article of their Sunday newspaper. That is the sort of thing which we have to stand up against and I intend to stand up against such editorials because the Editor did not set about to make it quite clear that the Statement which was published by them gave a wrong interpretation of what had taken place in the House and therefore constituted a breach of privilege of this House.

Now, Sir, no member of the Government has said that this was done in error or that it was not intended as it turned out to be; but, like the *Advocate*, the attitude of the Government seems to be that this was a statement which somebody raised in the House of Assembly and the Ministry went as far as to say that they are not going to be caught in a trap. Well, Sir, I am very glad that nobody was caught in a trap but the only body who seems to be caught in a serious trap is the whole House because it seems to me as if we are gradually surrendering our rights to a newspaper. It seems to be working under the idea that because you put certain people on a Board or two, it automatically means that those people are part of the

Government and therefore any criticism of the Government means a criticism of themselves. Sir, I am satisfied in my mind that this statement came from Government Headquarters at Bay Street and therefore the Government should make an apology for it. The *Advocate* newspaper unfortunately has not made any apology for publishing it; their whole attitude being, as was stated, that they do not have to say from what source they got it, and even they went as far as to say that we have no right to deal with the matter. They said in words like these: why should we worry with this matter? And it is on those grounds that I voice my disapproval. As I have said, I hold no brief for the *Advocate* newspaper or for the Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I have said on the last occasion when the motion was made for the vote of censure - and incidentally I am speaking on the amended motion - I would be rather reluctant to vote for the vote of censure because I felt myself then that responsible people like the Editor of the *Advocate* newspaper would not have published such a statement without checking it. 1.15 p.m.

Apparently, it has turned out that I was right. Now, what is most reprehensible in this entire matter is the fact that this is a Statement which appeared in the Press purporting to have been made by the Premier, and the Premier himself on the floor of this House gave the lie to the Press by saying that he never made that Statement. Then, of course, the right of hon. members came into play and that is the right to raise the question of privilege, which Your Honour rightly allowed, so as to find out how that Statement got into the Press. I said then that I felt that rather than have a vote of censure, the *Advocate* be called upon to find out whence the statement came - I reminded hon. members that it was still the right of a newspaper not to disclose the source of its information or the source of the writer, whether it is under a nom-de-plume, or otherwise, of an article. Since then, we have discovered in an article in the Press which is really not an apology but a part of what we called for up to a point, that is; "Will you tell us where you got this information from?" I think that it has been made quite clear by the Editorial in the *Advocate* that that information came from the Clerk of the Executive Committee. It was made clear that the *Advocate* understood that the Statement had been made by the Premier in the House on a particular date and it had not been published.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter, in the course of his remarks, wondered whether the *Advocate* had checked with its Reportorial Staff. I understand from the highest authority that they did check with the Reportorial Staff and they discovered that the Statement was not made, or at least it was not made with any of the Reporters present. However, it is possible, as has happened on several occasions, that Statements can be made or might be made in the House when the Reporters of the *Advocate* or other Press Reporters have changed late at night, or early in the Session before the Reporters come in to the House. As a member of this House, I am accepting the view that the newspaper published the Statement purporting to have been made in this House in good faith and they accepted it from such a high authority as the Clerk of the Executive Committee. I accept the view, I repeat, that the *Advocate* published the Statement in good faith. I feel that whether it was the *Advocate* or any other newspaper, the newspaper could say: "These are the facts; we got this Statement and we published in good faith. It was not brought in to us from the street, but as a result of a telephone call requesting that the statement be published and as a result of a statement in writing from the Clerk of the Executive Committee, we published that statement".

I should like to say that I have not got to defend the *Advocate*. I do not agree with the Editorial in the *Advocate* where somebody has allowed them to blind themselves to what was justice. It is the right of hon. members if something purporting to be said in the House and it was

not said - it is the right of hon. members to question how that Statement got into the Press. Nobody will take that right from me. For the Editorial to end on that note could only be so stupid and impertinent that it would tend to prejudice the whole situation. What newspaper Editor, seeing this note written from the Clerk of the Executive Committee, would not have published that statement in good faith? Let us assume that as a result of the debate in this House - and there were certain confusing statements made by the Premier and other Ministers over there; one Minister was saying under what circumstances a Governor could get his salary. Some of them said that he would get it from the time he got on the boat or plane and others said that no Governor could receive the salary until he arrived in this Island. I can quite see the reason for this statement and above all, I would like to say that at no time did any member of the Government make any reference to the Letters Patent. It was the hon. junior member for St. John who made a statement about the Letters Patent. If hon. members are not altogether acquainted with the facts of a Resolution or a Bill, or anything which they are putting forward and they make a statement, though not wilfully misleading the House, I think it is something to be admired if they would come back to the House and correct that statement.

This statement which appeared in the *Advocate* came from the highest authority - the Clerk of the Executive Committee. If it is an offence to publish that statement, I would say that the *Advocate* published the statement in good faith, because they can produce in writing the fact that the statement came from the Clerk of the Executive Committee. What is more reprehensible than anything else, however, is that the Premier said that he did not make that statement. Both the Premier and the Clerk of the Executive Committee are housed in the same building. A meeting of this House was held on Thursday night; neither on Friday nor on Saturday, did anything appear in the Press about this statement. It is assumed that the Premier attends his office every day unless he is ill. No statement was made that the Premier was ill or that he was out of the Island. Let me show where the irresponsibility is; my criticism is not that of a young man who must do what the Chief Secretary or some of the Ministers tell him to do. What else could Mr. Blackman do if he is told by the Chief Secretary or a Minister: "Get this Statement published in the *Advocate*". In the same building where everybody is housed, what happens? They telephone the *Advocate* saying that the Premier made this statement; if there had been any honesty of purpose, could they not have asked the Premier: "Did you really make this statement"? Can you think of anything pointing to a greater lack of honesty and a wilful disregard for the rights and integrity of this House?

1.25 p.m.

The Premier is in the same building and is seen by the Chief Secretary and other Ministers. I have no doubt that it was suggested to him that the statement should be made in the House. Would to God, Sir, that when misleading statements, though not wilfully, are made by any Minister and it is discovered that they are wrong, that such an attempt would be made on other occasions to clarify them, because I remember well when the hon. junior member for St. John made reference to the fact about not amending the Laws until you had amended the Letters Patent, everybody over there laughed and sneered at him. What is worse is that not one person went to the Premier and asked whether he had made the statement, but they sent it down to the *Advocate* saying that it was made.

Do you know whom we have to condemn here today, Sir? Let me say here and now that we cannot condemn Mr. Blackman, the Clerk of the Executive Committee; he could not have done it. It was the Chief Secretary or the Acting Chief Secretary who telephoned the *Advocate* to get this statement made. The Premier should have made the statement given to him, but his senior staff realised that although the Premier is not a very able politician, at least he shows signs of integrity and honesty. I can understand why he did not make that statement; he made a conflicting statement before and he could not contradict

himself in the phraseology which they used. I would not be surprised if the Premier made a statement saying that he was asked to make this statement, but that he was not prepared to use the phraseology which they used and therefore did not make it. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, what we have to be careful about and what is likely to happen is that had it not been seen by any of us, it might have got into the Hansard, because if people in responsible positions can be dishonest enough to send a statement to the *Advocate* saying that it was made, it is not impossible that they would try to get it into Hansard.

I feel that the explanation made by the *Advocate* is one which we should accept, with the exception of the end of it. No matter how people may feel about individuals, justice must prevail and you cannot allow prejudice to rule the mind in publishing a matter of this sort. There is no need to censure anybody here, and I want to say, like the hon. member for St. Peter, that neither the *Advocate* nor any other paper however much they may criticise me, will cow me into giving away my rights or expressing my views on the floor of this House. Anybody who takes upon himself the right to say that we should not criticise this matter, that it would be a waste of time or that we would be making a mountain out of a mole hill is either rude or dishonest. Suppose it was something reflecting the dignity of the Chair, would you have no right to question it? When the hon. member for St. John said that you could not amend the Law until you had amended the Letters Patent, everybody over there sneered and jeered like hyenas. I am not voting for the motion to censure the *Advocate* because I accept their explanation. What were they to do with a statement coming from the highest authority? The Clerk of the Executive Committee sent them something, but whom are we to censure? Mr. Blackman sent this statement to the *Advocate* saying that it was published in the House. The Hon. Premier was not in St. Lucia; he was not at Bathsheba, and even if he were they could have telephoned him; he was in the same office. Is it not a direct attempt (a) to undermine his authority and (b) to be dishonest about what transpired in this House? We have to censure those who are responsible for doing it. Like the hon. member for St. Peter, I would say that if they do that, they are capable of doing anything. As soon as people are vested with a little authority, they apparently lose all sense of balance and responsibility.

I cannot imagine, Sir, that the Committee will vote to censure the *Advocate* if we accept in good faith that they published it as coming from the highest authority. We do criticise the Editorial, however, for having the temerity to tell us that we should not question a matter of this sort. I have been in here long enough to know, Sir, that unless you watch things carefully - and this is no reflection upon the Reporters or anybody else - you will get things creeping into the Hansard that never happened in this House. We have seen attempts made here, and you have been very strong over the interference or insertion of anything in the debates. I am not interested in seeing any report of what I have said. The fact remains that I have been elected here and that I did not pretend to be a schoolmaster, an English scholar or a historian; I told them that I was an ordinary citizen, so I am not one of those pretentious fools who want to walk around. I will not vote for censuring or for a Committee. I feel that the people who should be censured are those who sent down the statement, because they had ample opportunity for checking it. The Chief Secretary and the Minister had sufficient time to check with the Premier whether he had made the statement and find out why it was not published. I cannot imagine the Reporters in this Island leaving out a statement; sometimes statements are made at the beginning of the meeting, but Your Honour grants the right to make them at other times during the meeting; therefore the *Advocate* acted in good faith. I am not speaking in defence of the *Advocate* or any other newspaper, but can you imagine the Clerk of the Executive Committee issuing a statement and the newspapers not publishing it? The Hon. Premier realised that his authority was being undermined and that he was being used as a puppet Premier. You want to run him around like a marionette instead of

allowing him to put it in his own language. I do not blame him.

I am not supporting the motion of censure, neither am I voting for a Committee to go into this matter, which was raised to let the Government know that the Opposition was wide awake. We want the Government and the *Advocate* to know that they must take no chances in allowing things to appear in the paper, because there are those of us who, although we do not take everything we read in the newspaper, read certain things and do not let them pass us.

1.35 p.m.

We want them to know that we had implicit faith in the Clerk and the Reporters of this House. When all of us on this side questioned them as to whether the statement was made in this House and they said no and there was no statement in the Minutes to show that such a statement was made, there was no alternative for the Hon. Premier to do than to get up and say that he did not make that statement. He could say nothing else nor nothing else could be said. Sir, I hope a thing like this will never occur again and I hope that Your Honour will always from that Chair support the rights and privileges of this House. Sir, the position might have been the reverse in two ways. This is no criticism of the Opposition; this is a criticism of this Honourable House.

The *Advocate* has shown us its responsibility. It has been able to show us that they had done no wrong and that they got this statement from the nearest if not the highest authority. Sir, I am not supporting the motion for the vote of censure because the *Advocate* has given an explanation. I think that it is sufficient that it goes into the records of this House that we deplore the idea of the Government officials not checking when they had opportunity to do so before putting a statement like that in the *Advocate*. It is not merely their causing that statement to be published when it was not made on the floor of this House but they could have done something which might well have undermined your dignity in the Chair by not checking up on statements. Sir, I also think that no hon. member in this House can be blamed; the person to whom you should attach the blame is the person in the particular Government Department, if he is Mr. Blackman, who caused this statement to be published in the *Advocate* before checking on it to see if it was made by the Hon. Premier.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, the amended motion proposed by the hon. senior member for St. Michael seems to me to have this disadvantage that it recommends the appointment of a Committee of the House to consider an alleged breach of privilege and report what action should be taken thereon, but in view of what I believe is the considered opinion of every hon. member of this Chamber and from the statement pronounced from the Chair at the last meeting that there is no question of it being an alleged breach of privilege but beyond all reasonable doubt, it constitutes a breach of privilege of this House; therefore, if we are satisfied that a breach of privilege has been so committed and as we have had our experience of Committees of this House being appointed but no action taken, and with our experience of these Committees and the length of the time they take to report and the fact that we soon are going into recess, I do not think that the appropriate step to be taken on this occasion in respect of this breach of privilege is to refer it to a Committee and for that Committee to recommend the action to be taken.

