

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1956-61

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13th January, 1959.

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); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O. B. E.; Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (Minister of Social Services); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER; Mr. C. E. TALMA; Mr. C. B. SEARLES and Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, (Minister of Education).

Prayers were read.

Messrs. Crawford and Straughn entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on the 1st July, 1958, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (After a Pause.) There being no objection, those Minutes are taken as read and confirmed.

NEW MEMBER TAKES HIS SEAT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Clerk of the Executive Committee, dated 22nd December last year, the following letter:—

To: JOHN WESLEY CORBIN, ESQUIRE

I hereby certify that you have been declared duly elected as a member to serve

in the General Assembly of the Island for the constituency of St. Andrew and that, in accordance with the provisions of section 86 of the Representation of the People Act, 1957, you took before the Governor and Executive Committee on the 22nd day of December, 1958, the Oath of Allegiance in accordance with the provision of the Promissory Oaths Act, 1870.

F. M. Blackman
Clerk, Executive Committee,
22nd December, 1958.

I will now ask the Marshal to escort the new member to his seat.

Accompanied by the Hon. Leader of the House, Mr. Corbin entered the House and took his seat amidst cheers.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following Documents:—

The Report of the Directors and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited for the year ended 30th June, 1958.

Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month of November, 1958.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am Commanded to lay Message No.1/59 to the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding the prorogation of the Legislature. The Message reads as follows:—

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE
OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that he proposes to prorogue the Legislature on Tuesday, 20th January, 1959, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Government House 8th January, 1959.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am also commanded to lay the following:—

Barbados Statistical Service — Selected Monthly Indicators — November, 1958.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for eight months ended 30th November, 1958.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Barbados Savings Bank for the year ended 31st December, 1957.

Report of the Audit of the Accounts of the Housing Authority for the year ended on the 31st March, 1958.

Report of the Housing Authority for the period 1st April, 1957 to 31st March, 1958.

The Markets and Slaughter Houses (Amendment) Regulations, 1958.

Reply to Question No. 20/1958 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding the recruitment of Barbadians by the Police Forces of England and Wales.

12.30 p.m.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

Reply to Question No. 21/1958 asked by the junior member for St. Michael regarding the provision of a Communal Bath and Latrine at Jackson, St. Michael.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to place the sum of \$105,550 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958–59

Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 38, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I should also like to inform the Hon. House, Sir, that it is my intention to ask leave when in Committee of Supply to deal with this money Resolution. I presume that all members have already been given copies of this Resolution. In view of the fact that this House will be prorogued on Tuesday next, I hope members will agree to pass this Resolution today.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Oral Reply to Question No. 7/1958 asked by the senior member for St. Lucy regarding the provision of religious observance and worship at the Mental Hospital.

Also on behalf of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Oral Reply to Question No. 9/1958 asked by the junior member for St. John regarding the staff of Postmen in St. George and St. John.

Oral Reply to Question No. 13/1958 asked by the junior member for St. John regarding the construction of the East Coast Road.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:—

Whether Government is aware of dissatisfaction amongst police constables attached to rural police stations in respect of their hours of continuous duty?

2. Is Government aware of hardship suffered by such constables at rural stations which are not provided with a cook for the men stationed there, many of whom are unable to cook properly for themselves and who cannot obtain cooked meals from their homes?

3. Will the Ministry cause an early investigation into the number of consecutive working hours per day required of a police constable at rural stations, and, wherever such appears excessive, have steps taken to reduce same?

4. Will Government for the benefit of the many constables attached to rural stations who are inefficient cooks, cause provision to be made for a qualified cook to be attached to each outside station?

To enquire of the Minister of Health:—

Whether it is true that, at the Barbados General Hospital, there does not exist equipment with which operations in brain surgery may be performed at that institution?

2. If the answer to above query is "Yes", will Government in view of the necessity for performance of such operations at this Hospital, particularly for poor persons who cannot afford to travel overseas for such operations without delay make appropriate provision therefor?

To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture & Fisheries:—

Whether Government is aware that the average owners of powered fishing boats find it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, to pay private enterprise for repairs to their engines, as well as at the same time repay Government, by instalments, the amounts owed to the Public Treasury for their engines, whilst simultaneously seeking to eke out a livelihood for themselves and their dependents from such craft?

2. Will Government take immediate action for the purpose of (a) having such engines repaired by Government personnel at a workshop provided for that purpose, making only a nominal charge for such repairs? (b) importing all such engines in future, through the Crown Agents or otherwise?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to move discussion on the Report of the Inquiry made by Mr. A. F. McKenzie.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am asking leave to give notice of the following Resolution:—

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House concur in the opinion that the island's constitutional position warrants the elimination of the word "Colonial" from the title "Member Colonial Parliament" which is affixed to the names of members of this Hon. House, and respectfully request that appropriate steps be taken to have the designation amended to another more in consonance with the country's current constitutional status."

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, before the first Order is taken, I should like to ask leave to make a statement.

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

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the statement is as follows:—

Under this item an amount of \$9,070 was provided for the purchase of the following refrigerating units for the General Hospital:

One water Cooler	\$ 550
One Ice Making Machine	1,500
One Refrigerator for storage of blood	1,750
Five Refrigerators for the wards	2,750
One Refrigerator for the Nurses' Home	550
One Refrigerator for the Main Kitchen	1,420
One Refrigerator for the Veacock Theatre	550
	<u>\$9,070</u>

2. A reassessment of the needs of the wards, the Nurses' Home and the Main Kitchen has shown that greater efficiency will be achieved by transferring four existing small refrigerators from the Nurses' Home and the Main Kitchen to the wards and in using the provision in the Estimates to provide the Nurses' Home and the Main Kitchen with large units which are really needed there. The revised proposal for expenditure of the funds provided in the Estimates is now as follows:—

One water Cooler	\$ 550
One Ice-Making machine	1,500
One refrigerator for storage of blood	1,750
One refrigerator for Nurses' Home	1,954
Two refrigerators for Main Kitchen	2,970
	<u>\$8,724</u>

3. Provided the House of Assembly sees no objection, it is now proposed to vary the expenditure under Head XXIII(2) General Hospital, Item 14, Refrigerating Units, as set out in paragraph 2 above.
12.40 p.m.

LEAVE TO DEAL WITH MONEY RESOLUTION

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am asking leave to deal with the Money Resolution for \$105,550 of which I gave notice not long ago when the House goes into Committee of Supply.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction while in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution for \$105,550.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59 No. 37

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave of the Committee to take charge of Item No. 1 standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, as hon. members will see in this Resolution, there is a request in the first place for the sum of \$889 for Arms and Ammunition, which were ordered some time in 1957-58, but which did not turn up at that time and as a result the money lapsed in the Treasury; therefore, we are asking now for a revote of this money. The House has already agreed to it.

The next Item is Incidentals, for which the sum of \$176 is required. As hon. members will see from the note, it was customary to put a certain amount of money in the Estimates under Miscellaneous, Item 29, to assist as a contribution towards the cost of printing the rate books — Police Tax — for the Vestry of St. Michael. This has not been done on this occasion; therefore, I am asking for the sum of \$176 to meet that requirement. Apparently, the money for this has been used from another vote and as the Commissioner has pointed out, the vote needs to be replenished to this amount.

The other Item, is Travelling Expenses for which the sum of \$2,770 is required. As you will know, we have agreed to increase rates of travelling and it absolutely necessary to have an increase in the vote.

The next Item is Subsistence Allowance to N.C.O.'s and Men, for which the sum of \$3,833

is required. The Public Service Commission has recommended that assistance be given to Policemen in training at the Regional Training School by way of fifty cents a day to enable them to help pay for their meals. The Government has agreed to it with effect from 1st April, 1958 and this amount of \$3,833 is required.

For the next Item — Training a revote of \$71 is required to cover the cost of certain books which were ordered during the financial year but which were not received. I do not think there would be any talk on that.

As you will see the next Item is new — Passports. In previous years the cost of Passports was met from the Item "Government Binding and Printery" under Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services. Since then, we have been trying to get the Government Printery to do all work or as much as possible. It has been found that we need 5,000 Passports which costs \$3,500 and this amount is required to meet that expenditure.

The last Item is Motor Vehicles. According to the Note, the amount of \$3,200 is required for the replacement of one four-year old van which was extensively damaged in an accident. That van was sold and the proceeds were put into the Treasury; so it is necessary to purchase another van.

I hardly think there is anything more which needs to be said on this Resolution. Therefore, I formally beg to move that this Resolution for \$14,439 do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like a little more clarification on Item 48, Subsistence Allowance to N.C.O.'S and Men, as regards the fifty cents a day subsistence to Policeman in training for the cost of supplying their meals. What does that amount mean? Is this given to them to purchase their meals? Is this given to them to go to the Canteen to get their meals? Will they have to supplement it from their own money? I am wondering whether their meals should not be provided free of cost when they are recruits. I would like a little clarification as to the actual procedure.
12.50 p.m.

These recruits go up there to be trained and they have meals up there presumably. Do they have to go elsewhere and purchase their meals or are they required to use meals prepared at Seawell itself and purchase from

their own pockets; but the Government will be giving 50 cents a day to help pay for them? If that is so, will the Government give us any idea as to what these meals will cost so that we will be able to see how far the money will go? I really feel that these recruits should have three meals a day and I am doubtful as to how far this 50 cents a day would go. I think that we will have to look for at least a \$1.00 a head to supplement this amount and that is putting it on a conservative basis.

As regards the matter of passports, I should like to inform the Honourable Deputy Premier that there is still some trouble as to the issuing of passports. When the present Federal Prime Minister was the Premier of this colony, I had drawn to his attention in this House that the Police Department took it upon themselves to refuse, postpone or decline issuing passports until the persons who applied for them satisfied the Department that they had paid either the Steamship Company, or the Airways Company for their tickets, as if it were not the right of anyone who has no criminal record to be supplied with an application form for a passport. Mr. Chairman, you have the right to travel anywhere so long as the place to which you are travelling says that it is prepared to accept you. There are people who make application for forms and they are told that these forms will not be issued to them until they satisfy the Department, by producing the receipts, that they are booked to leave the island. That is nonsense and it is putting the cart before the horse.

Sometime ago I sent to pay a Steamship Company for a ticket and the Police Department refused to issue an application form until I had sent the evidence that I had paid to visit the place in respect of which I was seeking to buy a ticket to visit. The boast among these people is that if you fail to comply with the requirements, they will keep you waiting. On one occasion the Police saw me and they knew that I was there to make a noise, in this case, the people were not kept back. I have had frequent clashes with the members of that Department because they feel that they are doing you a favour in giving you a passport. I trust that the Honourable Deputy Premier, when he discusses this matter with the Cabinet perhaps, will let the Police know that we deprecate any attempt to make it difficult for any law-abiding citizen to obtain his application form for a passport.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, with regard to Item No. 1 of this Head, the note says that the sum of \$889 was earmarked to

pay for equipment ordered during the last financial year; that the equipment was not received before the end of that financial year and therefore the amount lapsed. The equipment has since arrived and the amount we are asked to vote today is now required to make payment therefor. Well now, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in the past financial year we ordered more ammunition than we required; if the entire year passed and the equipment never arrived, therefore we did without it. That in itself is an indication that the amount which we are spending annually on ammunition is too much. I presume that the Honourable Minister will instruct the Head of this Department that the amount of ammunition which has now arrived should be deducted from the total amount which has been ordered for the current financial year. It seems to me, Sir, that he should deduct twice that amount. If last year \$889 worth of ammunition failed to turn up and we got along with the commitments for last year without it, then it means that last year's vote has been reduced by that amount, and this year we should be able to reduce the vote by twice that amount.

Let me assure the Government that the Opposition has no intention at all of pulling a Castro on them at any time this year and therefore they are relieved of any extra amount of ammunition; but putting fun apart, in a small colony like this, the annual expenditure on ammunition is something like £600. That was last year's estimate and it is, in the repeatedly expressed opinion of the Opposition, too high; now the Police Department and the Government themselves have confirmed the opinion of the Opposition that this amount is too high.

Mr. Chairman, in the past we have protested against the inclusion in the Estimates of what we considered abnormal sums for ammunition for hardly any reason at all because much of it has to be dumped; I understand that after a certain period it is not used. It seems to me that perhaps unwittingly the conviction of the Opposition is now being endorsed by the Government. The Opposition would like an assurance from the Minister that a proper investigation will be made in order to discover whether or not it is possible to make a considerable saving on the amount included in the year's estimates for this purpose; and further, the Opposition would also like an assurance from the Government that every effort will be made to make a drastic reduction in the annual amount both voted and expended under this Head. Certainly the Government will

agree that, little if any, constructive purpose is served by the annual expenditure of the sums which we have been in the habit of spending.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am going further than both hon. members who have spoken on both of these matters. It is patent now that this vote for arms and ammunition is like a Christmas Tree; because you had a Christmas Tree last year you must have a Christmas Tree again this year as a matter of course.

1.00 p.m.

Are arms and ammunition needed? In some instances they are, because sometimes I wish it were possible to use arms and ammunition; it would be divine. Some people need arms and ammunition for the purpose of liquidation; but in a normal way nothing has taken place, yet you find this patent ignorance all the time where you have a situation in which you can see that you do not need this required amount of money. It is a fact that you have been told repeatedly that they have to throw away ammunition because it was no good. You hear this idea of men practising. What are they practising for? You are building up a West Indian Regiment which can be flown from Trinidad to Barbados in a matter of hours; so the situation today is not the same. I would go further than hon. members and say that the money which you spend in arms and ammunition could go to various Police Stations in providing more amenities for the policemen. Many a policeman has not got even a chair in his room on which to sit and put on his boots; he has to sit on a cot; so you would be spending this money more wisely if you provided certain physical amenities for the men who have to work as policemen. I regard that as a very wise way to spend the savings.

In so far as Item 4 is concerned, one would have expected to hear from the Minister who introduced this Resolution what it all means. Now let us deal with this and see what is wrong, and let us see, as they say, whether the Addendum speaks for itself. The note reads as follows:—

“On the recommendation of the Public Service Commission and with the concurrence of participating Governments it has been agreed that with effect from the 1st April, 1958, recruits attending the Regional Police Training School should be paid an allowance of 50 cents a day towards the cost of supplying their meals.”