So far as this particular newspaper is concerned, it cannot escape censure because it is the only daily newspaper of this island and throughout the proceedings of this Chamber, from the beginning to the end, there are one or more representatives of the newspaper reporting and they were in a position to say whether or not this statement had been made or whatever else had taken place during the day in this Chamber. It, therefore, was the duty of the authorities of this newspaper when they received this statement from the Government Headquarters

to check up with their newspaper reporters and if they had any confidence in them to ascertain whether or not the statement was in truth and in fact made. As I have said, they always have one or more reporters continuously on duty.

In consequence, I am going to propose as an amendment to the motion proposed by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the Deputy Premier, the following:—"That the publication on page 5, column 5 of the issue of the *Barbados Advocate* newspaper dated 2nd September, 1958, under the caption: "Governor Gets Half Salary on Embarkation" constitutes a breach of privilege of this Hon. House." That, Sir, is my motion. We have in effect put on record that the publication was a breach of privilege of this Chamber and as this is the first of this offence of which we have taken cognisance, we just put on record that a breach of privilege has taken place but woe be it to that newspaper if it makes a second breach of privilege.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Sir, I take pleasure in seconding the amendment moved by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. I do not know if I am in place to speak on it but it is a fact that there was a breach of privilege and there is no doubt about it whether our tempers rise or fall. However, I do not think any member in this Hon. House can tolerate, condone or in any way approve of a breach of privilege of this House; therefore, we shall never do it. I do accept the criticism that in this particular debate there was confusion. I take it that this statement was a kind of clarification. If it were for clarification, let it have the right kind of communication. Let us just decide that it was a breach of privilege and I do not think that we need to take into account whether the *Advocate* was right or wrong.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, before you put the question, I just want to say this. On the last occasion when this matter was being discussed, I said then that I was not prepared to accept the motion as it stood when it was made by the hon. junior member for St. John and I went further and said that to my mind it merely wanted to enquire the source from which this statement was made. I think I was justified in saying that and more particularly since I have listened to the speech made by the hon. senior member for the City. He is not prepared to censure the *Advocate* for the publication but he is censuring the Government or some of the Civil Servants or the Chief Secretary.

Of course, the crux of the thing is as was spoken by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy when he said that the hon. junior member for St. John brought out something which no Minister brought out during the debate that has sort of cleared the air by his pointing out that the Letters Patent would have to be changed before we carry out this Bill or before it could be put into force. I regret that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was not here or perhaps was not listening when the Bill to amend the Governor's Act was being debated, otherwise he would not have made the statement which he made just now.

1.45 p.m.

Now, Sir, I should like to say that if there was confusion of the interpretation of what we were saying on this side of the House, the confusion was on that side. I particularly stated, in support of the Premier's motion, that we would not be paying three salaries, as was suggested or remarked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. I pointed out and I made it crystal clear that the Governor Designate would only receive salary when he got aboard the boat or the plane, and he would be paid one-half the salary until he landed here.

The report states exactly what we said. The Chief Secretary would be drawing full pay. As soon as the Governor is on leave and the Chief Secretary -----

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Is the Hon. Minister in order to go back and discuss in detail a matter which has already been dealt with in the House? Is he in

order to go back and say what he said then? Is the hon. member permitted to do that?

Hon. M. E. COX: I quite understand why the hon. member has interrupted me, but he forgets that the hon. senior member for the City has referred to exactly that to which I am now referring.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is only interrupting me.

Mr. WALCOTT: I only want to show you the net result of that, but I will leave the matter to Your Honour.

Hon. M. E. COX: The only thing which was not referred to from this side of the House was the question of amending the Letters Patent. We had put the position as clearly as possible; we made it crystal clear that the Governor would receive his full salary only -----

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise to a point of order. For the last couple of weeks we have been sitting for a lot of things from that side of the House. On every occasion that I have risen on a point of order there is objection from that side of the House. I want to know what Rule permits the Hon. Minister to continue something which has already been disposed of.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my right and privilege to give hon. members as much latitude as possible and to pull them up when I feel that they have had sufficient latitude. I have always done that during my tenure of office. That holds good for the hon. senior member for St. Peter. On the other hand, I think I have given the Hon. Minister a reasonable latitude in this matter; the Hon. Minister must not be making what has already been dealt with a point of debate at this stage.

Hon. M. E. COX: I appreciate that. I should just like to say that the only addition which was not made to what we said on this side of the Table as regards the position of a Governor who goes on leave or as regards a Governor who gets on a boat or plane to come to Barbados or the person who acts as Governor --- the only thing which we did not say was that the Letters Patent would be changed. We presumed that that was something which was not for us; our duty was to get the Bill passed and it was then a matter for Her Majesty to change the Letters Patent.

As regards the motion which is before the House, I have considered it, and after consultation with other members of my Party, I will say that we would be willing to agree to the amendment, but not on the same ground as that on which the hon. senior member for the City spoke at all. We do not accept anything which he has said along the lines on which he has spoken. We are not here to censure any Governor or any Civil Servant for committing any breach; we cannot do that. This is the ground on which I am prepared to support the amendment made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy; that it is the duty and the sole responsibility of any newspaper to make sure, before it publishes anything, that what it publishes is correct and that the publication is actually what happened.

We will all agree that there was a misunderstanding; we also agree that it was nothing which was done wilfully and that it was just one of those mistakes which any normal human being would make. It is therefore on that ground alone that we are prepared to agree to this very mild motion. I repeat, however, that it is not that the Government or any servant of the Government has done anything wrong; that Statement was one which the Premier was to have made but he did not make it. All the nonsense which was talked as to why the Premier did not make the Statement was not correct at all. That Statement was not made and the *Advocate* newspaper should have made sure that the Statement was made in the House before it made that publication. The newspaper should have made sure that the Premier did, in fact, make that Statement in the

House before publishing it, even if the Government Department concerned had sent the Statement to the newspaper. All the *Advocate* had to say beforehand was this: "We have nothing from the Clerk of the House or any official record to show that this Statement was made in the House and therefore we are not prepared to publish it." In that case, nobody could do the *Advocate* anything for not publishing that Statement. As far as I can see, it was the duty of the *Advocate* to make sure that the Statement was actually made in the House before publishing it.
1.55 p.m.

Again I differ from the hon. senior member for the City, and I feel that the amendment made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the Leader of the Opposition meets this particular case, and therefore, Sir, we on this side are prepared to support it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the amendment made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that we regard this matter as a breach of privilege, I would not have spoken again if the hon. member did not make reference to the fact that we cannot criticise or censure any Civil Servant.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I did not say we cannot criticise; anybody can criticise. I said we cannot censure anybody.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know what the hon. member thinks he can do, but I know what I can do. Let us analyse his argument very carefully. The hon. member said I was not going to vote for censuring because I was defending the *Advocate*. If last week we said he was defending the *Advocate* he would not have liked that. The hon. member said that the *Advocate* went wrong and that they should have first found out whether or not the statement was made in here when it went to them. The *Advocate* said that they received the statement from the Clerk to the Executive Committee, but the hon. member says that is not good enough, and they should not have published it without finding out from the Reporters and the Clerk of the House. The Clerk of the Executive Committee is closely associated with the Premier, because he works in the same building with him everyday. Was it not his duty to find out from him whether the statement was made? It was the *Advocate's* duty to find out after Mr. Blackman told them it was made and asked them to publish it, but let me say that I am not defending the *Advocate* nor am I criticising Mr. Blackman. I hope that the *Advocate* will publish that the hon. member said that they should publish anything that comes from the Governor-in-Executive Committee, so high an authority.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was talking about anything that is brought before the Legislature. I am not saying that they should not publish any statement from the Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member qualified it. If a statement comes from the Premier or from the Clerk of the Executive Committee, it is the duty of the *Advocate* to check it. Isn't the hon. member being grossly unfair to attempt that with the Clerk of the Executive Committee, who is Clerk or Assistant Clerk to the Cabinet over which the Premier presides? You cannot assume that because they prepared a statement and gave it to the Premier that it was made, and I am saying, Sir, that the way the motion is worded constitutes a breach of privilege. I think anybody would pass this motion because (a) the statement was published in the paper, and (b) it was not made in the House and therefore is a breach of privilege; but I am not going to vote for this on the same grounds as the Hon. Minister. He is voting for a breach of privilege purely because although it came from the Executive Committee, it was the duty of the *Advocate* to find out whether it was made, but he accepts no blame for those persons who sent it to the *Advocate*. The hon. member accepts no blame for the Clerk of the Executive Committee or the Chief Secretary, but he wants to say that we cannot censure anybody. Who cannot censure anybody? Do you mean that hon. members sitting over there cannot censure anybody?

Do you mean to say that I got elected here and I cannot censure anybody in here? The hon. member forgets his censuring and criticism of members in here, and that he has practically run people out of here. The hon. member wants to claim that everything that was said in the statement was said in the House except for the point about the Letters Patent. If that was done, why did you prepare a Statement for the Premier to put in the paper? Hon. members over there confused themselves over the matter, and I remember that in reply the Minister of Communications said that the Governor on retirement would get his salary and the Governor Designate would get his salary as soon as he got aboard the ship. When the Hon. Minister of Trade said that, I got up and said that if that was so, then we did not need an amendment because that applies to every Civil Servant.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I did not say that the Governor would get his salary; I said he would get half his salary.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry, the Minister of Communications said that. Do not let us forget that the Premier was in charge of the Bill, and you will recall that I told the Premier that if he would give me the assurance that he would not pay the Governor Designate a salary, I would vote for the Bill against everybody over here, and he said that he would tell the Secretary of State that the Governor Designate would not draw one cent of salary until he came to Barbados. That is recorded in the debate. The whole issue became so confused that when it appeared in the Press, naturally you tried to do something about it. How therefore can the hon. member justify his reasons for voting for what we consider a breach of privilege? 2.05 p.m.

I am sufficiently analytical to say that: (a) it appeared in the Press; (b) it was not said on the floor of the House; therefore it constitutes a breach of privilege; but a breach of privilege can be made in good faith and a breach of privilege in good faith is a different matter. The *Advocate* did not walk down the street and said that this thing happened. It was not like that at all. They got the statement from the Clerk of the Executive Committee. The Hon. Minister said that even if the *Advocate* got the statement from that source, before they published it, they could have checked on it. He would not say that the Clerk of the Executive Committee who was responsible should have checked with the Hon. Premier to see whether he had made the statement. The truth is that the Hon. Premier did have that statement to make in the House and he was not prepared to make it as it was worded. I know that. It was prepared to be made by him but it was not made. Surely the Cabinet Secretariat could have enquired from him whether he had made the statement. If the Hon. Minister believes that the *Advocate* should have enquired, I say that the Cabinet Secretariat could have enquired. Sir, I am sure if you were on the floor of the House, you would be bound to see it in that way.

Sir, I have made it quite clear that neither of the motions would I vote for. I am satisfied that the *Advocate* published that statement in good faith, but as this statement was published and it was not stated on the floor of the House, I do agree that it technically constitutes a breach of privilege. I do hope that it would be a lesson not only for the *Advocate* but for the officers in charge of the Cabinet to check to see that statements are made on the floor of the House. It is a fact that when you get statements from the Chief Secretary or the Secretary of the Cabinet that you seldom would question it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for the same privilege to speak on the amendment moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has that right.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I agree with the Hon. Minister, the Deputy Premier, and I hope that I may be able to shed a little light from what I am going to say and that the Hon. Minister would not believe that he is above taking advice.

I agree that he should have made it clear and so justified the position. I will go further and say that the *Advocate* must understand that the House of Assembly is not run by the Executive Committee. The House of Assembly is a distinct body and although the Clerk of this House may be small in stature, yet, he was the person who should have been acquainted when it comes to the publication of anything that takes place in this House because it is no point to ask Your Honour; the Clerk is there for that purpose.

Sir, I agree with the Deputy Premier that before the *Advocate* published any statement purported to be made in this House of Assembly, they should have enquired but where I do not agree with the Hon. Minister is that he is covering it up by saying that as long as it was done in good faith, nothing wrong has happened.

Now, Sir, it is clear that the statement really and truly came from the Cabinet. You cannot censure a Civil Servant as the constitution stands; whenever you censure a Civil Servant, it means that the Minister is responsible for that Civil Servant, therefore, he must take the blame. As I said sometime ago in this House, the Minister of Agriculture in the British Government had to resign from the Government. He did not do anything, but the Civil Servant had done it, and the Minister of Agriculture had to take the blame. The first thing that should have been done as soon as this question was raised was for the Minister responsible to get up and say that it was a mistake and as it was a breach of privilege of this House that he was going to make an unreserved apology for the statement reaching the Press. It is no point for the Minister to come today after a long debate and the facts show that a breach of privilege has been committed and saying what he did. I hold no brief for the *Advocate* or for the Government, but for parliamentary strictures which we should maintain. Sir, only this year, the House of Commons debated a breach of privilege in which a member was involved and the House went against the member who was claiming privilege. It does not matter that we are going against our own when it comes to a breach of privilege. As regards privilege, there is a popular belief that if you belong to a Party, the position of party transcends privilege of this House. If our association or party alignment is going to transcend privileges of this House, then, I say we should tear up the Rules of this House. One of the Ministers should have got up and made an apology and that is why I say that the Minister should be big enough on the last occasion to do that instead of fighting the issue if he had known what he said today, and, of course, what he said today are not facts which came to hand since we met last Tuesday. He knew all of that last Tuesday night.

Sir, what was done on the last occasion was known to them and knowing that it created a breach of privilege, they should have made an apology then. What is the good of fighting it out until you come down to the last ditch?

I further blame the Government in that if they wanted a statement to be published as coming from the House of Assembly and they wanted to get the veracity of their statement, they themselves should have acted first and should have consulted with the Clerk of the House. It is no point the Hon. Minister saying now that the *Advocate* should have checked with them. When a Minister takes action on something it is done with their collective responsibility but it was the Minister's responsibility for getting that statement down to the *Advocate*. The Minister was responsible for that; therefore, he cannot now come in the same breath and say that the *Advocate* should not have published it before checking it. You too, were responsible; therefore you should have checked and seen whether that statement was made in the House. 2.15 p.m.

I would say that when the Press publishes a report of something alleging or purporting to be something which we have said and we did not say it, that is a different thing. However, when you come to initiate something --- I may see in the newspaper a report purporting to be a statement which took place in the House, but if the Government members were not satisfied with the report which was made

by the Press, then a letter should have been written to the Press explaining the matter. Before I sit down, I would like to say this: we are coming very close to the point affecting Cabinet Government where Ministers have to resign. If Ministers come to this House and admit that a mistake was made by a Civil Servant, then that Civil Servant has not made the mistake, but the Government has made the mistake, and therefore the Ministers must be prepared to pay the Parliamentary penalty for such a mistake.

Let us not beat around the bush; it may be a matter involving something which is more important than what is now before us. When you discover that something was not done as it should have been done, who is going to be blamed? The Ministers must be prepared to say that, in view of the mistake having been made, they must go home. If we accept the conventions of the United Kingdom, then a Minister makes an apology on the floor of the House for any mistake; he accepts the full blame for what has gone wrong. He says: "I am the person who is to be censured." The Prime Minister of Great Britain has to answer for statements which have been made in the United Kingdom; if a mistake has been made, it is not Mr. Butler who has to be censured for it; it is Mr. MacMillan who has to be censured for it. The Ministers must say: "This is our responsibility and we accept the blame for it even although it was done by a Civil Servant. It should not have been done in that way and we apologise to the House for any breach of privilege which has been committed by someone else." If it is a breach of privilege in good faith by the person who did it, then the Ministers did it.

I will end by issuing a warning; I am warning the House what we are coming very near to the border line where no Minister will ever resign under any convention, because you can very well see that nothing today can be worked out by a vote. You have a breach of privilege admitted by the Minister on behalf of the Government itself and he makes no apology for it.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, when I spoke to the substantive motion sometime ago, I was purposely very mild and restrained, because what I wanted then most of all was that whatever decision was reached by the House it should be a unanimous one. I saw then that if we had divided the House on the original motion, we would not have got that unanimity. I asked the Hon. Leader of my Party whether, with the help of Your Honour and the Leader of the Government, a formula could have been found which would express the intention of the House as well as all sentiment in this matter. I was glad when agreement was reached between the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Leader of the Government and a motion was worked out which proved acceptable and it was shown to Your Honour and to the House. So acceptable was that motion, that it gained the allegiance of the hon. senior member for the City who was not prepared to vote either for the original motion or for the amendment last week. However, since the Hon. Minister has spoken things which were not clear to my mind are now clear to me, and it is entirely in consequence of his speech that I am convinced that the blame for this matter must rest fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Executive Committee. If we say only that a breach of privilege has been committed, they might mean one thing by that, but I will mean by it that the blame for this matter cannot properly lie entirely with the *Advocate*. The *Advocate* is wrong in this respect, that it has, in fact, published something concerning this House which did not take place. We have argued that at great length. If a Government Department sends a release to the Press, I do not know exactly what the custom is with regard to these things, but I cannot imagine that it would be the normal thing for a newspaper Editor or the staff of a newspaper to question the authenticity of it.

If, as I understand, ----

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. Since this matter concerns the House as a House, I think it is above party and above all other considerations in view of its

importance. I was not here for a great part of the debate, but it does seem to me that a lot of misunderstanding could be saved if I just ----

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a point of order.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I was just about to say that in fairness to the Hon. Premier, there was a statement prepared by him, but which the Hon. Leader of the House was not allowed to make.

Mr. TUDOR: I do not think that the Hon. Minister can read that Statement; he really rose on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister cannot refer to that statement because he has told the House that I have not allowed the Statement to be made. I should just like to inform the hon. members that if they want to conclude this matter, they have only five minutes more to go.

Mr. TUDOR did not continue his remarks..

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion reads as follows:-

"That the publication on page five (5) in the issue of the Barbados Newspaper dated 2nd September, 1958, under the Caption 'Governor gets half salary on embarking' constitutes a breach of privilege of this Honourable House."

The question is that this motion do now pass. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.30 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 3.00 p.m. 2.30 p.m.

On resumption

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention that there is no quorum, and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I would suggest that we resume Committee on the Natural Gas Corporation Bill.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE ON NATURAL GAS CORPORATION BILL, 1958

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day - Order No. 2 - is to resume Committee on the Bill to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950.

Mr. SPEAKER: *left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.*

Clause 8 was called and passed.

Clause 9 was called and passed.

Clause 10 was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 10 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Sir, I have an Order Paper which shows me Order No. 1 which is to resume Committee on the Bill to amend the Quarries Act, 1951. Has that Order been postponed or what?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Speaker called Order No. 2.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Do you mean that you do not have to tell the House of that? I think that you ought to have asked leave to postpone Order No. 1 and to deal with Order No. 2.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Speaker intimated to the House that we deal with Order No. 2.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: The Hon. Leader of the House has to ask permission to postpone Order No. 1 and to deal with Order No. 2, and we would all agree but do not just jump to Order No. 2.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have to ask apology of the Committee for not applying for leave to postpone Order No. 1. I should not allow you to lay the blame on the Speaker.

The question that Clause 10 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 11 was called and passed.

Clause 12 was called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE ON THE QUARRIES BILL 1958

Mr. SPEAKER: We are reverting to Order No. 1: to resume Committee on the Bill to amend the Quarries Act, 1958.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, speaking generally, when this Bill was last postponed in Committee, certain hon. members raised two questions: one was the question as to whether the option should be given to the owners of quarries to fence them, to put up a notice or to remove the overhang. Some hon. members felt then that it should be made compulsory for the quarry owner to fence the quarry instead of giving him the option of deciding on the other two or three points.

The second point was that some hon. members felt that in these quarries in which soft stone is cut they should be mechanised. The matter was postponed and, of course, I should say that at the time I pointed out that a provision was made under the Act which gave the Commissioner of Labour discretionary powers; in other words, if the Commissioner feels that it is necessary to cause the quarry to be fenced, he would instruct the owner so to do and if he feels that the putting up of a notice is sufficient to protect the safety of any person going around the quarry, he will instruct the owner accordingly, and if he feels that the overhanging cliff should be removed, he would also give instructions so to do.

3.15 p.m.

It may be necessary sometimes to remove the overhanging cliff and also to cause the quarry to be fenced. I made that point clear at the time, and as to the second point about the mechanisation of the quarry, I pointed out that a hardship might be experienced by persons who operate small quarries if this provision was put into force. A man may own a quarter of an acre or half an acre of land from which he cuts a few stones and if he is compelled to construct mechanical apparatus for the purpose of lifting stones, according to the old saying: "the play may not be worth the candle."

In that case, we may be preventing that poor man from getting a little bread from that source. I promised hon. members that I would go into the matter and I have done so; I invited owners of quarries and persons who work in these quarries to a meeting which I held and these points were discussed at length. In the case of large quarries, I was made to understand that there are two large quarries - one

at the Mount and the other at Chapel. As far as the Mount is concerned, I have been told that that quarry is no longer in operation and as far as Chapel is concerned, there is absolutely no difficulty in getting out the stones. The road is cut to the base and the lorry goes right down underneath the cliff; it is loaded from that point and there is no question as to the hoisting of the stones to the top of the surface. The question to be resolved now, is whether or not we should compel small people with small bits of land and who get a little livelihood from that soil to construct this mechanical apparatus. I am not in favour of that, especially, when it comes to the question of putting that provision into legislation.

As I have said, I have discussed the matter with these quarry owners and quarry workers. I had about eleven persons there, comprising quarry owners and people who work in these quarries, and there was a unanimous decision that the discretionary power which now exists in the Bill before us and also in the Act which this Bill seeks to amend, is quite satisfactory to them. As to the question of mechanising the quarries, all who were present at that meeting agreed that it was not in the best interest either of quarry owners or of the persons who work in these quarries to mechanise them.

With that assurance, I have decided to bring back this Bill or rather to carry on with this Bill as it now stands. I hope that hon. members will believe me when I say that I have made every effort to get whatever information was necessary or which I thought would be helpful to this Committee from the gentlemen who came to the meeting, and as I have said, I do not have to add anything to that. The decision both of those who are quarry owners and of those who work in quarries was unanimous. In the first place, there is no question of hoisting any stone; the lorry goes down to the base of the quarry and the stone is rolled on the lorry; secondly, as to the question of mechanizing the quarries, the financial burden is too much for these small persons to bear. I sincerely hope that I have been able to satisfy the public on those two points.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was not here when this Bill was discussed, but what I have now heard the Hon. Minister say calls for a contribution from me. Quarry legislation is a part of the Report submitted to the Government on proposals for a Labour Code by the I. L. O. What is strange to me today is to hear the Hon. Minister say that he invited employers or owners of quarries and people who work therein to a meeting. What I want to draw to the attention of the whole Government is that in respect of the Report of the I.L.O. it is emphasized that wherever organisations representing workers exist, the point of view of the organisations must be sought, and not the point of view of the workers themselves; therefore it is not a question of convening a meeting of the workers. I see that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is laughing, but this is no laughing matter; this is something of which I made a study. We have given our view as to things in this whole Labour Code and we are expected to discuss them when it comes to the implementation of legislation. We have come to one point where we are going ahead with quarry legislation.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I am sure that the hon. member will agree with me that soon after this Labour Code was written, the Barbados Workers' Union had a copy of it. We asked for comments to be made and the Union wrote back to us accepting generally what was in that Labour Code. All this Bill seeks to do is to put into effect what Mr. Matthews has recommended.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is not the point which I am making. Subsequent to that, the Hon. Minister has said that he had a discussion with the owners of quarries and people who work in quarries in connection with this amendment.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I should just like to say that I did not discuss anything about this amendment with the quarry owners. I said that there were two points raised by the members of the Opposition; the mechan-

zation of quarries was not in the Report made by Mr. Matthews, and the other point was that it should be laid down compulsorily that quarries should be fenced instead of giving the owners the option of deciding what should be done. That is something which members of the Opposition wanted inserted in the present Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: What I am saying is that the Hon. Minister sought the advice of the two sections of the industry; he sought the advice of the workers. What I am saying is that the Trade Union represents the workers. 3.25 p.m.