What do you mean by that? You mean that you are subsidising the cost of supplying meals to recruits by an amount of 50 cents a day. Now I will go further than the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Why is it that a man attending the

Police Training School who is already recruited into the Police Force — because I take it that to get to the Training School you have to be already accepted into the Force — is required to pay for his meals at that Training School which has been erected by the various Governments? Why should he be called upon to pay for his meals? Why do you not call upon the girls at the General Hospital who would be on the same basis as the policemen at the Training School? When you are recruited as a nurse, the Doctors say that you are not a nurse; you are in training to become a nurse, but you are provided with meals. Similarly, at the Mental Hospital, any day on which you have to go out, you are paid the equivalent of what you would have received in meals if you had remained at the Institution. This note says that the police recruits must pay towards their meals but you are going to provide them with 50 cents a day. What kind of Socialist Government do we have? Only a white-washed Socialist Government could come here today to give a man 50 cents towards supplying his meals when you have recruited him. What is the price of the meal? I would say this: if a body of men can seriously bring this to the Legislature, I do not know what is going to happen to this country if we go on in this attitude. You are asking a man whom you have recruited to supply his meals, and you know that you have a precedent where you do not ask a nurse to supply her meals. This does not need any particular interpretation. You are going to pay the recruits an allowance of 50 cents a day towards the cost of supplying their meals, which means that whatever is the cost of supplying the meals, they will get 50 cents a day. After providing them with meals, the question of paying an allowance does not arise, because if you are providing a man's meals, why should you call upon him to pay an allowance? If you provide a domestic servant with meals, you do not have to give her an allowance towards her meals. Why do we have to give a police recruit an allowance towards his meals when you are supplying the meals for the Police Training School? We understand that there is a Canteen at the Police Training Centre, and we understand too that someone has been fortunate to receive the contract for supplying meals at the Police Training School; therefore if it is a question of your supplying meals, why is it that you are called upon to give an allowance of 50 cents a day? Is it 50 cents a day when he is not at the Training School, or is it 50 cents when he is at the Training School as additional money? Is it because you are satisfied that you are not giving him enough food and therefore you are giving him 50 cents a day to buy sweets, chocolates and things like that as something with which to get dessert to the basic meal which you are giving?

On the face of it, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that you have not said what is the cost of supplying the meals; so I do not know why you are giving him 50 cents. What is the cost of the meal? Is it 52 cents and the man is being called upon to pay a penny while you are giving him 50 cents? Is it \$1.50 and he is asked to provide a \$1 while you are giving him 50 cents? The participating Governments have agreed to give him an allowance and the Barbados Government has agreed also to give him an allowance. Why?

1.10 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I told the Committee in the early stage that the Government of Barbados had agreed to contribute fifty cents, other Governments having agreed to the contribution. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition wanted to find out something of this fifty cents, and of course, the hon. senior member for St. Peter actually answered the question for him, because there is a canteen run at the Training School at Seawell and there is a caterer there who has the contract. As far as I remember, these meals cost approximately \$1.50 a day which can be regarded as the nominal amount. The Government has agreed to contribute one-third of that which is fifty cents so that the Officer would not have to pay more than one dollar per day.

Now, as regards the question of whether or not the Government should pay the whole amount, no doubt in Parliaments, especially when it comes to an Opposition which has no leg on which to stand, they at some time throw up things which they themselves if they were in power would not countenance. The question of supplying free meals to recruits was compared with Nurses in training at the General Hospital, but I think I am correct in saying that when a Policeman joins the Force, he gets something like \$90 per month and that cannot be regarded in similar light to that which a Nurse receives. (Mr. MOTTLEY: A Nurse gets \$80). I know that is not correct.

Why cannot the same argument be used for a Policeman who for example happens to be living in Bridgetown and has his family and gets his meals from his home but is compelled to go to St. Andrew, St. Lucy or St. Philip to do his job? It divides his home into two, because he has to get his meals on the spot, he has to buy or ask somebody to provide meals for him on the job and also to see that his home is kept intact; therefore, that is added expenditure. What is there to prevent us from saying that a man having been forced to leave his home to work in an area far away from his connections should be

given money to buy his food or should be given some subsistence allowance? That argument can also be used for teachers who go to Erdiston. Years ago, they used to go as far as St. John for their training. What argument would you use for teachers who go into training at the Erdiston Training School? Surely, the same argument can be used for that and I can go on like that almost *ad infinitum*. But, Sir, it must be understood that in so far as the Treasury is concerned it is not unlimited and the Government feels that inasmuch as these Policemen are in training, that they should be given some assistance by way of fifty cents per day for their meals. I do not think that should be anything which should be criticised and regarded as unsocialist. And that is perhaps all I have to say on that.

The question of arms and ammunition no doubt has been raised all over and over again. I do not remember for the last five years we have spent too much money on arms and ammunition, because I am sure that people like myself who have had the privilege of sitting on Executive Committee for some time have always opposed very strenuously any question of increasing the vote for arms and ammunition and the Commissioner of Police has always had to give every detail when it comes to this question of arms and ammunition, because I always believe although I know we must have some arms and ammunition that this business is a question of preparation to deal with, may be, the hungry people by the Force. But, Sir, the majority of these arms and ammunition are used in practising. Since 1949, the vote stood at \$2,880 and it has not been increased. It is the same today as it was then; therefore, it cannot be regarded as being too much today although there has been an increase in the membership of the Police Force.

There is, no doubt, some point in what the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said and that is that if the Commissioner of Police were able to do without that much ammunition during that year, well, then, there may be reason for reduction on this financial year's allocation. I am afraid I have not got any information on that and I cannot tell the Committee anything on those lines but, as I have said, for what it is worth, there is some point in that.

I do not think I need say anything more, but if we want to supply Policemen in training with free meals as a principle I do not hesitate to state that that principle should not only apply to Policemen in training, but it should also apply to teachers in training and all other people who find themselves in similar circumstances.

1.20 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister was very reasonable but he was not very logical. I do not oppose the idea of giving 50 cents a day to a policeman who is in training, to assist him; a policeman is given this 50 cents a day in order to help him in getting his meals; that is very reasonable and I quite appreciate it, but the Hon. Minister's comparison is very illogical. He has asked: What about a teacher who is working? If a teacher goes to Erdiston, instead of giving him an allowance of 50 cents a day, they take out \$30 a month for his meals. I quite agree with you that "A", a teacher, or "B" a policeman in training should be given an extra 50 cents to assist them; that should apply to all persons in the Government. I believe that the Hon. Minister became confused in his reply; what is the difference between a policeman stationed in St. Andrew and a policeman in training at Seawell? I can see the reasonableness in the argument of the Government assisting these policemen in training, but what about the policeman who is leaving Seawell and who will be attached to the Station in St. Andrew? What do you give him? Nurses start off at \$80 a month; a policeman starts at \$90 a month and you give him 50 cents a day to assist him with his meals. You cannot relegate one person into an inferior position as compared with another person; a nurse gets \$80 a month and you take back \$16 for meals. I have no grouse about giving these policemen in training this 50 cents a day and I counsel the Hon. Minister that he cannot be so illogical as to make the comparison between teachers and nurses. If you give this assistance of 50 cents a day to these policemen in training, then you should also give some consideration to a policeman who comes out of training and who goes to Crab Hill Station or Belleplaine. I hope to see the day come when we have a proper canteen system at these places. You do not give this allowance to teachers; in the case of a teacher who gets \$90 a month and who is selected to go to Erdiston and who happens to be a married man, \$30 a month is taken out of his salary. Now say that these men are making their contribution to the island and therefore let us allow them something too. The Hon. Minister laughs, but I am arguing from a logical point of view. He suggests that this allowance should also be given to a teacher. A policeman starts off at \$90 a month, he goes into training at Seawell and is given 50 cents a day to assist him with his meals; a boy starts as a teacher with a Higher Certificate and he starts at \$90 a month also; he goes to Erdiston and you take \$30 a month out of his salary. I say, let the whole thing be streamlined and if you do something for one then you should do it for all.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, when you are not sure about your facts and you make

comparisons, it will always lead to what the hon. member who has just sat down was talking about. The members of this House are paid and they are getting free meals out of the Treasury too. You build a Regional Police Training Centre twelve miles away from Bridgetown and you have to provide a canteen and all of these things. It is not a question of asking: if you treat these people in this way what are you going to do with the others. The hon. member says that a policeman who goes to Belleplaine is not given any assistance with his meals, but the circumstances surrounding the cases are not the same at all. You will find that many a policeman makes provision for getting his meals from his home and he gets the meals which he likes; in the other case, the only thing is that policemen have to eat what can be regarded as regimental meals and there is no choice. I understand that some of them complain about the meals; sometimes you complain about your meals at home too, but nobody knows about that. The complaint made about these meals is that sometimes it is quantum and sometimes it is quality.

Apart from the recommendations of the Adams' Commission which came here, a nurse was not fed at the Hospital based on her salary; I was a member of the Governing Body of the Hospital and I can say that nurses were fed as a condition of their employment and what was regarded of the cost of a meal was added to their pensionable emoluments. If you take an officer on any salary and send him for training in the United Kingdom or anywhere else, you include your fees; you do not tell him that he must take something for food based on the salary which he is getting; it is all based on what you are creating as a training scheme.

The question about Erdiston College has been raised. What would be wrong in principle with the Teachers at Erdiston Training Centre being provided with free meals? What would be wrong in principle in that? Is there anything outrageous in that principle? Is it the first time that you have ever heard of people at training centres obtaining free meals?

1.30 p.m.

If you say you cannot afford it, that does not mean that there is anything wrong in principle, because there is absolutely no principle involved. So far as the Erdiston Training School is concerned, the people in training receive meals and do not have to pay for them out of their pockets. If you cannot afford to do it, you should say so but you should not say that if you do it you would have to consider the other policeman on duty. That is another question for

dispute, because what you have to take into consideration in such circumstances is the type of appointment. If I had the type of job that meant working around the clock, I would realise the difference of a shift system. If I am told that something is wrong, I have no friends at Court or anywhere else for that matter to see whether they are pleased or vexed, because my political life is not looking to please any one person or number of persons. I have too many to please; so I take the role I take without fear or favour. If you are not doing this because you cannot afford it, that is different; but you should not say that you would have to do it to everybody, because that would not be true. As I have already said in here, do you not believe that you would have to start with us if you start on that basis? What justification is there today for members of the House of Assembly still to be expecting what we are expecting based on the changed situation? I do not want to bring these comparisons when I talk about salaries. It is true that we come here one day and you provide for that, but somebody may be looking to see whom this may hurt. The days of hurting people are over. If you need hurting, no matter who you are, I will hurt you. Therefore you should not raise these arguments. If you look at the vote you will see how much money we spend in this Chamber in supplying these things. Are you suggesting that we cannot afford that? Are you not carrying on something which was being carried on in completely different circumstances from what is existing today? So it raises these matters which you are not ready to face, and that is why I say if you have men at the Training School and you cannot supply them with meals, you should say so; but you should not say that you cannot do it because if you do you would have to supply everybody else. Is it being suggested that because members of the House of Assembly come here and get meals that you must provide a meal for people who meet somewhere else? This idea that you cannot afford to do a thing is a regular vague statement which you can use in any circumstance. You cannot afford to give a man more money nor can you afford to give a child more milk; the ability to pay is always a very useful term to use even in Trade Union negotiations. That is the determining factor as to whether or not you should pay more. I do not view it on the basis that you will have to give the policeman in St. Andrew; I view it on the basis that in these things usually where you have a Training Centre like that far from the scene of things and it is not easy for the persons to go to their respective homes, you provide them with these things with a view to making them feel comfortable when they are training.

A man in training very often gets facilities which he does not get when he comes out of training, but you give him these things for training purposes only, and there is no principle at stake. It is purely a matter that if you feel it is something you can afford to do, you do it, but you do not refuse to do it on the basis that you will have to do it for everybody. I do not believe that Erdiston Training College is on the same basis; that is to say a teacher, going to Erdiston Training College is not on the same basis as a policeman going to the Training School, because going to Erdiston College is a matter of choice. You are not compelled to go to Erdiston Training College, but in a disciplinary force I believe in many instances it is not a matter of choice, It is a matter of having to go or get out. You provide things under certain circumstances if the circumstances merit your doing them; if not, you do not do them.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I had forgotten to assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on the question he raised about Passports that I would take it up with the appropriate authorities.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1958-59, No. 38

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this next Resolution is for the sum of \$105,550. As you will see, this is in connection with the Inland Revenue Department.

In the first Item, it is required to pay the temporary valuers to have a recheck on various properties before the Local Government Bill comes into force, and this is to remunerate these gentlemen. It is proposed to pay them \$200 each excluding travelling.

The next Item is "Refunds of Income Tax and Death Duties". As you will see in the explanatory note, this amount is required to meet expenses to the end of the financial year, March, 1959.

The next amount is for travelling expenses. This is one item we have increased recently, and therefore it is necessary to increase this vote.

The next Item is "Office Equipment and Furniture", which it is necessary to purchase. The number of rateable hereditaments will exceed 50,000, and in the Estimates it is only 45,000 and therefore it is necessary to have an additional 5,000.

For the last Item the original charge for embossing has been increased and it is also necessary to purchase a further 5,000 plates. Perhaps I should give the Committee a little information on the last Item. Probably the Committee did not know that originally the Electric Company had agreed to furnish these plates at something like \$65 per thousand, and since then they claim — and I regret to say that I have not been give data or statistics to prove the justification on otherwise of their claim and therefore I can only tell the Committee what has been told to me — that they could not carry out this work within normal hours and therefore has to pay overtime, and in addition they had to make repairs to the various plates. Originally, as I said, it was \$65 and now it is \$100 per thousand. That is the information which I received and which I pass on now to the Committee.

1.40 p.m.

It is absolutely necessary to get this job finished so that you can bring into being local government as soon as possible.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, under Item No. 2, I see that the sum of \$100,000 is asked to be voted as a refund of Income Tax and Death Duties. Already the amount of \$400,000 has been voted for refund of Income Tax and Death Duties in the approved estimates for 1958-1959. That amount has fallen short and has proved insufficient. Now, I am fully aware of the fact that the P.A.Y.E. system is new and as such, the amount to be refunded will not be known and that it will be necessary to come down for another vote as is happening today.