The hon. member said that he saw the workers and the owners, but I am saying that whenever anything like this takes place, you should seek advice from the Organisations from which these workers come. In these matters the hon. member should get the Organisation's point of view if he is satisfied that these people come within the ambit of the Organisation, and not go willy-nilly to workers, because the Organisation would have a general over-all policy as far as the workers are concerned.

This is an old Clause which is taken from the previous Act, and I do not know if the lawyers can help me here, because it reads as follows:-

"Every owner or occupier of every quarry shall operate the said quarry in such manner as not to cause any undue risk of bodily injury to any person employed or working therein". Then it goes on to the Penalty Clause. How are you going to penalise a man in this Clause? What will the Labour Commissioner do or say? The other Sections are definite about overhanging roofs and things of that nature, but this Section is so wide and vague.

I do not know from what has been passed already whether there is anything stated about Workmen's Compensation. I know that in the old Act people are entitled to Workmen's Compensation, but what I would like to know is whether you are giving licences to these people irrespective of whether or not they have people working for them who are insured, because there was an incident in which a man working in a quarry lost his life and he was not insured.

I do not know if the lawyers can shed any light on the first point I made as to how you can penalise a man in this Section.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the observations of the hon. member with regard to the mechanisation of quarries, I want to say a few words. The Committee has been told that the Minister has had discussions with quarry workers as well as owners of quarries on this matter, and that in the case of the workers themselves, they claim that a hardship may be created on small quarry owners if they were compelled to provide hoists and so on, and then he named specifically two large quarries, The Mount in St. George and Chapel in St. Philip. He said that as regards Chapel, the lorries go down into the bottom of the quarry and take out the cut blocks of stone. I want to suggest to him that he could not have spoken to a single worker at Chapel quarry in St. Philip.

I do not know what he has been told by workers at the Mount, but I want to state most emphatically that I cannot conceive of a single worker, male or female, at Chapel in St. Philip agreeing not to mechanise the quarry. I am nothing at all to do with the Matthews' Labour Code in this respect. Mr. Matthews came here in 1956, and it would be expecting much too much to expect Mr. Matthews to know in detail the difficulties and obstacles under which quarry workers work in quarries in Barbados. He came here merely to suggest improvements in Labour Laws or the insertion in our Statutes of Labour Legislation for improving the conditions of workers where such legislation did not exist.

As far back as 1952, the Minister may recall that I raised this question on the floor of this House. When the debate ensued here in July, unfortunately I was out of the

island for a few days, and therefore I could make no contribution to it; but I am profoundly grateful to the hon. senior member for Christ Church (in which parish there are also quarries), who, I understand, proposed an amendment to this Bill which would compel quarry owners to provide hoists and winches to bring up the quarried stone, either quarried block stone or debris, marl, fine stone and what not, because we have to bear in mind that if even as he says lorries go down in the quarry for coral block stones, the debris still has to be brought to the surface, and this is done by women. If a quarry is supplying quarried block stone and the lorries go down into the quarry, if that is practical, and transport the stones to the surface, the marl and small stones and other materials dislodged by cutting the block stones are brought to the surface by women in baskets or some container, and I want to submit to the Committee that it is inhuman to ask women to continue to bring loads of quarried marl or debris from quarries on their heads to the surface all day in and all day out.

In answer to his point about small quarry owners finding it a financial hardship to mechanise their quarries, I should like to say that it is the small quarry owners who provide the winches. If he goes to St. Philip tomorrow morning to investigate the conditions in quarries adjacent to Chapel which he says is the biggest quarry, he will discover that the small quarry owners like Mr. Rogers and others provide winches; and they do not cost any fortune. Mechanising a quarry is not like mechanising a plantation; all you need is some sort of fan belt or rope and block and pulley with a container to haul the debris or the marl to the surface, and I am telling him without the slightest fear of contradiction that the small quarry owners in the parish are more prone to mechanise than the large ones. 3.35 p.m.

Now, of the small quarry owners, I only mentioned the name of Rogers because his name came to my mind. He installed a winch; and if a small quarry owner like Mr. Rogers could install a winch, well then, a plantation like Chapel could install one hundred winches because the output of Chapel quarry is about one hundred times more than Rogers' quarry.

The Hon. Minister must bear in mind that we must not sit here and wait for a specific recommendation from an expert. We have to use our own commonsense and allow our own vision and humanitarianism to guide us as to what is right and just for human beings in doing this job of work. What I say most emphatically is that neither the Minister of Trade nor any member of the Government could have discussed this matter with the quarry workers of Chapel because in the year 1952, the quarry workers at Chapel asked me to come there purely to discuss this question of mechanisation of the quarry at Chapel. After discussing it with them, I came in here and tabled this question before the House and this question was tabled on the 20th May, 1952:-

"To enquire of the appropriate member at the next meeting:-

"In view of the general conditions under which the majority of the stone quarries in the colony are operating, will the Government introduce without delay legislation to make it compulsory for all owners and/or operators of quarries beyond a stated minimum depth to provide efficient mechanised assistance for the workers employed to bring the stone and gravel to the surface?"

In other words, if you get a quarry which is eighteen to twenty feet deep, you may not need mechanised equipment to bring the quarried stone or marl to the surface, but the minute you are going down thirty or forty feet you need it. I want to tell the Hon. Minister that there is not every big quarry in which a lorry can descend to bring out the quarried stone.

Therefore, Sir, I am prepared to support the amendment moved by the hon. senior member for Christ Church because he himself knows that in his constituency of Christ

Church there are quite a few quarries - and I can think of some deep ones in certain parts of that parish - and he must have had the same experience which I have had in my constituency of St. Philip. I want to submit to the Committee that in this matter they should use their judgment. The installation of a hoist or winch in the biggest quarry would cost less than \$100 to provide and it can be done in some cases for \$40 or \$50. That sum does not represent any deterrent to the smallest quarry owner and certainly in the case of the large quarry owners or operators, the amount involved is infinitesimal.

The Hon. Minister of Trade must bear in mind that even if in order to avoid having to install equipment certain quarry owners said that their lorries could go down and bring up the stone, that is not the beginning or end of the story. I am prepared to meet the Minister on the spot at Chapel any time he likes for him to discover whether I am right or I am wrong, because unless every single quarry worker who worked at Chapel is no longer there and there is now a breed of quarry workers completely inured to the hardship of bringing stones from the bottom to the surface, I am prepared to tell him that he will find that any information he might have had about Chapel is absolutely incorrect. The hon. junior member for St. George can talk with authority about quarries in St. George, but I am prepared to say to him without the slightest degree of contradiction that since the smallest quarry owner in Church Village, St. Philip, has installed mechanised equipment in his quarry, there is even greater demand from the workers at Chapel for similar assistance.

The Hon. Minister of Trade must also bear in mind that this Government is supposed to be a Labour Government. It does not propose to come down on the side of the employer, be he small or large. In other words, if a small quarry owner finds that it creates a hardship on him to install mechanical assistance, the Government is not supposed to concern itself unduly with that because it is supposed to protect the rights of the workers; therefore, if in the Government's opinion mechanised equipment is essential, whether it is a small or large quarry owner, it is the duty of the Government to see to it that the conditions of work in all quarries are what is humanly tolerable and that those conditions do not impose unfair hardship or any sort of injustice on the people working in them.

Sir, the amendment proposed by the hon. senior member for Christ Church is quite in order; and provided that you make it clear that over eight or ten feet a quarry owner must have mechanised equipment - in other words, provided you impose the qualification of depth, you cannot under any conceivable circumstance impose a hardship on quarry owners or operators.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to the explanations given by the Hon. Minister of Trade who is in charge of the Bill. When one considers it, the object of this proposed amendment is to my mind the interest and welfare of the workers and that is of paramount importance. It is for them that I made this amendment and I would conceive that the Government would have in mind the welfare and wellbeing of the workers over and above that of the quarry owners. What is more, the quarry owners would expect fair treatment from the Government; but if, as the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said, providing mechanical device would entail only a reasonable expenditure and not anything beyond the means of the average quarry owner, I think that the interest and the welfare of the workers should be taken into account and we should allow the quarry owners to bear the small cost in installing winches or such mechanical devices.

3.45 p.m.

I do not care to question the Hon. Minister at this stage as to the composition of the delegation of quarry workers whom he consulted (Hon. M. E. COX: I can give it to you.) but I presume that it was comprised of small quarry owners not only from the parish of St. Michael, but also from other parts of the Island including the parishes of St. George, St. Philip, St. John and Christ Church in

which parishes I think the majority of the large quarries are situated. If that delegation were truly representative of the body of quarry owners and workers, well then, the Deputy Premier's explanation as to the hardship which will be entailed by these workers will carry some weight; but, speaking on my own behalf, I feel that the welfare of the vast majority of quarry workers would outweigh the little financial expenditure which may be involved in setting up a winch. After all, it is a question of human life, human freedom and human excess of work.

I feel that from our position in this House, I should say this; the average quarry worker, whether it be a man or a woman, would expect better treatment from a representative body such as this. I hope that the Hon. Minister will see some wisdom in agreeing to a slight adjustment of my amendment. I am trying to adjust my amendment so as to cope with what the Hon. Minister has reported. I should like to insert in my amendment the words "as the Labour Commissioner may think fit" after the word "quarry", so that the amendment will read as follows:-

"Every owner or occupier of a quarry as the Labour Commissioner may think fit shall provide the quarry with a suitable winch or other device for the purpose of hauling the quarried material to the surface....."

If the amendment read like that, that would give the Labour Commissioner a discretionary power. Where a quarry owner is not required to use a winch, the Labour Commissioner would not insist on the use of it, but where the quarry owner is required to use this equipment, then there would be the insistence on having the use of such equipment. My amendment in full will now read as follows:-

"Every owner or occupier of a quarry as the Labour Commissioner may think fit shall provide the quarry with a suitable winch or other device for the purpose of hauling the quarried material to the surface and during the operation of such winch or other device shall exercise or cause to be exercised due care and caution for the safety and welfare of the workers employed therein."

If the Hon. Minister and the Government as a whole were to accept that slight adjustment which puts a discretionary power in the hands of the Labour Commissioner who is the official of the Government to administer this Bill, then no hardship would be done to the small quarry owners where it is not essential to have this device; but where it is felt that this device is essential, this discretionary power would be vested in the Labour Commissioner who would insist that the quarry owner install a winch or some other mechanical device so as to protect the workers under these hard working conditions. I do not think that any hardship would be created on the small quarry owner if the Government were to accept this amendment. I do not see that any hardship could be meted out either to the small quarry workers or to the occupiers.

I beg to move that amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Hon. M. E. COX: I can quite see the point made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church even although I do not appreciate it. At the present time, we have Section 5 of the Bill which provides for the safety of persons who work in these quarries. As I have already pointed out, the Labour Commissioner has the discretionary power to compel a quarry owner to adopt such measures as he considers necessary for the safety or otherwise of the operation of quarries. In reply to a point made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip who has admitted that the lorry goes down to the base of the quarry and brings up the soft stone when it is cut (Mr. CRAWFORD: In some quarries) in some quarries, the hon. member says, I should like to say that in some cases women have to bring up the debris in baskets on their heads, and clearly they are not cases which call for any mechanisation. I think that the hon. member will appreciate that the same lorry only needs a cart on it and it will bring up the debris in the

same way as it brings up the stone; it is therefore not necessary to have this mechanisation. As the hon. member knows, marl is not given away; it is sold and it realises good money too.

As to the second point raised about this Government representing the workers, we are not ashamed of saying that with all the emphasis it can carry; but as we have said before, our whole point now is that we are not prepared to make conditions so hard for employers that they will find it impossible to hire workers. That is something which we have to take into consideration. We are a Labour Government as we will always be, but if Labour enforces certain restrictions which make it impossible for employers to carry on, then neither employers nor labourers will benefit from these restrictions. The point about our being a Labour Government need not be raised in this case, because, as a matter of fact, the amendment to this Bill is as a result of the demand which was made by this Labour Government for an expert to go into the whole conduct of labour in this country with a view to drafting a comprehensive Labour Code for the benefit of the workers of this country.

I have pointed out, and I still maintain the view, that I do not agree with the hon. member who said that mechanical apparatus or equipment will cost in the neighbourhood of \$100 or anything like that. Some hon. members say that it will cost about \$40 or \$50. An hon. member has said that the small people who operate small quarries are those who are willing and ready to install mechanical equipment just as in the case of large quarry owners.

3.55 p.m.

If that is so and if you agree that in their own interest they are willing to install this mechanical equipment, then why is it necessary to force them by an Act of the Legislature to install this equipment when you have already said that they are willing and ready to install the equipment? If they can find the money to do it and it appears to them feasible and reasonable, I am definitely sure that from the point of view of convenience and speed they will install this equipment. Again I repeat, if you force a man who is not in a position to purchase this equipment - and he may be cutting one or two dozen blocks a day and only getting a royalty from it of so many cents - it means that he cannot find the money to install the equipment, and neither the worker nor the owner will get anything, and the quarry will have to be abandoned.

The hon. member referred to Mr. Rogers. I should like to tell him that Mr. Rogers is not a small quarry owner. He is in the line with the big fellows.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, am I to understand the Minister is finished? I want the Minister to understand that I spoke of Mr. Rogers as being a small quarry owner in the context of a comparison with Chapel Plantation. I said that small quarry owners like Mr. Rogers had installed mechanical equipment, but a big operation like Chapel refused to do it. That does not mean that Mr. Rogers is a small quarry owner; it means he is small with regard to capital.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it is really interesting to see how the Hon. Deputy Premier puts his foot into it. As a Socialist, I do not share half the views he expressed in that short speech today, as his argument is purely an argument for exploitation, because it suggests that the interest of the worker is not so important as to force employers to put in machinery. I feel that if you can run a business and keep it going, you must not run it at the expense of the working-class of this country, and by that I mean that his argument is an argument against minimum wage legislation. If a man is running a small business and he cannot pay so much, would you let him continue to run it and pay starvation wages to people?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am sure that could not have been interpreted by this Committee. What I said had absolutely nothing to do with wages; so the hon. member must not misquote or misinterpret what

I said. I was dealing purely with a man who would be operating on a small bit of land, and if you forced him to put in equipment which cost a lot of money and which he could not purchase, the quarry would have to be closed down.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if a small quarry owner is forced to put in machinery in the interest of the man who is working in that quarry, and he finds it economically unprofitable, let him close that quarry. I would not allow him to make his margin of profit to keep the business open at the expense of the man who is cutting the stones. That is how I see it as a Socialist, and the Minister need not tell us that that would make conditions so difficult for employers in Barbados that they would have to fire labour, because the employers are living happier today under them than before; we know that. We know that conditions are so prosperous for employers today, that not only can they continue to exploit the working class people, but they are making more profits under the Labour Government than they used to make under their own Conservative Government. I heard the hon. senior member for St. George say that he could not buy five estates unless this Government was in power.

Let us get down to the amendment moved by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. What harm is there in accepting that amendment? I think the time has come as in the sugar industry when you have to bring down mechanical equipment which throws workers out of work to some extent, but you did it in the interest of efficiency. Similarly with quarries, if it means efficiency and will ease the workers, by all means put it in the Law so that it can be carried out. You did not argue that you should not bring down tractors and ploughs; therefore in the quarry industry, whether it be a small or large quarry owner, he should be forced by Law giving the discretion to the Labour Commissioner to install mechanical equipment. I am interested in the worker in any small or large quarry, the man who is cutting six square feet or 100 square feet; so the moment an owner is making a profit, just as in the case of goods passed on to the consumer, then let the increased cost for putting in this machinery be passed on to the builder. When they put money on food in Bridgetown, we buy it; therefore the builder is buying the stones and you should force a quarry owner to put in the equipment and let him get his margin of profit. Do not tell me that you will not force him to put in machinery on the grounds that he is a small owner. Has he shown you his books to show that he is a small owner? If he is doing it at the expense of the worker, there is where you must draw the line.

I am taking the hon. senior member for St. Peter to task, because with the Deep Water Harbour, more quarries are going down in this country; so how can he allow the Workmen's Compensation to remain as it is without producing Government? In addition to this, that should be on the Order Paper by now. You are allowing people to build a Deep Water Harbour, they are blasting stones and digging quarries, but what would be your Workmen's Compensation if a man gets killed in a quarry or working with the Deep Water Harbour? Do not let us pass Legislation piece-meal. We talk about representing the workers; so let us get down and do a job for them, instead of introducing money Resolutions to increase the Governor's salary.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, all the points raised by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew have been very well taken, but I want to tell the Minister this: I have heard the hon. member talk sense in this House, but he has never talked such utter rot; he has never descended to such depths of absurdity as he descended today. If he were an Eskimo from Lapland, from Iceland or from Greenland, I could understand him talking the rubbish he talked in here today, but there is no excuse for a Barbadian to talk the nonsense he talked this afternoon. Imagine him getting up and saying that when the lorry goes down to bring up the quarried stone, they could put on a little cart to bring up the marl.

4.05 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Surely the hon. member can credit somebody with

more sense than that. I did not mean that the same time the same lorry could be used as a cart to bring up the marl.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You are talking more foolishness now. A lorry cannot bring up stones unless it has sides. This is the point. How do lorries operate? The Hon. Minister is a Barbadian. If being a Minister means that you are an Australian or a Hindustani, let us understand that when you are a Minister, you do not know anything of the conditions in Barbados. The Hon. Minister should know that a lorry that goes for block stones has nothing to do with the quarry operation. What the Hon. Minister does not seem to know is that the people who are employed in quarries are employed purely for the purpose of bringing out the marl and they are paid for it by the day. The women are paid by the men who cut the stones and these men have no lorries. What nonsense is the Minister talking? Has he come from the Sahara Desert? A stone cutter gets so much for cutting a stone. In cutting a stone, there is an amount of marl. These quarry workers employ women to clear away the marl so that they can cut more stones. There is not a single quarry worker in St. Philip who has got a lorry. What is the Minister talking about? He began by saying that the Bill provides that a quarry is to be operated without causing any undue risk or bodily injury to any person therein. He went further and said that the Labour Commissioner is empowered under the provisions of the Bill to take action to ensure that the quarries are operated in safety. That has nothing to do with the safety of quarries. I do not know if I heard him correctly. This amendment is purely concerned with relieving the burden on the workers who are human beings who have to bring the stone and the marl up to the surface. They are not donkeys; they are not mules. In any civilised community, should a Government tolerate such a thing particularly after it is brought to their notice? Sir, if the Hon. Minister of Trade went to St. Philip, he could not talk that nonsense; they would run him out. They have complained to me about the intolerable hardship imposed on them by lifting up this marl all day long and bringing it to the surface. It is merely that you are transforming human beings into beasts of burden and we are asking them as human beings, assuming that they are, to put a stop to it.

Sir, the undue risk in a quarry is a different matter. The quarry should be propped at certain points if certain excavations are to be done. If that is not done, you run the risk of stones falling in and injuring the workers. I do know that two men were killed some time ago on account of that in a quarry in the Sherbourne area by the quarry falling in because the quarry was not propped; but that is a different thing entirely.

We always say that the people who work in the Government Service get certain exaggerated opinions in their minds as to the cost of doing things and it seems to me that this is a disease which affects certain people as soon as they become Ministers. If the Hon. Minister for Trade Industry and Labour had a small quarry operating and the people working in that quarry had asked him to install mechanised equipment, do you mean to say that he would not spend \$50 on it? He comes in here and tells me that I am talking nonsense because I said that this equipment could be put in for less than \$50. Sir, all you want are two pieces of railroad iron and a pulley with a piece of chain and block. When an empty bucket is going down, a full one is coming up. You can install two such devices for \$50. The installation of mechanical devices of this sort in any quarry is not beyond the financial capacity of any quarry owner and, as the hon. junior member for St. Andrew said, if you could not install that, you should get out of the business. The point is that the Hon. Minister of Trade is so fond of drawing a red herring across the trail that he cannot see the wolves from the sheep. When I say that Mr. Rogers could provide a mechanical winch, how much so then could Chapel? Is the Minister here to defend Chapel? Chapel did not do it out of mere spite. At the time when I talked of it, Chapel was paying its workers less than what the Mount was paying its workers and because the workers at Chapel refused to cut any stone unless they got what

the Mount was paying and because Chapel had to pay that price eventually, the owners of Chapel refused to give the workers the mechanised equipment which the Mount workers were given.

As I have said, the quarry workers have to pay women to bring the marl to the surface in order that they can get the stone to cut. That is no concern of the quarry owner. The Hon. Minister of Trade is completely misguided and misinformed if he persists in maintaining the attitude which he maintains now. He does not understand what we are driving at and what he has said shows that he knows as much of quarries in Barbados as he knows of a coal mine in the Zaar or in the Rhineland. And that is not good enough.

Sir, there is nothing at all wrong with this amendment. It contains every single thing - justice, consideration of humanity; and the fact that this is a Labour Government, by the amendment taking all these things into account it should encourage you to support it and not even to support it but to initiate it.
4.15 p.m.

This is not the first time that the Hon. Minister has heard me raise this matter in this House; I raised it in 1952 when I tabled a question in connection with it. I am annoyed to think that in 1958 he could repeat the same reactionary arguments which he used to bring forward in his refusal to support this amendment. To be quite candid, I do not think that the mistake has arisen on his part at all; what has happened is that he has been wrongly advised.

Mr. WALCOTT: Some new arguments have arisen with regard to this Bill and I must say that we are not fortunate in having the debates printed at an early time. I did not know that this matter was postponed for any amendment; there are some things which the Hon. Minister should have corrected and I think that the hon. member for St. Philip has corrected one of them. The Hon. Minister has said that the Labour Commissioner has a discretionary power, but he has been quite correctly informed by the hon. senior member for St. Philip that the Labour Commissioner would not have any power whatsoever to deal with a matter such as this, because it is a question of the provision of safety. You cannot refuse to give a man a licence because he does not install a winch in his quarry or anything like that. I do not think that the Hon. Minister should examine this question on the narrow ground which he has enunciated a hardship being created on the small man; I believe that any Socialist would agree that in any business enterprise where the capital formation is small, it does not matter as to the sort of concessions which you give.

The hon. introducer of this amendment states that he wants to give the Labour Commissioner a discretionary power in such circumstances as would seem fit. I quite agree with the hon. junior member for St. Andrew that the Hon. Minister has used a very dangerous argument on the floor of this House and it comes closely on the heels of a dangerous argument which was used by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture last week. That argument comes so close on the heels of the argument used by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, that I have to take him to task. He said that they are not going to have anything which forces the small man out of business, because eventually, you are likely to create a situation where that man is unemployed. This is a question where you are asking for the provision of a mechanical device, not as a means of putting people out of employment, but as a means of assisting people in employment under certain conditions. You hear the argument about people being put out of employment, but why is it that people use machinery in big employment like sugar factories and people are forced out of employment? What can you do about that? They say that you have to be very careful that you are not doing anything which forces employers out of business; but sometimes when an employer has forced people out of employment, he is still in employment.

I am a Trade Unionist, but in my opinion I would advise that in any enterprise where a man is starting business for the first time you should adopt an attitude different from that which you would adopt where people are employed in quarries in the manner in which they were employed from the time that Adam was a lad. Do you not consider that there are quarries which are in need of equipment and that they should have this kind of equipment? The Hon. Minister's statement is connected with a low standard of living which is exemplified in this community where you have a man holding on to a bucket or pushing a handcart with a rope attached - the Hon. Minister is saying that if that sort of thing is removed, then you are taking food out of that man's mouth. Last week, you had this back-to-the-land talk which I criticised from the point of view of outlook. Who would argue that a man should be forced out of business? I ask; is it not still a primitive method of asking people to work under present conditions in a quarry and whether those conditions should not be removed? There is international labour legislation dealing with the way you operate a crane. (A MEMBER: How long has he realised that?) Some hon. member has asked: how long did I realise that? But what they do not realise is that you have to live and learn, but they have learnt everything already.

So far as we are concerned, we could as well die now, because they have not changed their outlook.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not mind the "Asides".

Mr. WALCOTT: I must mind them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not hear them and I will ask the hon. member to keep to this Clause.