I am not speaking so much on that question as I am on the general principle of deduction. I want to bring it to the attention of the Government and to the Hon. Minister in particular that since the introduction of P.A.Y.E. system any amount of hardship and inconvenience has been suffered by the average

agricultural worker. The policy adopted has been whether the agricultural worker is liable or not to impose and to collect this tax from him.

Now, Sir, the average agricultural worker works for about sixteen weeks in the crop season and his average earnings are about \$20 per week at the most during that time. During the other thirty-six weeks in the year — what we call the hard times — he hardly works for more than \$10 a week; so then, at the outside, his earnings during the crop time would amount to an average of \$320 and during the hard times \$360, which would total \$680. As we all know, a single man is only taxable on receipt of over \$800 per annum and in case of a married man \$1,400: and if we then go in for simple mathematics and add the agricultural worker wages which he earns in crop season according to my figures — and if I am wrong I can be corrected by the hon. senior member for St. George who is a planter and has these figures at his fingertips — if my figures are correct:— I believe they are not far wrong, as I have said — he would have earned around \$680 in the course of a year. When I speak of the agricultural worker, I speak of the healthy strong one, not of the one who suffers from malnutrition. That means that he has earned less than what the single man is entitled to in so far as payment of Income Tax is concerned. In other words, a single man is allowed \$800 and a married man \$1,400.

My argument is that the average agricultural worker should not be called upon to pay income Tax at all and his money should not be deducted at all. I do not see how he is liable to this tax at all, because at the outset, he cannot earn more than \$700 per annum. The practice has been, since the P.A.Y.E. system, to try and extricate as much as you can from the ones who are least able to pay with the result that the money is taken out from them during the crop season and it is most rigidly collected in such a way as to cause a lot of confusion later on. You collect through this P.A.Y.E. system from people who are not liable and who should not be levied on and then later in the year you find out that they are not liable. As I have said, it does not take any mathematician or scholar to find out that he should not be levied on at all. Because a man has worked for \$20 a week during the crop season, it cannot be presumed that he will work for that for the whole year. The authorities know that and the plantation owners know that. I am saying that the average agricultural worker can only earn about \$680 a year and to continue that practice of levying and collecting on this P.A.Y.E. system from him indiscriminately should be discontinued, because in reality it is a hardship

and inconvenience to him in getting back his refund.

I am hoping that the authorities will see to it that the necessary refund forms are issued to the plantation owners and made easily available for agricultural workers to secure their refund. Sir, I am not speaking from hearsay, I have been actually informed by agricultural workers who have experienced the greatest difficulty in getting back their money. As I have said, if you look at this Resolution, you will see that the average agricultural worker should not be levied on at all, because in the average case, the amount he earns never comes to more than \$800. It may be so for the Superintendent or some of the Engineers, but the ones who are in the fields and the cane cutters who work hard in the crop season, they have to fall back and only get a pittance after the crop season is over. Sir, I am asking that some investigation be made in this matter. It is quite a good thing for them to do their part and to assist in the upkeep of the Island and in providing the necessary social amenities, but when we are calling upon people who are not earning sufficient to pay Income Tax, I think some enquiry should be made into the matter and the necessary refunds made so that agricultural labourers islandwide should secure their necessary refunds.

1.50 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to throw a little light on the situation and clear up anything that was misleading. I think that the honourable member who has just sat down is wrong in stating that all agricultural workers are at present being levied on for this tax. If I remember correctly, the hon. member was a member of the Government when we agreed to this Pay as you Earn system and the Commissioner of Income Tax, before making recommendations to the Government as regards the very agricultural workers to whom reference was made not so long ago, apparently got into touch with the various plantation owners and got the average earnings of those workers. As a result, the Commissioner recommended that, in so far as the agricultural workers who did not work for more than \$600 a year were concerned, no levy would be made on them. That is before the P.A.Y.E. system came into effect. I can quote chapter and verse for that. (ASIDES). Despite the asides of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I can say that before the P.A.Y.E. system came into force, a recommendation was made by the Income Tax Commissioner, or the Acting Income Tax Commissioner, who was Mr. Osborne at the time, that agricultural workers who did not work for more than \$600 a year should not be asked

to fall into line with this system. Therefore this system does not apply to all agricultural workers.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I am sorry to cross the Hon. Minister, but I made the point that agricultural workers who earn around \$20 a week during the crop season are called upon to contribute towards this P.A.Y.E. system. In other words, the money is deducted from their earnings. I am saying that in the case of those who work for \$20 a week, their money is deducted and that creates a hardship in that when the money is to be refunded to them, they have to beat about and they cannot obtain their forms easily.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sorry if I misunderstood the hon. member and I want to apologise. I merely wanted to point out that it was not merely a question of saying that all agricultural workers are levied on, but that if you work for more than \$600 a year then you are levied on. I agree with the hon. member up to a point, that this system should not only be applicable to agricultural workers but perhaps in the case of those other people who are in that category of wages. I think that hon. members will agree that the P.A.Y.E. system is a new system which was instituted and therefore it was reasonable to give the Commissioner a little time to put it into being, watch the effects and make his modifications as the circumstances warranted. Now that the hon. member has mentioned the point, I am in agreement with him; I am in agreement that in view of the fact that a single person does not pay until he earns over \$700 a year, perhaps the Commissioner may be willing to agree to go as high as \$800 or \$900 a year after seeing the system at work. It is no pleasure of the Income Tax Commissioner to collect money from people and then have to pay it back out; it is just a waste of time and money, because you have to employ people to carry out that work. I will promise the hon. member to report to the Cabinet the views which have been expressed by him — and I think other hon. members have similar views — with a view to meeting the proposals suggested by the hon. member.

Mr. TALMA: I just want to point out to the Hon. Minister that this is my only opportunity of making any constructive criticism on this matter. Although I might appear to have been heated when I was speaking, on the other hand, this is a burning question to the people whom I represent and it is my duty to bring the matter to the Government in a manner which will make them consider it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, it was only in the latter part of his remarks that the Hon. Minister paid attention to what was said by the hon. senior member for Christ Church; but even then, without having been told by the Opposition, he should have realised that what the Department is doing is expending money or using the time of the staff merely to collect money to which they are not entitled on the one hand, and to pay it back on the other. In referring to the Estimates for the Department under this Head, you will see that this year we gave them \$400,000; last year we gave them \$250,000 and they had an additional provision of \$80,000, and in the year before that they had \$225,000. All of those are refunds.

Now what is the point of giving the Department at the beginning of the year the sum of \$400,000 for refunds and then coming back later in the same year and giving them another \$100,000 for refunds? That is double work. You are collecting money which you are not entitled to do, you have to refund it and then you are paying \$12,700 for overtime work; therefore the point which was taken by the hon. senior member for Christ Church is exceptionally well taken. Merely because in a different week or month the earnings of the agricultural workers reach a point at which these people are entitled to pay income tax, there is no reason why you should refuse to bear in mind the fact that for the greater part of the year their earnings would be below the required minimum for the payment of income tax.

Of course I must say in passing that I think the hon. senior member for Christ Church has been very generous in his estimate of the annual earning of the agricultural worker, because while it is true that during the crop period his wages may aggregate \$20 a week, it is more than generous to estimate the substantive earnings for the remaining part of the year at the rate of \$10 a week for 36 weeks, because as you are aware, Mr. Chairman, for at least one-third of these 36 weeks he could be completely unemployed, so that makes it even more reprehensible to think in terms of deducting Income Tax from this type of worker during the few months of the year when his income for the other part of the year obviously would be far below his other earnings.

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m. o'clock, this House now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. 2.00 p.m.

On Resumption

QUESTION TIME

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I should be pleased if the Hon. Minister would reply to Question No. 7, standing in my name.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:—

- "1. No. Sir. There is no Chapel as such at the Mental Hospital.
2. Religious worship is led by the Chaplain, an Anglican Priest, every Sunday in the Assembly Hall; average attendance is 30 to 40 males and 50 to 60 females. A service is also held on Christmas Day. The Assembly Hall is 65 feet long and 22 feet wide and is also used for concerts, cinema shows and lectures. Holy Communion is celebrated once monthly in a separate room where an altar and communion rails have been erected. The Roman Catholic Priests are allowed to give Mass to the Roman Catholic patients as often as they wish."

Mr. SPEAKER: The next reply is in respect of questions asked by the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. CRAWFORD: With regard to these questions, I beg to request that the replies be not laid in the hon. member's absence.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think they have been laid already.

Mr. CRAWFORD: They were given notice of this morning.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the Rules, if the hon. member is not in his place, these answers must now be laid.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is not some hon. member entitled to ask that they be not laid?

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the relevant rule on the point — Standing Order No. 14. paragraph 4:—

"If a Member is not present to ask his question when his name is called, or if the question is not reached, the Minister to whom it is addressed shall cause an answer to be laid upon the Table of the House, unless the Member asking

the question has signified his desire to postpone the question before the end of Question Time."

It depends on the Minister and no other hon. member is mentioned: so the whole thing hinges on the Minister concerned and the hon. member who is asking the question.

The Hon. Minister concerned is not in his place.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: These questions are more or less under the control of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing who happens to be out of the Island at the moment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not proceed with those questions today, because the Hon. Minister is not in his place.

That brings us to the end of Question Time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1, is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter, if he cares, can continue his reply.

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON TRADE UNION BILL, 1939

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when I was replying to this matter, I was then beginning to point out to this Committee that this amendment which is regarded by the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, who is now acting as Premier, as repugnant legislation, was a piece of legislation which he himself was in favour of, and I am going to show you that right now. The Hon. Minister said that this amendment was not approved by the Executive Council of the Union and I was beginning to say that in bringing this amendment to this Chamber I had the right to do so and I believe every one in this Island would regard me more so than the hon. senior member for St. Michael as the man capable of knowing the wishes and aspirations of the Trade Union Movement, not only in Barbados, but in the Caribbean as a whole. I also pointed out that the Royal Commission and many of us who hold Socialist views were in favour of this piece of legislation and I am prepared today to show that the hon. senior member for St. Michael who is acting Premier today — and there is no adjective which can show a man in reverse as truly as he is

in reverse, because even today the introduction of the new hon. junior member for St. Andrew to this Chamber by the same hon. senior member for St. Michael is an indication of the man's mentality, because he is speaking one thing today and acting another way tomorrow.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to the hon. member making that statement. Here it is: I am the Leader of the House. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew is an Independent member. I escorted the hon. member in here. Could that be regarded as though I have changed my tune? I go further; I am prepared to be as friendly as I can with anybody who wants me to be their friend irrespective of whatever Party they belong; that is my democratic right and the hon. senior member for St. Peter has no right to say that I have changed my tune.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree. The statement has nothing to do with this debate.

Mr. WALCOTT: When I have finished, I am going to show if you do not agree today, it is not because you did not agree with the original proposal.

Mr. SPEAKER: Which original proposal?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to show as I go on.

Mr. SPEAKER: You say that I agreed with the original proposal, but it is not yet known.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes. I quoted on the last occasion the Royal Commission which made a specific recommendation after outlining what they had written to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and what they asked people to do. This is what the Royal Commission reported: "We consider it proper, therefore, that pickets in reasonable numbers should be given access to the workers both at the gates of the factory and at their homes, whether these be situated on private or public property." That can be found on page 200 and that everybody regards today, if they have any social consciousness, as the sort of modern Magna Carta which is needed in all things for the improvement of the West Indies. The Royal Commission did not write this for Barbados only, but for the West Indies.
2.45 p.m.

You have an old Trade Unionist like Sir Walter Citrine and you have the late Mr. Morgan Jones. Who would not be associated with Sir Walter Citrine in his attempt to improve Trade Union

legislation in the West Indies, something for which we were fighting so hard? And now you find a Minister of Labour in a so-called Socialist Government saying that peaceful picketing at or near a person's residence is repugnant legislation! He has not even allowed the Conservative members of this House to say that; he should be in the vanguard where this sort of thing is concerned. (Hon. M. E. COX: In the vanguard of irresponsibility?) You are so irresponsible that you are opposing what the Royal Commission has recommended. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is a young member of this House and he wanted me to bring forward documentary evidence as to what I was saying; I would ask him if he would deny his own handwriting.

I am going to draw to the attention of the House a debate which took place on the 6th December, 1949, when Mr. Adams introduced a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, and this is what the amendment to the Act contained. Clause 6 of the Bill says this:—

"It shall be lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union or of an individual employer or firm in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

That is what Mr. G. H. Adams introduced; that is the repugnant legislation which was introduced by the then leader of the Government. These are the debates of 1948–51 (Hon. M. E. COX: It suits you now to use it.) I am going to show you what a metamorphosis has taken place; a man who has said what the Hon. Minister of Trade has said would be more than a hypocrite. Here is what he said on this same amendment; the hon. Minister is denying it now. Well, Pilate washed his hands. What the Hon. Minister said appears on page 959. At that time the hon. junior member for St. James was of the same pigmentation but not in the same delegation as the present hon. junior member for St. James. This is what Mr. Cox said; he was not then the Deputy Premier of Barbados. This is what he said:—

"The arguments adduced by the senior member for Christ Church and the junior member for St. James are arguments in favour of the passing of this Bill. Sir, if we listened carefully to their arguments both of them said that Trade

Unions in this island were successful and were being carried on in a satisfactory manner."

He is saying today that the Trade Union is not being carried on in a satisfactory manner.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I did not say that; I have never said that. As a matter of fact, I said the reverse. I said that it was absolutely unnecessary to have this amendment when we have reached this stage in this country. I am not yet dead and I can still defend myself against you or anybody else.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is a rhetorical remark; I am not now quoting him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier did say things complimentary about the Trade Union.

Mr. WALCOTT: He did not use those words. I was reading what he said but I looked out of the book so as to give him a polite dig. Let the hon. member say to what he is opposed; he was born with all the dignity in the world. When all of us were fighting against the cause of the people you were fighting for them. The hon. member used words about chameleon changing his colour to suit the occasion; well let us see the chameleon of 1949 and the chameleon of 1959. This is the chameleon of 1949. Mr. Speaker, this book is a bit heavy and therefore I have to lower my height, but I will continue to read.