Mr. WALCOTT: It seems to me that there is a matter of serious partiality where you are going to get a situation in which the members on the other side of the House can speak as loudly as they like and nothing is said about that; but when a member from this side says anything by way of a joke, it becomes an interruption. I want to say that you do not work on the basis of creating a hardship on the small man, but on the basis of how you regard this amendment. Did you have this amendment ten years ago? If you have something before you today to be examined, are you not prepared to examine this thing which is now before you or are you going to deal with antiquity? It is an ignorant idea of having something to deal with today, but you look back to 1938 when the issue did not arise.

The hon. member spoke about workmen's compensation. That matter was addressed to the Government twelve months ago. We have written asking the Government about workmen's compensation. I spent quite a lot of time on it and I pressed that it should be run on a basis different from that upon which the Government is now running it. What is serious, is that the Hon. Minister should make this statement on the small-man basis. I believe that the Hon. Introducer of this amendment is a representative of the small man; when he spoke about the small taxi man, he is a representative of the small taxi man and the small businesses.
4.25 p.m.

I doubt very much that he would bring an amendment that would militate against the interest of the class he represents: so I do not think it is done with the idea of driving small men out of business. This is done with the idea of relieving a little bit of the drudgery that exists in the quarries. You have put in loudspeakers to make it easier for everybody in here to hear. Will somebody ask why you did not think of that before? When I came to the House thirteen years ago, you did not have loudspeakers. The sun has not got any nearer to the earth, but several places have been air-conditioned; so you cannot blame the human brain for knowledge and improvement. If the hon. member sees something that can give assistance to quarry workers, should the hon. member ask why he did not mention it before? Is it wrong? The philosophy of the Minister

of Agriculture seems to be not to put a small man out of business, but soon we have got to get down in Barbados to stopping this small man talk. Some people do not like the Senate inquiries, but if we had some of the U.S. Senate investigations here, some people would commit suicide. What do you mean when you talk about a small man? You mean a man who is doing business in a private way, but lacks the vision of expanding and is content to make a little money or a reasonable profit working on that basis. Some people do not like joining with other people in a company. It is one of those things with Africans, and that is why Africans have not caught up with the world's economic situation, because they have not reached the stage of putting money with others and investing on a big basis.

I did not know that this amendment existed, and it brings me to the point which I made to the Minister that when you are discussing these matters, you should discuss them both with the employers and the workers, and you are likely to arrive at a decision which is more in keeping with what you desire. The Minister said that he had examined this amendment which has been put forward, but the net result is that it would force small men out of business. I am saying that the hon. member's amendment does not intend to do that; it is intended for those businesses which the Labour Commissioner thinks should have it. Do you know that a man can go down in a well and there is nobody to test the depth of it before he enters it? He may descend into it and come back out dead. If somebody initiates something, you should not say that it would hurt the small man, because there are improvements which you must have. A man nearly died digging up the road; we do not have legislation which says that before a contractor undertakes digging up the earth that there must be men around who know safety measures; that man could have killed twenty people.

My view of a matter like this is that you should examine the amendment and see if it is reasonable and in the interest of the worker. I was at Seawell two days ago, and I saw one worker giving another man a prop with a stone, rolling it on to some improvised thing, and I wondered how many they could roll away in a day. You kill productivity on the basis of employing three more people! I feel, Mr. Chairman, that if there is a proposal to remove drudgery from people without doing any harm to the industry, the Minister and the Government should examine it. I do not think the Minister could mean that this amendment would make the employer spend more and drive him out of business. Are you saying, Mr. Chairman, that a man should not be entitled to these things? A change of thinking along these lines would be good, because we accept too low standards as a way of life, and that is why when these changes come about we cannot view them in the light in which they should be viewed. I would be more concerned when a big employer puts in a lot of equipment and 100 workers become redundant without the provision being made for them, because if you do that through technical improvement, you have to give them something to relieve the shock. That is why I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is necessary to examine these proposals.

I am sorry that I have to support it in this way, because it appears to me that the Government might have been unwilling to pass the amendment if some of us did not support it. If they are willing to accept this amendment which does no harm to the Government, it seems quite reasonable and can do no harm to the small quarry owners.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Trade said after the proposed amendment was read out to this Committee that he quite saw the point which the hon. member for Christ Church was making but did not appreciate it; I think what he meant was that he appreciated it but did not agree with it. It is a distinction with a difference.

Now, Sir, it may perhaps be thought that we are offering this amendment merely because it is good politics to do so. That could be true, but it is true politics because it is something which is in the interest of human beings;

and since it is something beneficial, this Committee ought to lose no opportunity of doing it. Any proposals to stop women from putting marl on their heads to trudge up the sides of a quarry with it should have exactly the same appeal as the proposal, for instance, to stop women from climbing lorries with bundles of canes at crop time to throw them on the lorry. If you speak of the dignity of labour, you do not only mean the fact that people should get remunerative work and enjoy it, you mean that the work itself should be such as does not degrade.

There was a time some years ago when the Minister of Social Services, the hon. junior member for St. George, used to regale his audiences at public meetings with some of the lesser known facts of slavery, and he used to point out how the slaves in olden days used to dig through rock with their bare hands to make the roads on which we now walk and drive.

4.35 p.m.

Well, we all wept and sympathised with them and those of us who could give him a vote, gave him one and he is where he is now. He played upon the strength of the people and upon our inward feelings and better nature. It is the same principle today. The time has come when this Government should not have to be pushed or exhorted to remove all these restrictions and hardships on these people who work in these dangerous occupations. It should rather be the case that they initiate them with their opponents trailing behind them. As it is now, we are put in the position of having to make a song and a dance about something which should be accepted as soon as it is stated. If it is true that the Hon. Minister of Trade consulted opinion among the small quarry owners, I think we should cry shame on him for not drawing that to their attention because it is not a matter on which he should ask their opinion; he should be in a position to tell them that the Government feels in the interest of themselves and the workers and the industry itself that this particular device for bringing marl and soft stone to the surface should be instituted.

It has been argued that it may put quarry owners out of business because they might not be able to find the capital to put in winches. I do not think we heard the Hon. Minister correctly. What has he the Development Board for? I think this would be a good case when they raised objection and said that they were not able to put in these devices for him to say immediately to them, so much we want you to put in this particular device that we are prepared to recommend to the Development Board that they recommend all these small quarry owners the necessary funds for that purpose; therefore, the argument that they could not find the capital could have been offset with the assurance from the Government that the money would be forthcoming to all of them who could not find it possible to do so financially; therefore, there would be no excuse and that is the only way in which it should have been attacked by the Minister.

Now, Sir, this amendment does not even say that everybody must do it regardless of the circumstances. From an administration point of view, it quite wisely leaves a wide discretion to the Labour Commissioner to exercise his own judgment in these matters and if after doing an inspection it was discovered by him or his subordinates that a particular quarry did not require it, that is covered by the amendment. You cannot argue today that since a few of the people are willing whenever it is conveniently possible to install this device that the House of Assembly must wait until they do it and, therefore, do not be in a hurry to pass a law to make them do it. That is no argument at all and it defeats the very purpose we have in mind. We feel therefore, that it is better to write the provisions in the statute and to make it flexible enough by giving the Labour Commissioner discretion to impose the regulation as and when he thinks it fit to do so. Certainly we should make it strong enough to serve notice on the quarry owners what the intention of the Legislature is and it is the intention of the Legislature that they pursue this practice. It is for that reason the amendment has been urged.

I do not know how other hon. members feel but I know, for instance, that there is a considerable body of

opinion engaged in this particular industry in St. Philip which feels very strongly on this matter. At once, I imagine the Hon. Minister will say: what right has another member to say what is felt or not felt in St. Philip. He may say that every Tuesday but it is for this House of Assembly to know how I feel on this particular matter. What I feel about it is that I would always like to be able to go through St. Philip without let or hindrance and without suffering the sneers and jeers of the hundreds of people who would have a grievance if we do not help them with this equipment. For that reason I am voting for the amendment.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point or two. The Bill which is before the House seeks to provide safety measures for the protection of the public at large as well as the workers in the quarry industry. We are not now thinking of making provision for the economy of the industry; that is a different matter and in several respects. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy in discussing this amendment could have asked for a diamond blade saw to take the stones out and a machine spray to eliminate the dust which is found in the cutting of stones in every quarry. It is all right to make nice speeches and to discuss about slavery but I would like to be sure if hon. members want to be practical about this matter. It is no use our making political speeches in here when we can do so outside. You are thinking of a quarry 60 feet deep and having one winch to remove stone. What would you expect one winch would do? The hon. member is only displaying a lack of knowledge of what he is talking about and may be, a study of the industry.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, before the Hon. Minister goes off on a tangent, let me tell him that nobody suggested a winch for removing quarried stone.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: That was the discussion. The hon. senior member for Christ Church introduced the amendment to provide for mechanical equipment and the hon. senior member for St. Philip as well as the hon. senior member for St. Lucy talked of having a winch to remove the stone from the quarry.

Mr. TUDOR: I never said anything like that.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: You talked about removing rubble and marl from the base of a quarry. Would you remove marl and rubble from the base of a quarry without a winch? (Laughter).

Probably, Sir, the hon. member has now come around to the folly of the whole idea. Primarily we are concerned with the safety of a quarry and the protection of people who work in the industry. We are not now concerned in this Bill with the mechanics of the industry.

4.45 p.m.

Let us think of the small quarries. In the case of a man who is operating a quarry on about a quarter of an acre or half an acre of land and about ten to fifteen feet deep, it is difficult to get the lorry to the base. The equipment of the quarry is a service to the worker and a small quarry is difficult to operate, because of the outlay. Where you have an individual operating on a half acre of land, do you think it is reasonable that we should make it compulsory by law that he should install expensive equipment to say nothing of the maintenance and the recurrent cost of the equipment? It is a question of the recurrent cost of this equipment to the operator. If we want to get down to the question of operating equipment, if we want to change what are out-of-date and obsolete methods, that is something which is entirely different; and we would need an entirely different type of legislation from what we have here.

As regards the sugar industry, we cannot make a law that a factory operator must buy a mill which will grind so much an hour and on the same basis as a smaller man; you cannot make that compulsory.

Mr. TALMA: I should like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister that I have inserted in my amendment addi-

tional words which will cause this provision not to be made compulsorily, but which will make it at the discretion of the Labour Commissioner.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: If the matter is left to the discretion of the Labour Commissioner, is that not making it compulsory? What discretion would the Labour Commissioner have if he said that you must put in some equipment and you failed to do so? Is it not farcial to say that there is discretion given to the Labour Commissioner and there is no means of enforcing it? That would come either through the Magistrate or you give the power to the Labour Commissioner, but you would have to make it the law. Is that right or wrong? For hon. members on the other side, I think it would be good if they would pay attention to safety measures in a quarry, and that is the matter with which we are primarily concerned. It is a question of providing safety measures for the people who work in these quarries day by day.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not think that the hon. member should be allowed to get away with that. There are things other than safety measures dealt with in this Bill. I have said that in Barbados we are getting too much accustomed to low standards and we are accepting them as if they are something divine. In the same way the hon. member speaks about that - if we had brought down an amendment affecting places where food is sold, somebody would say that we are running the small man out of business; but it did not matter how many people have to be run to the Hospital. The cheap talk you will get is that you are running the small man out of business, but nobody knows how many people you are running to the grave. When you are dealing with the question of removing a primitive idea - the hon. member talks about putting something on two sides of the lorry; there is a law that no ship can set out to sea unless you have a winch on the sides; you put a winch not only for safety, but you want to get away from this primitive idea.

This is not any new legislation to show that you are creating a quarry industry; the mere fact that you are passing legislation for safety in these quarries is based on the length of time during which these quarries were being operated without these things. Does the hon. member not know that there is an aspect of safety, that although you have these things lifted in this manner, this provision would be a means of safety? Do not let the hon. member talk about driving people out of business; the very Trade Union Act exists on the same ground. I hear an hon. member say that we do not live in 1870. The Trade Union Act has restrained trade, but it has prevented people from trading in their own street will. The hon. member says that from his examination, it would appear that this provision will drive people out of business, but let us know the facts.

The quarry at the Mount Plantation is a famous quarry in this island. When the Minister of Labour referred to the workers, I have to record that, in many instances, when it comes to certain matters, workers would not press for certain things, because I say they have all accepted a low standard of life. Sometimes you initiate something which is better for all the workers but they do not clamour for it until they begin to use it. The hon. member says that if it is something discretionary, you do not have to enforce the law, but I should like to say that there are things in connection with which you give the Labour Commissioner a discretion. What the Labour Commissioner would do in some cases he would not do in other cases. You do not define what you mean by safety. In this connection, this is what was suggested by Mr. Matthews:-

"Upon receipt of an application for a licence to operate a quarry, the Labour Commissioner shall satisfy himself that the boundaries of the quarry in respect of which licence to operate has been applied for are clearly and easily defined; the applicant is in fact in control of the quarry and shall within seven days of receipt of the application give notice in writing of such requirement as he may deem necessary for the safety of persons employed in such quarry and shall refuse a licence to operate until such requirements have been fulfilled."

4.55 p.m.

That is what Mr. Matthews recommended but you have not accepted it. He was even giving the Labour Commissioner discretionary powers to decide on the necessary safety measures for this. The reason for this is that there is no list of definite safety measures which you can put down in anyone's life to say 'these shall be the safety measures for all time,' because they vary from time to time, and it is unfortunate that more attention is not paid to them. You give the Labour Commissioner power to change them from time to time, because what you do today in a quarry you did not do 25 years ago. What appears to be stupid on behalf of the Government is that if they come down with any Bill and a suggestion has been made by the Opposition, they feel that they would be making the change for members of the Opposition. We do not work in a quarry, and when you change legislation to make improvements for people, you do it for the community which we represent. If somebody says something and you realise that it is good, you should get down to doing it as quickly as you can. I do not know why the Minister of Social Services should regard this as a measure which would be difficult to administer. What you have to find out is whether at the present moment the industry as a whole requires this sort of facility which you are providing, and then you may see that you can do it.

I agree with members in a general way that it is not the best thing to legislate for these things, but the members on the other side like legislation. I hope you will see that the suggestion is one in keeping with business, and hon. members should realise that in process of time they will have to pass legislation which appears to be hard on people making money.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there is a reservation which I have on the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, and it is in Clause 5 (1) where the Government has seen fit to introduce something which is absolutely unnecessary for reasons which I will explain. That error has been repeated by the hon. senior member for Christ Church in the amendment which he proposed.

Clause 5 (1) reads as follows:-

"Every owner or occupier of every quarry shall operate the said quarry in such manner as not to cause any undue risk of bodily injury to any person employed or working therein."

Now, Mr. Chairman, as far as the present state of the Law of Barbados is concerned, every owner or occupier of a quarry must operate such quarry or any other business undertaking for that matter in such a manner as not to cause any risk at all of bodily injury to any person employed or working therein, and the only effect of a Clause such as Subclause 1 of Clause 5 would be to qualify the nature of risk to which a person engaged in the quarry may be subject. We are now talking about undue risk and that is going to lead to legal complications, because the present state of Law is that they must operate it so as not to cause any risk at all of bodily injury. You cannot qualify risk and talk about undue risk; it means then that you are exempting quarry owners and quarry operators from that ordinary duty of care which one citizen owes to another citizen in the country, and I will go further and say that the question of risk and the question of duty of care extend not only to people employed in the quarry industry, but any licensee or any person coming into close contact with the workings of the quarry or the people working in the quarry from time to time. That is the state of the common Law of Barbados.

If I go into a quarry, although I may not be working therein, to speak to a friend, to observe the operations of the quarry or to purchase a quantity of marl or sandstone, and any accident happens to me as a result of the working of that quarry, the quarry owner would have under the normal process of the Law to pay me compensation for failing to exercise that duty of care which every citizen owes to another citizen, regardless of whether or not he

worked in the quarry. The hon. senior member for Christ Church has repeated the error by stating in this amendment that "every owner or occupier of the quarry shall provide the quarry with a suitable winch or other device for the purpose of hauling the quarried material to the surface, and during the operation of such winch or other device shall exercise or cause to be exercised due care and caution for the safety and welfare of the workers employed therein."

The latter part of the amendment is completely unnecessary; it is not only unnecessary, but is likely to give rise to unnecessary complications, because we now seem in Barbados to be qualifying the ordinary duty of care owed by one person to another in the question of employment. It may sound a bit pedantic to those who are unacquainted with the Law and those people who have not come into close contact with the Law of negligence to which I am referring. If we insert a provision like that in the Statutes of Barbados, it appears to me that any other member of the public who may suffer any injuries as a result of the working of a quarry may have put up as a defence that there is a Statutory duty to provide against risk of injury in so far as employees and workmen are concerned, but there is no such Statutory duty in relation to the members of the general public. Not that I am saying that that would necessarily be a good defence as far as I am concerned, but I can see where such complications may possibly arise, and therefore I would counsel the hon. senior member for Christ Church not to fall into the same error which the person who drafted this Bill has fallen into, and to delete that part of it from the amendment which he proposes.

On the general principles of this Clause, I do not want to repeat anything that has been said by the hon. members who have sat down, but I would like to say this: the hon. senior member for St. Philip made reference, I believe, to the Mount Quarry in St. George. It is high time that we in Barbados examined the economic state of quarries in this island. To the best of my information and belief, the Mount Quarry is owned by a gentleman by the name of the Hon. Gerald Lascelles; that quarry is owned, in other words, by an absentee proprietor. It has recently been closed down causing unemployment to a large number of workers in this country.

5.05 p.m.

What the Government should do is to take over the land which forms the quarry from the Lascelles' family and operate it as a model quarry so setting an example to the other quarry owners and operators throughout the country. I would like to say that the question of the prohibited cost of putting in a winch, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church proposes, is not an argument which in this enlightened age we should be giving voice to in a democratic chamber of this sort.

Suggestions have been made as to how any hardship can be alleviated to these small quarry owners. Let me say that any small quarry owner is some kind of landowner and he is eating his cake and having it too because he is wasting the assets of this country everytime he excavates soil from the earth. He pays no specific tax for excavating the soil of the country and he gets the fruits from it and gives the miners just a small pittance for their subsistence.

The Government therefore has to seriously consider the getting of royalties from these large undertakings, such as Chapel and the Mount, and it should be enacting legislation as is done in Jamaica in the bauxite mining industry so as to rehabilitate the areas where this soft stone has been excavated.

The junior member for St. George has said that it is not necessary to have a hoist or winch to lift the stone from the earth on to the platform of a lorry but surely I believe the Labour Commissioner under the amendment would have some discretion to say which type of quarries would necessitate the employment of a winch. There are many quarries of this country which are of a considerable depth, the approaches to the bottom of which involve your going

down a very steep grade, but there are other quarries like the Mount Quarry in which you can approach them from the bottom along another road. There are contraptions and devious things like caterpillars, small trucks and other mechanical devices for lifting goods, which I believe have been employed by the merchants for stocking goods, which can be employed to lift the stone from off the surface to the crane and on to the surface of the lorry and I think all quarry owners should avail themselves of such mechanised equipment because it is not my idea for a working man to have calluses on his hand caused not only by using a drill but then by having to go and lift these stones on to the platform of a lorry. He does not get anything extra for that. Why cannot you have these stacking machines?

I am saying this in all seriousness. When you consider it, the quarry at Chapel, in the parish of St. Philip, or the one at the Mount, ton for ton of earth excavated, is more profitable than any gold mine in the Witwatersrand, South Africa, which is the richest gold bearing area in the world because when they lift 200,000 tons of earth out of the Mount Plantation, they are getting more money out of that than what they get out of Witwatersrand when they lift the same tonnage of earth, and the quarry owners over here do not have one-fiftieth of the capital outlay as what it takes in the gold mining area. Because of that alone, you should be getting some sort of royalties out of them.

I wonder if the Government of Barbados is considering acquiring the Mount Quarry in that light. Here it is, you have people taking out all the assets out of the land and you are getting nothing. It is a fantastic situation. There you have something, but just because it is soft stone, you do not consider the economy of it and the wasting aspect of it. Just as the people in other countries consider gold mining, I think the time has come when we should set up a Commission to review the whole situation in so far as stone quarrying is concerned. We can make a start right now if we believe in the dignity of labour not only by accepting the amendment but by taking over the Mount Quarry even on the basis of a lease or on the basis of acquisition of the land under the Land Acquisition Act and then installing there all the innovations and all the mechanical equipment suggested by members on the floor of the House. Certainly it would be a means of knowing the whole economics of quarrying operations. We can also experiment with slabbing stone by mechanical means such as those which were done at Bayfield by a firm which carried out certain experiments there a few years ago. I do not think that the experiments received enough encouragement from the Government because I do not think it was fully appreciated that quarrying so to speak for soft stone and coralline stone is the basis of the building industry in this island. We are now importing a tremendous amount of cement from a neighbouring colony when we have excellent building material and it is not put to the best advantage. Sir, what we must ensure in this country is that the resources which we have are not placed at a disadvantage by having to resort to labour which we associate with pulling lighter oars and Chapel slavery and that kind of thing. I do not know of any human task which is more exacting and more devastating in its effects on the frame of a person than having to lift block stones and the quarrying from the face of nature such building materials with an iron drill.

Sir, in conclusion, I would like to suggest that the latter part of the amendment by the hon. senior member for Christ Church is unnecessary because it only emphasises something which has been already established and which is a law of the island and, that is, that every citizen owes a duty to the other not to be negligent, regardless of whether there is a contract of employment existing between the person who is negligent and the person who is injured. I suggest that you delete all the words after the word "service."

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment as proposed by the hon. junior member for St. John. My amendment will then stop at the word "service."
5.15 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Before that question is put, no doubt the Hon. Minister of Social Services has explained quite fully the purpose of this Clause and of the Bill as a whole. As the Hon. Minister has pointed out, this Bill deals with the safety of the operation of quarries and not with the mechanisation of quarries. The amendment proposed by the hon. senior member for Christ Church has something to do with the mechanisation of quarries, or rather a part of the amendment has something to do with the mechanisation of quarries. The point was raised by the Hon. Minister of Social Services in respect of the use of diamond saws, and the use of these saws would relieve the people who cut these stones much more so than the erection or installation of mechanical devices; because no doubt the drills which are used by these people are heavy drills and the cutting of stone on the whole is therefore a bit of drudgery work. Since that point has been raised, I would be willing to have a further postponement of this Clause so that I can go into the whole question in so far as these quarries are concerned. This is no easy matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. When the Hon. Minister spoke about the mechanisation of quarries, not much of what he said seemed to be to the point. The mechanisation of quarries would mean the actual cutting of stone by machinery; the mechanisation of quarries will mean, where the device is installed, large-scale machinery for cutting the stone. If it is a question of using a diamond saw, then that is not mechanisation. Let us understand what we are talking about and do not let us be confused by the stupidity of people who do not know what they are talking about. The mechanisation of a quarry is an entirely different matter both from the provisions of this Bill and from what the amendment of the hon. senior member for Christ Church proposes. None of us would sit here and agree to any mechanisation of the quarry industry, because it would put people out of work entirely. I am amazed that a lot of the tommy rot talk by the Hon. Minister of Social Services could influence this debate, because if I thought so at the time, I would have answered him.

Hon. M. E. COX: Surely, Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member wants me to give way to him, I will do that and speak after him.

Hon. M. E. COX: I feel very strongly on the points which have been made, but this is a matter to which very serious consideration will have to be given before any decision is taken on it. I do want to emphasise that, in my opinion, it is much easier to get the stone to the surface by a rope than it is to cut the stone with a drill all through the day. Hon. members have not suggested that workmen could get saws with which they could cut the stone.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. So much did I mention the question of extracting stone from the soil by some means other than hand drilling that I was almost afraid, Mr. Chairman, you were going to tell me that I must stick to the amendment. If I deal with the matter only in a cursory manner, you will understand that I want to be parliamentary.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is something which we should not stick in a Bill, because that would mean that every quarry owner should be equipped with these mechanical devices. (MEMBERS: What is wrong with that?) Not only for cutting the stone, but also for lifting the stone from the quarry. Everybody cannot work for money easily; some people have to work hard for it. However, I am prepared to agree to a further postponement of this Clause with a view to going further into this matter. I am prepared to accept a postponement.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the further consideration of this Clause be postponed.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am agreeing with the postponement, but if there is one hon. member who, I know, will bear me

out, it is the Hon. Minister of Social Services to whom I referred this question when I was a member of the Housing Board.
5.25 p.m.