Hon. M. E. COX: He can read until tonight.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member says that I can read until tonight. I know that. I will prove that the hon. member was not speaking the truth when he said that the Trade Union was not in favour of this amendment; but he was in favour of the same amendment and spoke on its behalf; — nothing has been said about the Trade Union being against this amendment and he had the brazen effrontery to stand up in Parliament and say that the Trade Union movement is not in favour of this amendment. Well, listen to the chameleon of 1949:—

"They admit that working men are capable of negotiating peacefully with employers but because people behave well and do not commit murder, it does not necessarily follow that there should not be a law on the Statute Book whereby if murder is committed the offender can be punished. The two hon. members say that Trade Unions have been getting on well and that they are capable of functioning satisfactorily. Why are they, therefore, afraid of giving them more power?"

Today to give them more power by this amendment would be a reprehensible piece of legislation, but at that time it was to be regarded as being normal! The hon. member says that this is reprehensible legislation which we want to put on the Statute Book.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I am not going to have him misquote me.
2.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry; the hon. member said it was repugnant legislation. He wants to pay a compliment to the Trade Union Movement. I will continue to read:—

"If you have advanced satisfactorily in any trade or in any sphere, there is all the more reason why you should be encouraged, because you have shown yourself to be a responsible person. Up to the present, the trade unions in this island have been getting on quite well with employers, with the exception of the Sanitary Board which employs the scavengers." He was taking a lash at the hon. senior member for the city because we had some trouble with the Sanitary Board in those days. "Hon. members must have read the discussion that took place quite recently at that Board in respect of the scavengers and I repeat that with the exception of that Board, the trade unions have been getting on fairly well — a fact which has been admitted by every hon. member who has so far spoken on this subject — with employers in this island. There is therefore nothing to be afraid of in passing this Bill." That is what he said in 1949. There was nothing to be afraid of in passing this Bill in 1949; but today you have to be afraid of this Bill. Look at the wickedness of the man who could say that ten years ago, and after being elevated as a Minister of Labour he wants to say that a trade union is not worthy of something which he agreed to ten years ago. Ananias could not make a statement like that.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member referred to me as "wickedness" and I take objection to that. I was never wicked, never will be and never want to be; I cannot be.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member objects to the use of the word "wickedness".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I said look at the wickedness of him; so what is unparliamentary about that?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think there is anything unparliamentary in it, and I would not pay any serious attention to that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I will continue to quote the hon. member.

"I have often heard members of this House and persons outside say that if a thing is good enough for the United Kingdom — they use that argument when it suits them — they see no reason why it should not be good enough for this island." (*Laughter.*) "When it does not suit them they say that because a thing is good enough for the United Kingdom it does not necessarily follow that it is good enough for Barbados."

When a man can say that in 1949 and can come back today with a complete metamorphosis and be associated with anything called labour, it is the most vicious, wicked, conservative statement that could ever come from any man's lips. You said that in 1949 in supporting this measure, and today you make a complete change, and have the effrontery to say that this is not supported by the Trade Union Movement. Isn't that a calculated, wicked statement to make?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member had better be careful with his personal references to the Leader of the House who was a member of the House then. He may indulge in all the rhetorical frenzy he may care to.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this is one occasion where the word "wickedness" is a mild term to apply to anyone in Parliament who could be like this. Not only did he think that the Trade Union Movement was not in favour of this, but he asked when did they discuss it. I will warn the hon. junior member for the City that he is on better grounds with his colleagues when he makes an attack against me, and he will retain their friendship for a longer period than if he attempts to make complimentary remarks to me. When the junior member for the City said that I was regarded in the eyes of the Caribbean as a good Trade Unionist, that was a joke which the Minister could not face, so out of that he said this is not a Trade Union measure. Far from that the President of the Barbados Workers' Union told me that they were discussing another matter and then the hon. member asked whether the Executive Council was in favour of the measure, and the President told him that they had not discussed it. Here, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member goes on:—

"If a little more love was shown to the workers....."; he loves these romantic phrases; it is just like one of those Pentecostal songs

that goes as follows: "Put a little more oil in your lamp and keep it burning!" If the hon. member would put a little more love to keep the lamp of socialism burning, he would become a good example in his Ministerial post. Listen to the statement which the hon. member made. "If a little more love was shown to the workers, that fear which the employers have would more or less disappear but: because there is not that love for the workers, there must be that fear." You loved them then, like Brutus, but you do not love them any more. You have no chance of saying anything now, so sit down and take what is coming to you. I know you feel that you can get on that side and do as you please.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has now turned away from the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: I know that would happen to me. I have nothing to offer.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now addressing the Deputy Premier.

Mr. WALCOTT: Are you going to allow the hon. member to sit there and talk as loudly as I am talking and say nothing to him?

Mr. SPEAKER: In using the pronoun "you", the hon. member is not addressing the Speaker. If the Deputy Premier is making loud asides, he is not addressing the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: I apologise, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Asides are what I hear; some asides are not worthy of notice, but others are. If the hon. member for St. Peter is addressing the Chair, he cannot make asides also, because he cannot make a speech and asides at the same time. It is bad enough for hon. members sitting in their seats to make asides, but when one is making a speech and asides at the same time, that is awful.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to hear that the asides are so loud that you can hear them; so if you can hear them I can hear them too, and I am going to reply to them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not allowed to reply to asides.

Mr. WALCOTT: The asides should not be so loud that the Speaker can hear them and allow them to continue.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is listening to asides, but I am listening to the hon. member. I am going to insist that if the hon. member is addressing the Speaker, he must not at the same time speak to anyone else in Parliament.

Mr. WALCOTT: I should like to know what are the rules when an hon. member is speaking and there are loud asides from other hon. members. If you are going to permit asides to be made so loudly that you can hear, even though you do not consider them worthwhile, it is not the content of the asides but a question of how loud your voice is, and I want to be given the same privilege in this Chamber as any other hon. member.

3.05 p.m.

This is what the hon. member said. "If a little more love was shown to the workers, that fear which the employers have would more or less disappear; but because there is not that love for the workers, there must be that fear."

Here it is the Hon. Minister is speaking on the amendment. He went on to say: "I feel that if the principle of peaceful picketing is included in our Trade Union as it is included in, shall I say, the Laws of other civilised countries, you will find that if the occasion arises for the observance of peaceful picketing, this phase of the Trade Union Movement will be carried out as successfully and as satisfactorily as the other phases have been carried out during all these years."

That was in 1949, when he said so. He questioned why employers did not have any love for the workers and he said that if they showed more love they would have no fear. This Act was created in a civilised community. Is Barbados no longer civilised? Is it that as soon as we get Cabinet status, that we are no longer civilised? Imagine a man ten years ago saying that you want Ministerial Government and you want to be on equal with the Mother Country: you want dominion status and that he wants to see the Trade Union Movement as powerful as any other Trade Union Movement can be; but ten years after he says that this piece of Trade Union legislation is repugnant legislation and the country would be no poorer without it. Would the country be poorer without Cabinet system? Would the country be poorer if it did not have the Bankruptcy Act? Would the country be poorer if it did not have Ministerial system? Would the country be poorer if it did not have all this nonsensical legislation which fills up the Order Paper every week?

Here is what the Hon. Minister, the Acting Premier, said further: "This is really a provision in the Trade Union Act to give the workers the right to stand up and tell the people that an employer has treated them badly and to show them some sort of resentment to the treatment that has been meted to them. If you say that you are willing to give workers a square deal, I cannot see the need for fear of putting this provision in this Act."

Now, Sir, this was an amendment for peaceful picketing which you were passing; you were not passing the Trade Union Act. The whole Act had already been passed in 1939; so there was never any question of your giving them the right to stand up. This is what he said on the Clause for peaceful picketing: "this is really a provision in the Trade Union Act to give workers the right to stand up and tell the people that an employer has treated them badly and to show some sort of resentment to the treatment that has been meted to them."

(Hon. M. E. COX: Not at their residences.)
He says not at their residences.

Now, this is the way how Clause 6, read at that time: — "It shall be lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of the Trade Union or of an individual employer or firm in contemplation or furtherance of a Trade Dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

The hon. senior member for St. Michael, as you can see from that, did say "to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides". He has just said not at their residences. Let us look at the voting on that occasion. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to involve you in this, but on that occasion, as I see here, you the Speaker voted for it.

The question was put that this Bill be now read a second time and it was resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

"Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, — that is the same hon. senior member for St. Joseph in this House — FOSTER, — who has passed to the great beyond — MAPP, — who is now in Trinidad — BRYAN — who is now Chairman of Committees — I suppose he has forgotten all

about it — COX, — F. L. WALCOTT, ALLDER, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD and Dr. CUMMINS. There were ten members who voted for it. The seven who voted against it, were as follows:— and let us see whose company the Minister is in now. They were:—

Noes: Messrs. GILL, BETHELL, GODDARD, REECE, E. K. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD.

The Hon. Minister is representing the same Government. That Government has not changed since 1949 when this amendment was brought down to this Chamber. Now, you are saying that this is repugnant legislation. How do you know you wanted it then? The Trade Union was not as powerful then. It had 8,000 or 9,000 members as compared with 17,000 members today and you say that you know what the people in Barbados want. You agreed with it then. You said then that these conservative people do not have any love for the people and, as a matter of fact, the conservative people in the House voted against this amendment. They never wanted the Trade Union Act at all. Do you think the hon. senior member for St. Michael would have said that if he were not prepared to vote for it? You get the hon. junior member for St. Joseph saying that this is an anachronism. Can you imagine a greater anachronism than he today? It is true that in 1949 he might be young and may not have understood what was going on in this country. And you get the Minister saying that people have turned but he does not change his colour; he is constant. Let him point you to a day in which I was in a struggle which was not a struggle on behalf of the worker.

3.15 p.m.

I challenge him. Fifteen years ago I was in the struggle to help the underdog and in those days he would not speak of me in the terms in which he spoke today. In those days when the derogatory remarks were made about a chauffeur coming into the House, I said that he had as much right to come in here as anybody else; but today he says he is not a chameleon which can change its colour to suit the occasion. You listen to what he says. (Hon. M. E. COX: You were a member of the Electors' Association.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not speak in terms of the second person, because the debates will be read in that way; the debates will have the word "you".

Mr. WALCOTT: If you read the debates and you see where the second person appears you will see that it is not applicable to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Many thousands of other persons may think otherwise.

Mr. WALCOTT: The remarks are not applicable to you; I am very sorry that you should think so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must speak in the third person and not in the second person.

Mr. WALCOTT: Look where the hon. member is seeking cover; he asks; were you a member of the Electors' Association?

Hon. M. E. COX: I made a definite statement.

Mr. WALCOTT: I challenge the hon. member that that is a wilful lie; I challenge him that he cannot prove it. That is why I say that he is a wicked man and a wicked liar too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Things are now getting out of hand. This sort of thing is not parliamentary; the hon. member can convey and he can be understood to convey all that he means to convey. The words "wilful lie" are not really parliamentary and the hon. member is not allowed to refer to another hon. member in that way. There are words and circumlocutions which can be used by hon. members, but parliament cannot continue to function smoothly and well if one hon. member is allowed to speak of the remarks of another member as being wilful lies. That is just intolerable and it must be offensive. If the hon. member were speaking and another hon. member made such remarks as "wilful lies" applying to the speaker I know that he would have every right to resent them. The hon. member can convey all he wants to convey and be just as strong without using such unparliamentary remarks.

Mr. WALCOTT: I quite agree with you that the words used are unparliamentary because there are words which would convey the same meaning, but when a man can be so wilful and deliberate to get up and say something which is utterly untrue, where would your patience be? I would have to be like Job and I do not intend to be like Job. The hon. member is getting up and saying something which he has absolutely no evidence to prove, but he is saying, because he can get it recorded, that he has evidence to prove it. If the case were different and in other circumstances a man like that could not live long; he would not live long in any Republic. He gets up and says something which is absolutely untrue and he knows that it is untrue; he has no

evidence to prove it; but he is a person who tries to say something which has no element of truth in it at all. Well, any hon. member with that type of mentality is capable of doing anything; that is a murderous mentality.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph says that this amendment is reprehensible when the Trade Union has not discussed it. Imagine your debating the right of an association to have peaceful picketing and you say that you did not discuss it with the Trade Union! If anybody says that freedom of association should be given to the Trade Union, are you going to have a meeting to discuss whether or not you should have freedom of association? This does not require anybody to discuss anything like that because it is a part of your whole make-up. I will read further on in this debate in order to give you some idea of what took place in connection with this matter. As you know, Sir, the present Premier was not given to many speeches but all of the members of the House whom you would expect to possess a social conscience, spoke on this matter. This is what Mr. Brancker said:—

"Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to dilate on this matter. I think that so far as giving the second reading to this Bill is concerned, if one reads, as one is expected to do, the Objects and Reasons and accepts as a fact that the main purpose of this Bill is to adopt the provisions in the United Kingdom Trade Disputes Act with regard to certain matters — contracting out and peaceful picketing — there can be no question that we should give this Bill its second reading. After all, this Branch of the Legislature very recently showed its willingness in the development of trade-unionism when, a short while ago, as you will recall, Sir, we passed a Resolution to provide money to assist in sending someone from this colony to attend a Trade Union Conference. That was the I.C.F.T.U. Conference, "in the United Kingdom; therefore we have shown our belief in Trade Unions and we are asked now to give the second reading to a Bill, the main purpose of which is to adopt the provisions enforced in the United Kingdom with regard to trade-unionism. That is why I say that I see no reason to dilate on this matter. We would be very inconsistent if we did not give the second reading to, and eventually pass this Bill."

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not spoken today and said that this is a repugnant piece of legislation.

3.25 p.m.

Now, Sir, a specific amendment was moved by the hon. senior member for the City and it is

not that the Hon. Minister was not aware of it. Mr. Mottley said that he was not in favour of the idea of going to a person's home. I explained that it was not going to a man's home as if you were spying on somebody or seeing a delicate operation performed in someone's domestic duties, and I attempted to show what was stated in relation to the Law. Although I am not a Lawyer, the Lawyers would agree that I am not wrong when I quote Vester and Gardner when they say: "This provision is subject to the property rights of others and to the rights of others to go about their lawful business. Pickets are therefore not entitled to obstruct traffic by lying down in the highway;" I remember on one occasion an eminent Lawyer said in Barbados you could lie down and block traffic and call it peaceful picketing. To continue quoting; "Pickets are therefore not entitled to block traffic by lying down in the highway nor to obstruct pedestrians by deliberately standing in their way or touching them, or otherwise using violence; and they are not entitled to trespass on private property. "Stay in", "stay down" and "sit down" strikes all involve trespass, for an employee is only entitled to remain on the employer's property for the purpose of employment, and if he "downs tools" his licence to remain on the property determines. If thereafter he remains on the employer's property against the wishes of the employer he is guilty of the tort of trespass and is not protected by the Section". So when you hear members saying that when you pass this Bill a man can go into another man's backyard and take his saucepan off the stove, it cannot work.

The hon. junior member for St. James in those days, Mr. E. K. Walcott, was more liberal than the one who succeeded him, because in the debate he said as a matter of courtesy a man should have this right. He meant that a Trade Unionist should have the right to go to a man's home and tell him a strike is on and not to come out to work. He wanted an amendment like the one in Trinidad where a man should have the right to remain on the property, but though I was not a Lawyer I pointed out to him that so far as the legal interpretation was concerned, that was not in the Act and he could not trespass, because peaceful picketing did not give the right to trespass on any person's land. The Speaker on that occasion did not enter the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: To get the records straight, the hon. member said that on that occasion I voted for the amendment. As far as I remember, I do not think I was a member of the House then.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I seem to know when you were a member of the House better than you.

Mr. SPEAKER: In calling names, the hon. member did not call mine. Why?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet finished. (A VOICE: That was in 1949.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I was here in 1949.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you are a man blessed with more patience than I am, but I am patient enough to wait until such time when I shall read the names for your benefit. We went through the various Clauses and came to Clause 6 which reads as follows:—

"It shall be lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a Trade Union or of an individual employer or firm in contemplation or furtherance of a Trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

I do not think on this occasion that I should read what I said then, because I am the same person today. It was left to me, the Leader of the House, to move the Clause and the Hon. Dr. Cummins seconded it, but I was allowed to speak on it because I was regarded as the one more knowledgeable on those matters. When the hon. junior member for the City paid me that compliment, I thanked him very much, but I must also warn him not to pay any compliments if he wants to remain a member of the Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it would be better if the hon. member in speaking of members who are still members of the House would use the member for the constituency and not use the word "Mr."

Mr. WALCOTT: There is another Law Book by Sir Walter Citrine which determines what peaceful picketing means; it means that you can go to a man's place and tell him not to work, but the question of violence does not enter the picture. This is what I said:—

"This is the other Clause on which debate has taken place. I heard an hon. member say that this Clause was taken out of the Trade Disputes Act, and put into the Trade Union Act but there is nothing wrong with putting it in the Trade Union Act; it is only a matter as to how some colonies pass this legislation."

That is to say, Sir, it was in the Trade Disputes Act of 1906 in the United Kingdom. It was not in the Trade Union Act of 1871, 1875, 1876 and the various amendments which took place with the Trade Union Act as distinct from the Trade Disputes Act. This Act came out of the dispute after the Taff Vale case in which the Associated Railways sued the Union for damages because some of the men walked off, and they had to pay to the High Court an amount in the vicinity of \$45,000. In those days the Labour Party came into power for the first time, and the Trade Union showed its strength and power and this Act was passed in 1906, and it was regarded by Beatrice Webb as a triumph because the Union could no longer be sued for these things. I said that it was only a matter as to how some colonies pass this legislation; that is to say, after the general strike we came back with this question of picketing from the 1906 Act and put it in the 1927 Act, and the Labour Party brought it back in 1945. I went on to say "we have had experience here where people became panicky and we saw what measure could be put on the Statute Book. The purpose of "peaceful picketing" is to give a Trade Union the right to bring to the notice of work people wherever a grievance occurs. It is nothing to do with a fight; you cannot associate "peaceful picketing" with fights and I can tell hon. members that sometimes you have acts of violence occurring where there is no strike. Mr. Mottley was the person who suggested that the wording should be changed and that we should delete the words "at or near a house", and this is what he said: "During the debate on the second reading of this Bill I declared my position and due to circumstances over which I had no control I was prevented from being in my seat to continue my remarks. I said that I felt that "peaceful picketing" was long in coming to Barbados. The fear which people had with the advent of the Trade Union Bill in Barbados could be somewhat modified in the sense that after a period of less than ten years of Trade Unionism in Barbados, those who are responsible for the administration of Trade Unions have shown a great sense of responsibility; and if they show no less responsibility when this Clause is included in the Act then I think there will be little to fear."

He was in favour of it in a general way, and said "that is why I said that I did not see anything wrong at this stage of having this provision in the Act. In any country where an Act is new you must get people misunderstanding and misinterpreting it, and it all depends upon the responsibility of the leaders and upon how well they shoulder that responsibility."

I will not read the part where he went on supporting it, but I will read the part where he said "it would be alright where the management of a business carried on in any of these big countries lives probably in an apartment house, thousands and thousands of miles away from the business premises, but there might never arise any necessity for this provision being made in an Act such as this. I am going to move an amendment to this Clause; as I have said, after years of Trade Unionism in Barbados, persons responsible have shown their responsibility, but when it comes to the working of this Clause in respect of the furtherance of a trade dispute where persons can attend at or near a house or place where he happens to be, in the interest of all concerned, although the wording is in the English Act, I do not think it would serve in Barbados the purpose which some hon. members think it will serve."

3.35 p.m.

That is Mr. Mottley, the hon. senior member for the City then. He put in an amendment then against this. Now, this is what the Hon. Minister of Trade regards today as repugnant legislation.

Sir, it was a long debate, because it was in Committee. Mr. Alder spoke, Mr. Mottley spoke, I spoke and then the question was put and this is where you, Mr. Speaker, is involved. The question was that the words proposed to be omitted stand part. It was put and resolved in the affirmative, the "ayes" were Mr. SPEAKER, — who is you, yourself — and Messrs. ALLDER, MAPP, BRYAN, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, CRAWFORD, BRANCKER and Dr. CUMMINS — 9. Nine members voted for that specific amendment which was not to take out the words "at or near the house". Look how I can bring this to show how a man can make this right about turn in the same amendment. Now let me show you who voted against it. They were, Messrs. BETHELL, MOTTLEY GILL, GODDARD, REECE, E. K. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD — 8. Not one single member who possessed any socialist or labour feelings at all voted against this. Those who were not members of the Labour Party but who were labour members voted for it. The hon. senior member for St. Philip was not a member of the Party, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was not a member of the Party, but they voted for it. In those days, the Party in power did not have enough members in the Party to carry the majority. If it had to depend on the voting strength of the Party, then the motion would have been lost. They had to rely on the strength of certain elements of the Opposition. That is the same amendment which they on that side today are saying is repugnant.

Sir, what is going to happen to a country like this? It is nothing more than that I have brought the amendment in. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph not knowing all about this, hops up like a Jack-in-the-Box and says that this is an anachronism. That same hon. member at the same time as this amendment was being dealt with in this House in 1949 was pursuing a policy which he represented to me that he was helping Mr. Staybrook from organising the oil workers in Aruba. You know what he has forgotten? He has forgotten that I have never been associated with a Company's Union. That is the sort of people whom you get today and who want to discredit somebody. Sir, do you think that they can ever go to workers and say to exchange me for them? In the very organisation which I represent, the Hon. Minister of Trade has gone to the extent of saying that the Trade Unionists are not in favour of this. The last time it was debated in this Legislature, the Government brought it down and when it came to the amendment the Hon. Minister voted for it. He had a bounden right to do so, If he owed the people a pledge, if he wanted Trade Union legislation to advance to the same extent as it was in other parts. How dare him to say now that this is repugnant legislation when it is part and parcel of our whole philosophy?

Mr. Speaker, I have discharged something in this House of Assembly today, in which I have no need to fear. Now, that I have seen the turn of the debate on this specific amendment, I can only come to the conclusion that if the Hon. Minister of Trade had today in 1959 to move the passing of the Trade Union Act which was passed in England in 1875 with the restrictive clauses where a Trade Unionist could not picket any man's place, he would not pass that, because if he is saying today that peaceful picketing is repugnant legislation — and this is mild in its operation to the Trade Union Act, which says that a Trade Union can cause its men to go on strike and leave all the things which they were handling outside and the employer cannot sue for loss or for damages — do you think he would have passed that?

But the seriousness of it is more than that. It is this insidious type of opposition to something which is brought by someone other than a member of the Government. That is why you get all this debate. Let me tell them that this cannot give me any kudos. You can only give me kudos for reading and trying to bring something up which is not in the Trade Union Act, but peaceful picketing of itself cannot give me any kudos, because anyone who knows anything of the Trade Union Act will know that peaceful picketing is part of the Act and it is not a bright

idea of mine. When it can be seen from this debate in 1949 that every single member in this Chamber who was a member of a Labour Party voted for this amendment, even those who were not members of the Barbados Labour Party, it does show you that it is because this amendment has been put forward by me this time that they are not in favour of it. That is what is insidious about this debate.

3.45 p.m.

Do you know why this legislation was not on the Statute Book? The Other Place, we were informed, were not going to vote for it and that is why it was not the law; but it was passed in this Chamber; therefore it is not a question of any coercion. This legislation was passed in this Assembly in those days in the teeth of opposition, because you will remember that in 1948-49 we came in here to redress the complaints which then existed. When the Hon. Minister says that they were fighting for the people, I ask: what were we doing? What fight were you carrying on which we were not carrying on? You had the opposition of the plantocracy and the merchants and therefore the fight which we carried on was the one which we had agreed to. But the hon. member asks: When they were fighting for the people, what were you doing? Well, apparently when he was fighting for the people, I was fighting against them, he is fighting for them now and I am fighting against them. And the hon. member says that I was a member of the Electors' Association! Well, if a man can say that in front of your face, what would he do behind your back? You must purge and get rid of these people; that was the last statement made by the Ex-Premier of this colony. That come from Hitler's Fascist camp; the Ex-Leader of that party said that you must purge and get rid of such people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope when I referred to you that you were not of the opinion that you had voted for this amendment and I was slandering you. If you support it today or not, if you feel that the Trade Union Movement is in favour of it or that it is not in the interest of the workers to have this amendment, it is immaterial to me. I am saying that this amendment stands in the same place and with as much force as in 1949, why then should I be afraid of bringing forward this amendment? You can see the change, because if a man is associated with a Party and the Government is the Party in power and they run a newspaper and they say that the newly-elected member to this House is an ignoramus and he does not know syntax, you can look around and see how many people you have who are fortunate enough to know syntax. Now

as a Socialist, you are propounding this sort of thing; you are propounding the philosophy that if you do not know any syntax or grammar, the House of Assembly is not the place for you. Their Party Organ can do that and now the Hon. Minister can hook the same man in the House of Assembly! If you can do that, then you can do anything. These are only lessons to show you the mental gymnastics of people when it suits them to oppose something. One would have thought that at least the Minister of Labour in a Socialist Government would have been the last person to oppose an amendment to peaceful picketing, which gives the Trade Union the power which he said it should have had in 1949. You have a strike taking place; you have to use pickets, but where is a man living? I can quote an instance where a man owns a bit of land in a remote village; he refuses to pay the right wages to the workers, the workers had to go on strike but you cannot go to that remote place because that would be ineffective; on the other hand, a man is living in a district along with other people, and we want to draw to the attention of the people that he is not a good employer.

You have people who do not know anything about the trade union struggle, or who have not read anything about the trade union or for its advance; now they are telling you that this thing should not be here. I have here the Report made by a lady called Miss Ivy Lawrence who compiled labour legislation in the West Indies. You have peaceful picketing in Trinidad and you have it in Jamaica; do you realise that of these representative Governments, we were the last to have the Trade Union Act on the Statute Book? They had it in British Guiana and in Trinidad before we had it here in Barbados and these other colonies were Crown Colonies. We protested against the Trade Union Act when it was passed and we were in favour of what the Trade Union said; now that we are in full bloom with greater responsibility and with greater ministerial power you are saying that this is repugnant legislation and the country would not be any poorer without it. At some time a man changes his mind; well, a period of ten years has brought a change with the Hon. Minister of Labour. He has changed so far that he regards this amendment as repugnant legislation; so did a former Attorney General and the others who voted against it, but what is the sort of advance with a Labour Government of this island when you have the Minister of Labour parading today in these colours among the employers, when the Labour Movement will be challenged by the Government in power? Since the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union is who he is, they will use things against him. Well, I will

go down fighting. Only a man who is masquerading for Carnival will act like the Hon. Minister of Labour; but he is the Minister for Carnival, not the Minister for Labour. (*Laughter*). You suit a road march in Carnival if you are against peaceful picketing in this amendment. You have slandered the Trade Union movement and you believe that with this aspect of nepotism, it is the prominent thing today that when people are looking for Ministerial gifts for somebody, they will have to look to you for favour; but I am not looking to the hon. member for any favour.

3.55 p.m.

I am not looking to the hon. member for any favours. What I am saying is that this is legislation that was approved of before, and it is legislation which I have the greatest confidence can be included here. As I have said, let all of them vote against it; I will take my time because I am a believer in time. You cannot get away from these words today. Why should you say it was good then and it is not good now?

Mr. Speaker, I have discharged my responsibility. I just wanted to show what the hon. member said then. If he can be the Leader of the Government which is a Labour Government and be associated with this, I have not yet reached the stage where I have to play politics to get back in here. I am too big a man in my own beliefs and I stand up for truth, right and righteousness. Hon. members said that they liked it then; were you parrots then or marionettes dancing to a tune? If I say "yard fowls", that would be unparliamentary.

We suffer from a disease in this island and the disease is known as "inferiority complex". I do not think the hon. member who has spoken against this is any debating equal for me in a matter like this. All he has shown is that he is the biggest reactionary in the Labour Movement in any part of the Caribbean holding a Ministerial portfolio of Labour. He could not sit down among Liberals anywhere except the type he is among in Barbados. I say Sir, that this is a classic example of how a man can change by giving him a little authority; they have dressed him in a little authority, called him a Minister, and he gets up and says that this is repugnant legislation. To be associated with him is to be associated with the devil. What you are bleeding about is that you did not know you had said these things, nor did other hon. members know that he had said them, and I challenge them to say they knew. Ask the Minister to go outside, take a vote and see what would happen. You could see the blush on the face of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph

while I was reading, and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph went to sleep immediately. He did not know that this was written, but black and white comes back very terribly sometimes. All this has shown is that it is double-cross; it is just like the advertisement for shaving, "Before" and "After". Look at the hon. member! A shameless spectacle of political conduct. You should go to the altar and pray for your action in a matter like this. All it has shown to the Labour Movement is that the hon. member will be very persistent in saying things that are not true, and I hope that will not offend the Chair. He is famous for saying things in this Chamber and when he gets outside he laughs and says "it does not matter, I have said it already". It is just like another song "I get it already".