One thing I agree with in this is that the whole thing should be taken in a comprehensive way. While I agree with the amendment, whether or not you postpone it, I would have voted for it with one slight further amendment. There are quarries that can do without a winch, and I was going to suggest that quarries below a certain depth should have a winch, no matter by whom they are owned. I agree with the postponement for the reason that you should go into this matter from every angle, because it is not only a question of getting the stones out; it is a question also of quarrying them. The Minister of Social Services and I raised the question when we were on the Housing Board and we suggested that Government should bring somebody from Italy - that seems to be the best place to get an expert on this matter - to go into this question of quarrying stones here, because the present system is dying out, and with the material we have, we should try some means of getting it out easier. You cannot expect that a man of 23 or 24 years will go into a quarry and work as he did twenty-five years ago; it is a very hard job, but it is very important to Barbados if we must build houses that will last.

I agree strongly with the postponement, because on more than one occasion I have asked the Housing Authority to send this up to Government, and in my speech on the second reading of this Bill I raised the question of getting a winch to get out these stones from the quarry as well as the question of hewing the stones, because if you make a survey you will find how much money we spend in the importation of lumber to this island. I think I have discussed with the Minister of Social Services a type of drill for these quarries. As a matter of fact, it will be recalled by hon. members that one firm got down some machinery, but it was found that it was the wrong kind and only suitable for working in coal mines. It has been suggested time and again that you want a diamond saw; none of us know what will happen, but we would like to see you get some mechanical unit that could get the stones out, and I believe if you want to get any advice on that, you must go to the country where you can get the best advice, and that is Italy, where you have people dealing with marble quarries.

I am supporting the postponement but I would have supported the amendment. I hope Government has not moved the postponement because of the numerical strength on this side. As I watch the smile on hon. members' faces, I am convinced more than ever that this postponement is merely palliative because they feel that the amendment would have been carried; let us hope it is not really that and that they are genuinely interested in making a comprehensive survey of quarrying in this country with a view to providing more stones, thereby building more substantial houses and making it easier for the workers who must toil day after day in these quarries, and consequently importing less lumber. I have very much pleasure in seconding the motion for postponement which I believe was moved by the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that further consideration has been postponed, because I know that the concrete block industry is being given preference over the soft stone industry. A soft stone quarry owner approached me one day and asked if we could not pass a Law to stop it, but I said that we could not pass a Law to prevent a man from earning his bread. I always felt that one of the hardest jobs in this country is cutting soft stones, and if the Minister can see fit to implement or introduce saws which will eradicate the drill system, I am sure this industry will be able to stand up to the concrete block industry. Sometimes after the cutter has formed the stone and goes to block it, it breaks in half and he loses that stone, and in my opinion if he used a saw he would be able to save his labour by not having these stones breaking at the last moment. By this method he would not get so much dust either, because the drill has to make a

channel and that creates a lot of marl, while in the saw system there would not be so much marl, and you would not have to hire so many women to head it off.

As far as the winch is concerned, after a cutter has cut the stone he will have to roll it to the winch, unless the lorry can go inside and he will only then have to lift the stone. I am glad the Minister has seen fit to postpone this for the purpose of mechanising the whole thing so that the industry will be able to stand up to the concrete block industry, because there are very few stone buildings going up because of competition with the concrete block industry. A concrete building is much cheaper, but I do not know if it will be able to stand a storm as can a stone building. Until we mechanise the quarry industry we will be doing no good, because the concrete block industry will surely kill it. I hope when the Minister returns with this Bill that he will have every thing in order.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the last two hon. members who spoke raised the point of cheapening the method of cutting quarry stones.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I was one of those two members and I never raised that point at all.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The point of mechanising the cutting of stones from these quarries has been taken up by the Ministry with the West Indian representative of the International Corporation which administers Technical Aid Programmes to the United States. I got in touch with him and the matter was discussed with the Permanent Secretary, the Manager of the Housing Authority and myself, and since then, he has asked us to send some samples of stone to the United States which we have done.
5.35 p.m.

The whole point is that it has not been lost sight of by the Government and we are doing something about it. I do hope in the near future that we would have a reply from this Technical Aid so that I can let this House know what prospects they are in the future for introducing this mechanical device in quarries.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, just one small point I want to raise. I was very pleased that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph raised this question of soft stone now being supplanted by concrete blocks. The hon. member may recall that about three years ago I pointed out in here that the Government was the biggest offender in this respect because even for foundations the Housing Board was using concrete blocks while the average builder outside even if he built with concrete blocks would lay the foundation with soft stone.

Sir, I am not amused or impressed by the Government's parliamentary dodge today because the motion for postponement is only a parliamentary dodge. Sometimes I wonder whether this is Parliament or a Punch and Judy show. Do you really believe that the hon. Minister who was talking about mechanising the industry was one of the same hon. members who opposed the amendment? They got there and argued for hours *ad lib* that if you make a small quarry owner furnish mechanical equipment, you would run them out of business and now the Hon. Minister is saying that they want the same small quarry owners to mechanise the industry. I have never in my life heard more tommy rot. When you sit down and listen to them and see the asinine spectacle which they make of themselves every Tuesday --

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I object to those remarks. They are unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Philip to withdraw the word "asinine."

Mr. CRAWFORD: If you want me to withdraw that word, I withdraw it. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask you in all seriousness and with all due respect to the Chair what would be the appropriate word to apply to their attitude here today. A mere \$40-winch we were asking quarry

owners to install and the Government Bench is saying that if you make quarry owners put it in, it would put them out of business. Sir, it cost them over £20,000 to install the plant at Goddard's and the land was leased from Dacosta & Company. Well now, Mr. Chairman, let us assume that the average small quarry owner would not attempt any large scale mechanism scheme like that but certainly, Sir, large scale mechanism or small scale mechanism must be completely beyond the means of the small quarry owner or operator if they cannot even put in a \$40-winch. All that it means is that the Government would have to subsidise the industry, that is to say, the Government would have to import the mechanical equipment and give it over to the quarry owner or operator, large or small, which might put possibly more people out of work.

The position is this. The Government can pursue its further enquiries into mechanising the task of cutting soft stone without prejudice by accepting this amendment if, as the Hon. Minister of Social Services points out, this Bill is purely concerned with safety measures. The Hon. Minister of Trade and Industry professes to welcome his enlightenment at persons engaged in quarries being safeguarded from harm and injury. He went so far as to say that it would be dubious. The Hon. Minister professed to be very appreciative of his enlightenment that the same Bill was purely concerned with the protecting of workers in quarries.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Philip. We are now dealing with the question of postponement. I would ask you to refrain from going into the principles of the Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What are we postponing?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to refrain from making comments on the Bill itself.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I am doing is to comment on their motion for the postponement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Stick to that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I began by telling the Committee that that motion was merely a parliamentary dodge and should not be taken too seriously and I began to give an explanation of that allegation. I am going on to say that the Hon. Minister of Social Services said that he could not accept our amendment because the Bill was only concerned with the protection of workers from injury. Now, Sir, if in this Bill you cannot insert an amendment making it compulsory to provide a winch, can you put in this Bill clauses to mechanise the industry? It is as completely far-fetched. They say that any proposal to mechanise the industry must be the subject of an entirely new Bill.

I say, Sir, do not let them call for postponement; throw out the Bill. They are not fooling us with their kind of nonsense that you cannot in this Bill insert anything for the mechanisation of the industry.
5.45 p.m.

They have found themselves in a completely indefensible position, because of the stand which they have taken on the Bill. Our arguments were completely unanswerable and they cannot defend their case at all. Instead of saying so, instead of accepting the amendment and admitting that they were wrong, they have resorted to all sorts of parliamentary dodges so as to exculpate themselves. In Parliament, dodges are sometimes to be expected, but do not let them talk nonsense about the mechanisation of an industry and say therefore, that they will postpone the Bill. We know that they are postponing the Bill, because they do not want to accept our amendment, and because they do not want to vote for it.

The question that the further consideration of this Clause be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE OTHER PLACE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Honourable the Legislative Council a Message returning with amendments the Bill to repeal the Public Officers' Housing Act, 1952, to make certain amendments to the Housing Act, 1955, and to provide for other incidental matters.

I understand that copies of the amendment are being circulated as well as copies of the original section.

QUESTIONS

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, at the proper time at today's sitting of the House, I could not give notice of my questions. I am therefore asking the leave of the House to give notice of those questions.

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

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Premier:-

Will the Minister state what moneys, if any, remain in the Rural Amenities Fund?

Will he further state what current or future projects, if any, are to be financed from this Fund?

Will he consider issuing a "white paper", setting out the full details of past Expenditure from this Fund, as well as the current and probably future charges upon it?

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

Will the Minister state what the Government's policy is with respect to the following?

(a) Sixth form teaching in the grant-aided Secondary Schools.

(b) The age limit for writing the Barbados Scholarship Examination.

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

Is the Minister aware of the grave dissatisfaction, now existing among Secondary School Teachers, with their present salary levels, as compared with the levels in other branches of the establishment?

Will the Minister consider the early appointment of a representative Committee to investigate this dissatisfaction and to make appropriate recommendations for salary adjustment in the light of its findings?

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

Will the Minister state what Certificates, if any, of the London College of Preceptors, give their possessors exemptions from the examination for Certificate "A" or "B" or both for Primary School Teachers?

Will he also state what qualification alternative to Certificate "B" is adequate for the entrance of Primary School Teachers to Erdiston College?

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

Will the Minister consider easing the financial difficulties of the Erdiston Students by withholding one-third

of their salaries, and not one-half, as now appears to be the case?

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:-

Will the Minister state whether there is a Chapel at the Mental Hospital?

If the answer is in the negative, will he state what provision, if any, exists for Religious observance and worship in that Institution?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will he state the dimensions of the Chapel, its location, and the number of persons it can conveniently accommodate at any single sitting?

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

Is the Minister aware that it is the desire of the residents of Clinketts Housing Scheme in the Parish of St. Lucy to own the lands on which their aided self-help houses were constructed?

Will the Minister undertake to instruct the Housing Authority to enter into negotiations with these householders with a view to giving effect to their desire?

Will the Minister further direct the Housing Authority to defray, from its own resources, all the necessary legal expenditure arising out of the transfer?

Mr. Speaker, I desire an oral reply to these questions. 5.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we hope to have a long adjournment from this evening, we would like to have these amendments passed today. This is very important, because we want these public officers in the meantime to get the loans which they so long desired; so I am asking that the amendments to the Housing Amendment Act, 1958 be taken as the next Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take the amendments to the Public Officers' Housing Loans Act as the next Order of the day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

COUNCIL AMENDMENT re PUBLIC OFFICERS

HOUSING LOANS ACT

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, copies of the amendment have been passed to hon. members, and I should like to say that it is simply a matter of drafting. I do not think there is any fundamental change in the Clause which reads as follows:-

"On the coming into operation of this Act, there shall vest in the authority by virtue of this Act and without further assurance all estate or interest in, or charge on, any land, building, policy of assurance or gratuity, conveyed or assigned to the Governor-in-Executive Committee by way of mortgage for securing advances by way of loans and interest and expenses under the provision of the Public Officers Housing Loans Act, 1952 and all other properties, rights, liabilities and obligations of whatsoever nature which immediately before the coming into operation of this Act were vested in or were the properties, rights, liabilities and obligations of the Public Officers' Housing Board or the Governor-in-Executive Committee acquired or incurred under, or otherwise in pursuance of, or for carrying out the purposes of, the Public Officers' Housing Loans Act, 1952, including any monies standing at that date to the credit of the Public Officers' Housing Fund and any lands and hereditaments acquired for such purposes."

As I said, there is no fundamental change and I beg to move that this amendment be now read a first time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the amendment was read a second time and agreed to.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 8 as the next Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take Order No. 8 as the next Order of the day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

THE WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS, 1958

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment to the Wireless Telegraphy Act, and

it seeks to change from wired broadcasting as we have at the moment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Regulations have not been circulated, and therefore the Hon. Minister may not proceed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition agrees, I think we can move the adjournment now.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 9th October, 1958 at 12 noon.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.05 p.m.