He started off by saying that the President of the Union told him that the Executive Council was not in favour of this. The President plainly said that he never had such conversation with the hon. member, and far from that, they were talking about something completely different and then the hon. member asked about this measure and was told that it was not discussed. He also said in the debate that a candidate running for the House was given \$100 by somebody in Roebuck Street; that is the type of mentality with which the hon. member approaches everything. On another occasion he said that when on the Executive Committee I told Sir Alfred Savage something, and when I pointed out that at no time were we on the Executive Committee together, he said he was a member then. From the start he said that this was not anything which the Trade Union Movement was in favour of, that it is repugnant and you could do without this legislation. He is the same man who in 1949 said "if these people had a little more love". Why don't you want them to stand up just for the last parting shot? (Hon. M. E. COX: What's the difference?) It does not make one stroke of difference because you have no conscience. Parliament is a matter of conscience, but some people's conscience has a price. You know, some people are shameless enough even when going to the gallows to laugh; it is a sort of psychological inversion; you laugh at what you should cry at, because you believe if you laugh it would take away the tears. What has caught the hon. member by surprise is that he did not know he had said this. In that debate he voted against taking out the words "at or near a house". What can you do with a man like that? He has a comparison outside this House. The characters outside this House are the characters that used to ornament the trees in some of our Supreme Court yards who would give evidence on either side. If any man can say what the hon. member

said in 1949 on the same specific thing and come back today and change his tune, then you can only leave him to the Almighty. When they vote against this Bill, it will come back again, so it will not be a question of who voted for or against it, it would be a question that in 1949 they voted for something, but now in 1959 they voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say on this matter at this stage. I think I have discharged my conscience quite fully to the people whom I have the honour to represent.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. L. E. SMITH; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. CRAWFORD; Mr. TALMA and Mr. BRANCKER — 7.

NOES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. L. St.A. THORNE; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. DOWDING — 9.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any more Private Members' Business?

Mr. WALCOTT: As you will see, Sir, Item, No. 2, stands in my name, but in view of the fact that the Hon. Minister to whom that question relates is not in his place, I do not propose to deal with it in his absence. It is with respect to the Reply to a question which I put to the Minister *re* the payment of members of the unestablished staff on Public Holidays.

Mr. SPEAKER: We will go to Order No. 3.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, that Order stands in my name, but in view of certain action taken subsequent to my giving notice of this Resolution, it is no longer necessary for it to remain on the Order Paper. The matter can be dropped. I am asking leave that it be taken off the Order Paper.

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

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO. 15

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with Item No. 15 of Private Members' Business. The Item stands in my name.

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

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON RESOLUTION
re WAGES PAID ARTISANS AND
LABOURERS

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Item is to resume debate on the Resolution relative to the level of wages at present paid to artisans and labourers employed by Departments of Public Works, Highways & Transport and Waterworks.

I notice that on the last occasion when we were debating this Resolution, the Hon. Minister of Trade was speaking when Government Business was resumed. It is for him to say whether he wishes to resume before I reply.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I never thought this question would have been brought up again after certain points were made on the last occasion. On the last occasion when I was making my points on this occasion, I pointed out then that the Government was considering the whole question of some sort of increase for quite a few of its employees and I then pointed out that the Resolution before the House was no doubt very circumscribed in that it dealt only with employees of the Public Works Department, the Department of Highways & Transport and the Waterworks Department. I drew attention, Sir, to the fact that at that time there were many other employees in Government Departments who no doubt are also entitled to some consideration along these lines, and I referred to the matter as cheap politics and I still feel that it is cheap politics in view of the fact that the hon. member opposite is supposed to be interested in what is called the Transport and General Workers Union which no doubt tries quite unsuccessfully to harbour a certain type of worker into and around that organisation if you can so call it.

As I have said on the last occasion, there are quite a number of persons employed — cooks, washers, nurses, the people who clean the markets, the porters, the Policemen and the Postmen — all of whom fall into the category, at least the beginning wages of the Key Scale people, part of whom this Resolution seeks to help. I pointed out then that the Government could never countenance a Resolution such as this which no doubt is discriminatory in its whole concept, in that it has left out a large number of people, as a matter of fact, a much larger number of persons who are employed by the Government than the ones it seeks to help.

The hon. member on the other side referred to the Godsall Report which was before the House. I heard it said that they had to insist

upon the Government to make those increases which were made to the Godsall Report. That is not true. The Government brought down the Godsall Report as was drafted and recommended and laid it on the Table of this House. Simultaneously with that Report, Government sent down a Resolution to this House stating that it was prepared to make certain increases and to the extent it intended to make those increases on the recommendations made by Mr. Godsall.

4.15 p.m.

Some of the members opposite suggested at that time that the wage, instead of being thirteen dollars and some cents for the unskilled workers, should be something like \$15; but it was then pointed out by the Premier who was handling the item at the time, that within the limit of the finances, that could not be done, and all hon. members at the time accepted the proposals put forward by the Government. No doubt, we have been severely criticised by both hon. members who spoke on this Resolution as to the amounts which the Government pays to its employees. I was able to get some figures and I hope that hon. members will believe me when I say that it was not a question of merely getting figures in respect of the Printery; I also tried to get figures as to the categories of workers who are similar to those mentioned in this Resolution.

From the outset I must confess that I regard these wages, especially the wages paid to the people at the bottom, more particularly the unskilled employees, as wages which are not sufficient to provide these people, in my opinion, with the bare necessities of life. I believe that everybody on this side of the House will agree or admit that the amount of \$13.64 or \$13.68 a week for a cantonnier and people in that scale who receive a rate of 31 cents per hour, is certainly not good enough in this day, and especially when the cost of living has risen within recent times. I want to say that we regard these wages as being low, and, as I pointed out to the House already, the Government is at present considering the question of increasing these wages. However, alongside of some of the wages which are being paid by the Government, I have a list of the wages which are paid by private enterprise; and when one hears the hon. senior member for St. Lucy speak so glibly about the low wages paid to these workers — perhaps I should not say what I am going to say now, because I do not know of his being employed or of his employing anybody — but perhaps it may surprise him to know that there are porters employed in Roebuck Street, people who work in provision stores and messengers who have to work a whole week for \$10. I have here a list of

the wages paid to porters employed in provision stores—

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have in my hand a list of the wages being paid and I am merely comparing these wages in order to show — not that the Government is paying any fabulous wages — but merely to show that the Government is paying far better wages to these employees than some of the people who deal in the sale of fish and pork and things of that sort. We have provision porters, \$10 to \$14 — 44 hours a week. Other porters, \$10 to \$13 and they work between 40 and 44 hours a week. Messengers, \$7 to \$8 and they work 44 hours a week. That is as far as Roebuck Street is concerned. Now we come to High Street. You have porters being paid \$14 to \$16 and they work from 40 to 44 hours a week. The Swan Street Porters are paid from \$4 to \$13 a week and they work from 39 to 44 hours. Messengers are paid from \$5 to \$8 and they work for 39 to 45 hours a week. The Broad Street porters are paid from \$8 to \$16 and they work for 39 to 44 hours a week. Messengers are paid from \$8 to \$18.50 and they work for 39 to 44 hours a week. Shops Miscellaneous Porters are paid from \$10 to \$18 and they work for 39 to 44 hours a week. Messengers get between \$7 and \$15 a week.

This a list which you can get from the Labour Department at any time you desire to have one. As far as the Printeries are concerned, these are skilled people to whom I am now referring. We have the Linotype operator — I am not mentioning the name of the Press. I do not have all the Presses here, but I know that some people get as low as \$5 a week and they are working for 45 to 50 hours. It is all very well to come into this House of Assembly and criticise the Government, but it would be far better sometimes for hon. members to see the mote in their own eyes before they deal with the beam in somebody else's eye. You have Pressmen working for \$6 to \$14 a week, and I should like to say that in respect of none of these wages is any pension or gratuity given to anybody. You have bookbinders being paid from \$13 to \$20 a week; compositors \$4 to \$16 a week Guillotine operators, \$11 a week, rulers \$8 to \$12 a week and Feeders \$3. At another Press the book binder is paid from \$12 to \$24 working for 44 hours a week. Compositors are paid from \$8 to \$15 a week; Pressmen \$12 to \$15 a week and although these are technical people, they still do not receive a wage which is commensurate with that

of the man in the street or the unskilled man whom we call the cantonnier. The Ruler is paid \$12.

4.25 p.m.

Now, Sir, I only got these figures because no doubt when the Government is being attacked from time to time on not paying reasonable wages and being indifferent to the needs, wishes and peculiar situation from the economic point of view of the workers, I think it is time that the Government put its position clear. As far as the Government is concerned, the unskilled worker is not as good as we would like, and I repeat the matter is being gone into and at some time in the very near future we will be coming to the House.

Now mention was made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip about the cost of living, and he went as far as to state, apparently with some authority, that the cost of living in Barbados was the highest in the Caribbean area, Sir, I am in a position.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. o'clock, the House will revert to Government Business.

LEAVE FOR Mr. BARROW

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before Government Business is resumed, I obtained permission from His Honour the Speaker that I might at this stage, with apologies for not doing it earlier today, ask for three weeks' leave of absence from his duties as a member of this House as from today for the hon. and learned junior member for St. John. A cable was received from him this afternoon stating that he could not be back on the date he originally expected to be back which would have been within the forty days prescribed by Law; so with your permission, I am asking that three weeks' leave of absence be granted to the hon. junior member for St. John from his duties as a member of this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave for three weeks' leave of absence for the hon. junior member for St. John, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to resume Committee of Supply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the Suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I had finished my remarks on that.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded in each case by Hon. F. E. MILLER, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 24) Order 1958."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave of the House for the Hon. Minister of Education to take that Order standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 24) ORDER, 1958

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Order seeks to increase the number of Assistant Librarians Grade I by one for the St.

George Branch Library and the abolition of the two posts of Library Attendant and the creation of three posts of Clerical Assistant.

Now the Addendum is not in my humble opinion as full as it well might have been, and although I presume this matter will not be controversial, I feel it is my duty to give hon. members as much data on the matter as is humanly possible. For that reason, I will continue by pointing out that as a result of Government's intention to increase the number of Branch Libraries throughout the island and as a result of our having opened the Valley Branch Library in St. George on the 5th of this month, we will have to provide additional staff for the running of that particular Library and I want to make sure that that Branch Library is staffed similarly to the Branch Libraries at Speightstown and Oistins Town.

4.35 p.m.

At this juncture, I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be fitting for me to point out that these Branch Libraries are divided into two sections — full-time Libraries and part-time Libraries. The Speightstown, Oistin and St. George Branch Libraries which are for the parishes of St. Peter, Christ Church and St. George, are regarded as full-time branch libraries in that they cater to the needs of the general public between the hours of 9 a.m. and 12.30 p.m. and again from 3 p.m. to 7 p.m. but the other section of libraries only open from 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.

It is our intention to have the full-time libraries staffed as follows: we propose to have at each of the full-time libraries one Assistant Librarian, Grade I, one Library Attendant, Grade II, and one Duster who would also be a full-time worker, but at our part-time libraries we are going to use what we call a part-time Supervisor and a part-time Duster. The object is to see to it that the full-time libraries are sufficiently well staffed to admit of their being able to carry on and conduct the business of the library in the most efficient manner possible. In order to attain that end, we are going to start by transferring from the Public Library staff which has been trained there and people who are fully conscious of the business with which they have to perform. In the case of the St. George Branch Library, the Government is now seeking to more or less replace these people at the Public Library who will be transferred there by the introduction of a

new grade of worker known as Clerical Assistants. The difference in the work between a Library Attendant of an old and the Clerical Assistant whom we are now introducing is that the Library Attendant of old was mainly expected to indulge in the dusting of books on the shelves and the guarding of them; but as a result of the fact that there has been a greater demand of the Librarian in so far as servicing of the Library is concerned, this Library Attendant of old was of necessity forced to do the work that the Librarian is doing. That too is occasioned by the fact that full-time libraries today are now opened for a matter of roughly 42½ hours instead of the usual 33½ hours; so that if you have the Assistant to the Librarian, when the Librarian has to go to lunch, the Assistant must be someone who would be capable of carrying on the services of the Library. We have found it almost impossible to get a person of the necessary calibre to carry out the work of Assistant Librarian for the salary which is paid the Library Attendant, therefore we have got to try to get a better type of person and to get that type of person we would have to pay more and this type of person is today designated as Library Assistant.

We are going to replace the staff which is removed from the Public Library to the Branch Libraries with these Clerical Assistants who will find there the sort of work which they are fitted to do and what is more, they will be in a position to get some general training. According to the Addendum to this Resolution, you will see that the present "assistants" at the Branch Libraries are known as Library Attendants. In the early days of the branch library system when the duties of the "assistants" were largely confined to gardening books, mending, packing and portering, there was no difficulty; but an increase in the demands on the libraries has made it necessary for the "assistants" to shoulder work of a far more responsible nature than formerly. As I have said before, we cannot use that type of worker now and we are forced to regard them as Library Assistants. We are going to change three Assistants from the General Library and these would be sent out to the Branch Libraries and in their place we are going to employ three Clerical Assistants at headquarters.

I think the matter is as simple as that. If any further information hon. members would like to have, I shall be quite willing to supply it. I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir Winston Churchill once said that a nation can make no better investment than by putting milk into babies. I think he should have added "and books into their hands." I would expect, Sir, that the fact that I have suggested putting books into babies' hands would be taken up by some hon. members but to others I think they will appreciate I am speaking generally and that the youth of the nation are the persons to whom we should give the greatest consideration.

Now, Sir, I am not at all convinced that this staff is sufficient for the purpose that is needed. I feel that money expended in this manner, no matter what the amount is, the dividend must be one of such richness to the future of this Island that in no way whatsoever should any parsimony take place. Sir, I am saying this purely and simply for the matter of going on record because I have already spoken to the Hons. Ministers of Education and of Social Services on this matter. I wish it to be recorded and I wish it stated that it is my opinion that the use of a library, particularly one in the country districts, should be available to all persons who wish to use it at almost any time.

4.45 p.m.

Now Sir, I know that that would be impracticable but I do feel at the outset — and I want to be reassured — that consideration will be given to the question of appointing sufficient staff to this and other Libraries in the island so that the inhabitants who are anxious to learn from books will have the opportunity to do so. In this particular case I feel that the Library should be opened between the hours of, say, 6—9 p.m., if advantage of it is to be taken by those persons who, after leaving their work and returning to their homes, are then anxious to go to the Library and read or take out books at any time during that period. I know that the present idea is that we are learning, that the staff is being removed from one place to the other. I want to say, and I want to be recorded, that consideration must be given to the question of ensuring that this Library is opened when people can take advantage of it. With those few words, Sir, I feel certain that the persons concerned will give the matter due consideration.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on so many occasions annually when we are discussing the Colonial Estimates I have referred to keeping the Libraries, and particularly the Public Library, opened at night, that I am very pleased to have the support given to the idea, which has just fallen from the lips of the hon. and gallant senior member for St. George. It is an absolute necessity and it is a very simple thing to have people available for staff so as to keep the Library until at least 10 o'clock every evening. There is enough available material for staffing the Library; when one is out you have another to take his place. Even on certain afternoons you may have a skeleton staff. There is no reasonable excuse at all for not keeping your Library opened for at least six days and six nights in the country from 9 or 10 a.m. until 10 o'clock p.m. every week. There are many people who would find that they have the opportunity of availing themselves of books from the Library and the reading room; after they have completed their day's work they go home and have their dinner, and then go to the Library and remain there until it is time to catch the last bus.

I think it was two years ago when the present Premier, in response to the renewal of my plea that the Public Library should be opened until 10 p.m. said that he would give the matter careful attention. That is one of the usual snap phrases used in making these promises, but this matter has become one of the hardy annuals like the abolition of the Grand Jury and the establishment of the Government Printery; we have had to remind the Government of these necessities. They have to consider that ideas which do not come from them will have to be put into force. Coming from a source like the hon. senior member for St. George a leading factory owner, a big business man, a Conservative of Barbados who starts off by quoting Sir Winston Churchill, I am sure that this appeal will have more effect on the Cabinet than the pleas which have come from this branch of the Opposition and from this side of the Table.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in duty bound I think I should make a few brief remarks with respect to the points which have been raised by the various speakers. First of all, I want to say that Libraries come under my portfolio and I am prepared to give this matter the utmost attention. I feel that Libraries should be open as late as it is discovered to be necessary to open them. I would not fix any hour, either 9, 10, 11 or 12 o'clock and the necessity should show itself by the patronage which the various people who are expected to use the Library display, they are the people who, in

my humble opinion, will dictate to me the hour for closing the Library. If, on the other hand, I find that people are making the necessary use of the Library, I am prepared to see that it is kept open as long they will use it (*Cheers*). There is no point in any one setting up a Library and then trying to find out how it will be appreciated. I ask hon. members to believe me that Libraries will be given to this community. In the country districts transportation is one of the big problems which operate against the late opening of Libraries in certain areas and I would like to comfort hon. members by saying that not only are we thinking in terms of Branch Libraries but we are thinking of doing something else which will take the books to the people even at their homes. That will happen in the course of time.

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

4.55 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with this Bill which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) ACT, 1958.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Executive Committee Act, and I intend taking the various points as set out in the Objects and Reasons.

The first amendment is to Sub-Clause 5 of Section 3 of the Executive Committee Act. That Clause, Sir, makes it incumbent on the Officer administering the Government to summon a meeting of the Executive Committee, or in other words, to see that members assemble at a meeting over which he presides.

Since the introduction of Cabinet System, it is considered no longer necessary for meetings of a general, perhaps even a policy making nature to be summoned by the Governor. That, Sir, has been going on for some time in conformity with the convention under which the Ministerial System operates; but it is felt that legal status should be given to this change, and therefore the first item in the Objects and Reasons seeks, as I said, to amend Sub-Clause 5 of Section 3 of the

Executive Committee Act. Members will see that from the amendment it is no longer necessary to summon a meeting to discuss matters of general interest, so that Section will be amended to read as follows:

"Whenever business of any kind shall have to be transacted by the Committee, and it is considered expedient that there should be a sitting of the Committee, all the members of the Legislative Council and all the members of the House of Assembly forming part thereof shall be duly summoned to attend the Executive Council, but they shall not be entitled to attend the Executive Council except when so summoned for the transaction of such business as is provided for by this Act."

Then Sub-Clause 6 shall be amended by inserting immediately after the words "transaction of any" appearing in the subsection the word "such".

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The Hon. Minister referred at one stage to the Council and then at another to the Committee.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Executive Committee is comprised of members of the House, the Legislative Council and members of the Executive Council, so normally speaking, under the old dispensation we would have to meet to have a meeting. Nowadays we do not; the Cabinet meets as a Cabinet and its decisions are passed on to the Council, and I have a feeling that the Council ratifies what we decide by a sort of round robin. This amendment, therefore, is to legalise that action, and it is only if it becomes necessary to meet that the Council will meet.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. We have to get this clear before the hon. member sits; if not there is bound to be misinterpretation of what the amendment proposes to do. I understood the hon. member to say that the Cabinet now meets and arrive at decisions and the Executive Council ratifies them, and he is under the impression that the Council does it by means of a round robin. We are not concerned with that, but if that be the case and if it is merely to give the force of Law to the ratification by the Council by means of a round robin or otherwise, why amend the Executive Committee Act?

Hon. M. E. COX: The Executive Committee is the supreme instrument of authority, and as you know under the new dispensation certain powers which the Executive Committee once had are now delegated to the Cabinet, but it is still necessary to submit the decisions of the Cabinet to the Council.

We at present have no authority to make Subsidiary Legislation, neither can Subsidiary Legislation be delegated to the Ministers under this present set up; therefore whatever we decide on so far as legislation and things of that sort are concerned has to be referred to the Governor-in-Council. The words which I mentioned just now come in line two of Sub-Clause 5 after the word "Committee", so it will read as follows:

"Whenever business of any kind shall have to be transacted by the Committee and it is considered expedient that there should be a sitting of the Committee, all the members of the Legislative Council and all the members of the House of Assembly forming part thereof shall be duly summoned to attend the Executive Council, but they shall not be entitled to attend the Executive Council except when so summoned for the transaction of such business as is provided for by this Act."

5.05 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I hate to interrupt the Hon. Minister so often, but he must understand what he is saying is not clear to the House. We have a Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act of 1891 and what the amendment states is that it is not necessary for the Committee to sit for the transaction of all its business. The Hon. Minister says that the Cabinet must now sit and arrive at decisions and those decisions are referred to the Executive Council. (Hon. M. E. COX: I had better say to His Excellency the Governor.) So far as he is aware the Council arrives at these decisions by means of a round robin. What does he want to do to give the Council power? Why amend the Executive Committee Act?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is not trying to follow what I am saying. If he reads the Act, he will see that it refers to the Executive Council. It reads as follows:—

"Whenever business of any kind shall have to be transacted by the Committee, all the members of the Legislative Council and all the members of the House of Assembly forming part thereof, shall be duly summoned to attend the Executive Council, but they shall not be entitled to attend the Executive Council except when so summoned for the transaction of such business as is provided for by this Act."

What I am pointing out is this: In the second line after the words "by the Committee" you add the words "and it is considered expedient that there should be a sitting of the

Committee". I wonder if the hon. member followed that. The hon. member will see that amendment at (1) in Clause 2 of this Bill. In other words, if you do not consider it expedient that the Committee should sit, well then, you send around your round robin.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In other words, you want to extend to the entire Executive Committee the same privilege which is now occupied by the Council alone. The Council now ratifies by means of a round robin and you want to give the Executive Committee the same power to ratify by means of a round robin and not by summoning the whole Executive Committee.

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, you want the Executive Committee to ratify by means of a round robin, because at present, they have no authority to do it. At present the Council should meet but, as I have said, I have been made to understand that ratification is done by means of a round robin: so we only want the authority under the Act to carry on.

Then, the other amendment can be seen at (2) by inserting immediately after the words "transaction of any" appearing in subsection (6) thereof, the word "such", and that Section will now read as follows: "any four members of the Committee shall be a sufficient quorum for the transaction of any such business."

That is the position, Sir, as it stands in relation to the first part of the Objects and Reasons.

As regards the second part, as hon. members will see, there has never been any provision under the Executive Committee Act for the appointment of a Clerk, neither was there any provision for the oath being taken. The insertion of new Sections — Sections 3A and 3B — seek to give the authority for the appointment of a Clerk and also for the oath being taken as you will see set out in the Bill. I hope that is clear.

In so far as Clause 4 of this Bill is concerned, it amends Section 9 of the Executive Committee Act. As hon. members will see, the Governor at present under Section 9 has power in cases of emergency to authorise the expenditure of sums not in excess of £25. Of course, that is done in accordance with the view of the Executive Committee. Since we have changed over under the Act to the decimal system of accounting, this particular Section

merely seeks to convert these pounds into dollars and that is \$120.

Now, the next amendments are to Section 10 of the Act and these can be found under Clause 5 of this Bill. The first referred to, is by the insertion in line 8, after the words "successors in office" the following words "in the case of the real property"; the second is by the insertion in line 12 immediately after the words "of this Island" the following, "and in the case of the personal property, in trust for the public of this Island". Then sub-section (3) is amended by deletion of the words "three times". In that same Clause you will note that it requires that regulations being made under that old Section should be published in the "Official Gazette" three times. By the removal of the words "three times" it means, that the Regulations will now be published in the normal way, that is, in the "Official Gazette" as we do today; so the question of publishing these Regulations three times is considered to be unnecessary.

Now, a little lower down in this same sub-section — sub-section (3) of Section 10 — the penalty Clause of forty shillings is converted into dollars and it is now ten dollars instead of forty shillings.

In Sub-Clause (5) of this Section, it seeks to delete the words "Officer of the Police Force including the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents". Those are the persons who can bring cases in addition to the Harbour and Shipping Master against violations of the Act. Instead of setting out the names Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner and so on and having that unnecessary wording, we are merely cutting out those words and saying "member of the Police Force".

Now, Section 7 of the Bill amends Section 17 of the Act. Under Section 17, the Governor is empowered in case of the death of any Public Officer who may have held office under the Crown and to whom was payable at the time of his death any monies by way of salary, allowance or pension, to make payment if he considered it expedient to the legal representative of the individual up to a sum of ten pounds, but this amendment seeks to amend that Clause in order to increase that amount from ten pounds to one hundred dollars.

5.15 p.m.

I think that that amendment is a reasonable one because when this amount was fixed, it was

in 1891 and today salaries and wages have increased by tenfold or more. That I repeat, is a reasonable amendment so as to allow the Government, without having to go through all of this redtape in respect of probate or Letters of Administration, to authorise the payment of an amount up to \$100 to an individual who is the legal representative of a deceased person.

There is only one more little point which I would like to make and it is that I shall have to move an amendment, as soon as we go into Committee on this Bill, to Clause 6 which will have to be deleted and I have another Clause to insert in its place. I also have a slight amendment to make to Clause 1, because this Bill is dated 1958 and we are now in 1959. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in my opinion this is a brazen example of the manner in which we have been doing these things for many years in the past and we are now asked to regularise it.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The hon. member was not listening to what I said.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I said that this position obtained since the institution of Cabinet Government which was only brought into being last year. How the hon. member gets all these years in his head, I do not know.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I correct myself; I will say that we have been doing these things for all these years since we have been under Cabinet Government. I am wondering if we have come to the stage when legislation will be brought down so that we will be able to transact our business in this manner. I am not at all clear as to the Objects or Reasons of this Bill. In the next place, neither the Hon. Minister nor ourselves have had the opportunity of putting these amendments next to the principal Act and comparing them until we arrived here. It is obvious from the manner in which the Hon. Minister has introduced this Bill that this is the first time that he has

attempted to put the two things together. I know that this matter does not fall within his portfolio, but if we want to go on this way, let us go on in this way; let us tear up all of these things and let us have the Act and the amendments to be made together. No hon. member can appreciate amendments of this magnitude without having had the facility of the principal Act before him. If it is considered necessary for the Executive Committee-----

At this stage Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. DOWDING: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, as it is proposed here provision is being made to make it clear that it is not necessary for the Executive Committee to sit for the transaction of all its business. Well, Sir, this proposal can be taken to the 'nth' degree and we are not supposed to sit here and the business of this colony can be done by means of a round robin. To suggest that the business of the people can be done by means of a round robin is to be utterly and absolutely indifferent. I am told that these round robins are being sent out right now and it is no more than what is causing the legislation to be in the mess in which it now is. Fancy our having come to the stage where in a Bill brought before this House we are saying that business is going to be done without a sitting. That has been explained to me and I fail to see why it should be so. The persons concerned are paid to do their work and I fail to see why the business of this country should be conducted in a round robin manner; they are paid to do their work and if the Executive Committee does not allow the Cabinet System to work you should have a means whereby you can place responsibility where each clerk has his job to be done and you will be able to appreciate that when the time comes somebody can say who is responsible. Are we going to have this round robin business to be legalised by this House? I fail to see that that should be so although there may be reasons for it. The Cabinet system calls for a change; but I fail to see that we can appreciate a change by a round robin method.

As to the other matter, without the facility for which I have often appealed to Your Honour — I am appealing again to Your Honour that when it comes to these amendments we should have a copy of the Act which we are amending. Of course, things like that will go on even further with this method of legalising business; the business of this country will be done by means of a round robin. That is what I am told.

5.25 p.m.

The fact that a meeting is to be called should be laid down in the Rules and should be adhered to, and there should be no possibility of the business of this island being done in such a manner that Mr. A, B, C or D should sign on a piece of paper, because if that paper flies away somebody should be called to account. The Leader of the House has only just taken over this and has not been able to explain it in full, but I deprecate absolutely and utterly any business of this Government being done in a round robin manner.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind members that the Executive Committee Act of this island is the most important Act on the Statute Book, and we have to be extremely careful how we tamper with it. On this occasion while agreeing with certain points made by the Hon. Minister, yet I am afraid that if we were to carry this amendment to its logical conclusion, we would end up with a confused mass of legislation which would take us no where.

In the first place the Cabinet derives its power from the Executive Committee Act, which controls the whole Government. Under the convention it has certain powers to deal with certain matters which have been delegated to it, and I will refer to the Governor's Message to the Secretary of State, dated 27th May, 1957; the reference is WS:260/S.I./Vol.V/42. I am trying to point out that the Executive Committee or the Cabinet proper today only has certain powers to deal with certain prescribed Acts. I will read the powers and functions and then the entire Act. These powers and functions are:-

- (a) the transaction of public financial business;
- (b) considering ways and means;
- (c) advising the Governor on any measures which the Executive may deem it expedient to bring before the Legislature;
- (d) the conduct of public works;
- (e) the control and management of public institutions.

In dealing with these matters we could probably agree with the Hon. Minister that no regular meeting need be summoned. I am not agreeing that you can meet any place; I feel you should meet at a stipulated place, in

this case, Government Headquarters, and not in the Lower Green, the Upper Green, Queens Park or any private residence or club. You should have a stipulated place to meet because after all it is conducting Government and public business. It is the most important body in the island because it is a body which runs the Government and controls the island; you should not have to be summoned in writing, but you have to be summoned and at a specific place, because the Clerk of the Executive Committee has to be present to make notes of the meeting which is taking place, records should be kept and important Government files have to be handed in in order to conduct business in a proper, legal and constitutional manner.

As I have said, under the convention the Cabinet has certain powers to deal with certain prescribed matters, and it may be as well for me to read Clause 6 of the above-mentioned Message which will probably clarify things to some extent. It reads as follows:-

"I propose to establish the Cabinet by using the legal machinery contained in section 28 A of the Interpretation Act, 1949, as amended by the Interpretation (Amendment) Act, 1954. This provision enables the Governor-in-Executive Committee to delegate his authority or the authority of the Executive Committee to exercise his or its statutory powers or perform his or its duties, except to hear appeals or make subsidiary legislation. Under this provision it is therefore competent for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to authorise the Ministers to exercise collectively the powers and perform the duties imposed on the Executive Committee under and by virtue of section 2 of the Executive Act, 1891. These powers and functions are -

- (a) the transaction of public financial business;
- (b) considering ways and means;
- (c) advising the Governor on any measures which the Executive may deem it expedient to bring before the Legislature;
- (d) the conduct of public works;
- (e) the control and management of public institutions."

Now the Cabinet has under the convention - not under the Act, specific powers to deal with these matters as set out here from (a) to (e); on matters outside of these the Cabinet has

no power to deal with them. Let me make a point here now. The Clause starts by saying "Whenever business of any kind". It would therefore be confusing everything to make an amendment that way. The Cabinet has power to deal with specified matters, but it has not got power to deal with those matters, which, under Section 28A of the Interpretation Act may not be delegated. The Governor-in-Executive Committee would continue to deal with those matters which under Section 28A of the Interpretation Act may not be delegated, with matters of an executive nature such as appointments to boards, etc., and with matters for which the Chief Secretary is responsible to the Governor.

For matters dealing with the Civil Service you want the Financial Secretary to be present, for matters with the administration of justice you want the Attorney General or one of the Crown Law Officers to sit in and advise.

5.35 p.m.

When we attempt an amendment of such far-reaching nature, we are really quibbling and dabbling with an Act and causing confusion. The Cabinet has power to deal with specific duties and not all kinds and natures of business; so to make this insertion that whenever business of any kind is transacted, that is increasing the power which we delegated to you.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member seems to be a bit confused on that. We are not removing that Clause either. We are only saying now, if you consider it necessary to have a meeting. The hon. member seems to be a bit confused over it. I do not know if he has taken a leaf out of the book of the hon. senior member for St. George.

Mr. TALMA: I see whenever business of any kind is transacted that you have power to summon a meeting and I see you have power under the conventions to deal with only specific business. You are trying to amend an Act which generalises, whereas your power is only limited and restricted.

Hon. M. E. COX: This is nothing which applies to us as a Cabinet. The Cabinet can sit and decide on whatever it likes, but the other people only sit and rubber stamp them.

Mr. TALMA: First of all, there must be members of the Executive Committee to start with. You have to swear to the Executive Committee oath first of all. You have to swear to keep your secrets. I have been a Minister,

therefore I know what happens. Unless you take the oath you cannot be a Cabinet Minister. The Act is stated thus: "Whenever business of any kind shall have to be transacted by the Committee and it is considered expedient that there should be a sitting of the Committee." According to your amendment, if I understand it, all I am saying is that the Act is generalising, whereas you have no power to deal with business of any kind, that is to say, you have no power to deal with business which has not been delegated to you. What has been delegated to you is what is set out under the conventions.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to remind the hon. member that His Excellency the Governor can summon a meeting of the Executive Committee whenever he so desires.

Mr. TALMA: I am not dealing with that at all. That is only said to confuse the issue. What I am saying is that the Cabinet would like to have power to meet at any place and at any time and without having to be summoned in writing. I am not in favour of your meeting anywhere and you should be summoned. I do know that at some times you may want to meet twice in a day but if that is so, you can be summoned through the telephone. I do not agree to your meeting any place.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have never suggested that.

Mr. TALMA: I thought I read that here.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not in the bill.

Mr. TALMA: Anyhow, the fact is that I do agree that you can obviate the necessity of actually having to summon a meeting in writing. I am not dealing with that particularly but I am dealing with the proposed amendment. You propose to amend a general clause which refers to any kind of business whereas the Cabinet only has power to deal with specific things, and unless you specify, you will have it all monkeyed up.

Mr. Speaker, I am really just trying to assist the Hon. Minister although he may regard it in a different light. I am not blaming the Minister at all; I am blaming the Legal Draughtsman. He is wrong, no matter what his qualifications are. I see the mistake here all right and the Minister will have to come back with it. If he relies on his numbers and have it passed, he will have to come back here with it. The amendment is wrong and I will advise him to postpone the Clause and try and bring it right. Let your Legal Draughtsman look at it again and try and make it right. The

amendment is wrong and should not be further considered today. As I have said, if you persist with it and rely on your numbers, you will still have to come back here with it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order to make a further explanation?

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

Mr. TALMA: There is another point which I would like to take up. While agreeing to some extent with the amendment to increase the amount which the Governor is empowered to pay out without Letters of Administration from \$48 to \$100, it does not go far enough. I would like to point out to the Hon. Minister that in the Objects and Reasons, provision is made to enable the Governor-in-Executive Committee to dispense with probate or Letters of Administration in respect of any salary allowances, or pension payable to any public officer at the time of his death where the amount payable does not exceed one hundred dollars. At present the Governor-in-Executive Committee can only dispense with such probate or Letters of Administration where the amount payable does not exceed ten pounds. I want to point out to the Hon. Minister that that is a move in the right direction but I am afraid he has not gone far enough for any widow whose husband has died intestate and for whom his pension or gratuity amounted to \$150. If you take, for example, someone in the Public Works Department or in the Department of Highways and Transport who is getting a small gratuity, it would not be profitable for her to go into Court and spend almost as much in order to get this money. Very wisely you have increased it to \$100 but I can tell you that court fees, in matters like this, especially now pending the abolition of the Assistant Court of Appeal in its Equitable Jurisdiction — it means that you cannot any longer go there and pay a small fee to secure Letters of Administration. You have to go to the Supreme Court and in going there you will have to pay more than one hundred dollars to secure one hundred and fifty dollars. I think that your Crown Law Officer could have advised that petitions for grants of Letters of Administration would swallow up one hundred dollars.

5.45 p.m.

I can quite understand increasing it, but suppose the amount involved is \$300 or \$150! You may have to spend \$100 in order to get \$150. I would suggest that this amount be made about \$500. If a petitioner sees some-

thing substantial in his hands when a matter is concluded, then he will not be interested in going to the Court at all. While this is an amendment in the right direction, on the other hand the increase proposed is still too small. In these modern days when there is no Assistant Court of Appeal — under the former Court of Appeal Act, with the Court in its equitable jurisdiction, you could pay \$30 or \$40 and have Letters of Administration issued by the judge, but now, irrespective of the size of the estate, there is only one Court to which you can go and therefore it would not be profitable for a poor person whose relative may have left him a gratuity of \$150, to pay \$100 in order to secure the grant of Letters of Administration. I am suggesting that if the Government wants to come to the assistance of the people, then, it should increase this amount to \$500; the increase from \$48 to \$100 is not doing anything. As I have already said, in order to recover \$150 you may have to spend \$100 or even more. I am hoping that the Hon. Minister will see that I am really trying to assist in this matter and to show that the amendment which he has proposed is not strictly in order. In view of what I have said, I am moving that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed; I am making that motion in the interest of the Bill itself.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that a lot of the confusion over this matter is due to the fact that the Hon. Minister was not quite clear in his introduction of this Bill. With the introduction of Cabinet Status certain responsibilities which were previously held by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, devolved entirely upon the shoulders of the Cabinet. It is specifically set out here in the Convention that those responsibilities were (a) the transaction of public financial business; (b) considering ways and means; (c) advising the Governor on any measures which the Executive may deem it expedient to bring before the Legislature; (d) the conduct of public works and (e) the control and management of public institutions.

Well now, Sir, am I to understand that the basic reason for this amendment is that the Governor feels that he should not have to summon a meeting of the entire Committee to decide on those measures the responsibility for which has been passed on to the Cabinet? If that is the case, then the reason for the amendment is clear; but if that is not the case then the reason for the amendment is not clear. The Cabinet meets and decides finally on the matters to which I have made reference before and then they send on those decisions to the Executive Committee. The amendment before us proposes that you

must only summon a meeting of the entire Committee when it is considered expedient that there should be a sitting of the Committee. In other words, it would be considered inexpedient that there should be a sitting of the Committee if you are dealing with matters for which the Cabinet has full power. If it is a question of dealing with a matter for which the Cabinet has full control, then a round robin is all that is necessary. The decision on these matters is within the province of the Cabinet and since ratification is made formally you put the items by way of a round robin and you let the other members of the Committee know. If that is not the meaning of the amendment I am not going to support it.

I have already referred to the matters for which the final authority or full power has been delegated by the Executive Committee to the Cabinet, but the Executive Committee itself still continues to deal with certain matters which have not been delegated to the Cabinet. It seems to me that the question of settling public business merely by means of a round robin, unless that business has been already resolved by a Committee legally empowered to resolve it, would be allowing the public business to be conducted in an unsatisfactory way. If you are allowing the Committee to append their decisions on matters on which the Cabinet have sat already, then I am supporting the amendment with the rider that certainly in matters of this sort, the information which is given to this Assembly should be more complete, or that the Minister responsible for its introduction should more clearly endeavour to set out what the proposed legislation intends to do. I am not quite clear in my mind from what I have been told today or from the amending Bill before us, exactly what the position is. Certainly, I think that the House is entitled to a simple presentation of what are the underlying facts before it is called upon to vote.

5.55 p.m.

The present Law is that when any business of any kind is to be transacted by the Executive Committee, the members of the Legislative Council and the members of the House of Assembly shall be duly summoned to attend a meeting of the Executive Council. All the amendment wants to do is to say that some authority, we are not told whom, is to say whether or not there should be a meeting. That in itself is dangerous since the Executive Committee still has no power to deal with matters over and above those delegated by convention to the Cabinet. We are not told who is to be the final arbiter or whether or not a meeting is necessary. All the amendment says is "and it is

considered expedient that there should be a sitting of the Committee; in other words, if it is not considered expedient, there will be no meeting. Who is to be the authority on that?

Certainly, Sir, the Introducer of the Bill should go a little further and tell us who is to be the arbiter and whether or not there should be a sitting of the Committee, but if it boils itself down to what I said earlier, let us know that. It can be one or two things; it may be a matter on which if the Cabinet has power it would not call a meeting, but if it has no power then you call a sitting. You have one of two factors operating and the House should be told what the Government has in mind, and I sincerely hope that the Introducer of the Bill is in a position to settle our doubts on these two issues, whether it is for clarification you are going to hold a meeting, purely because the Cabinet has no power finally to resolve the matter with merely formal ratification by the Council, or some authority is going to get up and say we have full power to deal with this, send a round robin and that is the end of it. The present Law is fairly binding; it says that whenever there is any business of any kind, whether small, big or important, you must summon a meeting; that is what the Law says. They are trying to say that since Cabinet Status the Cabinet has certain responsibility within itself; so therefore some of the meetings of the Executive may be to deal with things for which the Cabinet has responsibility, so why call the Executive Committee. The Cabinet therefore decides and let them append their signature. It is one or two interpretations, and for my own information and for the sake of clarifying the position, I think it should be made clear which is which.

Mr. TUDOR: I second the motion.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I thought by now the position was clear to hon. members. Even now, the Act as it stands gives the Officer administering the Government authority to summon a meeting whenever he thinks it necessary. He is the person to decide whether or not there shall be a meeting. Under the present convention, Sir, and members read out part of it just now, the Cabinet meets as a Cabinet and not as the Executive Committee; the Cabinet has certain powers delegated to it as members mentioned just now. The last member who spoke said that if it is merely a question of the other members by way of a round robin ratifying what the Cabinet may decide, within the powers which are delegated to it, it is all right; but on any matter which is not delegated to the Cabinet, then the Council should meet. We are quite clear as to what we are doing.

Now the Council, if it so desires, can meet whenever it wants to meet.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I never said that if it is a matter outside the province of the Cabinet, then the Council should meet. I said the entire Committee including the Council should meet.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is where he is getting confused; he does not understand the convention. We cannot make Subsidiary Legislation as a Cabinet nor can we appoint any member to a Board or anything like that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is being unnecessarily impertinent and rude by telling me that I do not understand the convention when I am trying to explain what he has not explained. I have told him that what the House wants to be told is whether or not the amendment merely proposes to allow the Executive Committee members who are not Cabinet members to ratify formally by signature by means of a round robin matters which the Cabinet has decided and which fall within the province of the Cabinet. I went further and said if it is a matter for a decision under Section 28A for which the Cabinet has no full authority, then I would not agree with a round robin, because the entire Executive Committee should be summoned. All I have asked him to do is to tell me whether or not that is the position, and he should have done that when he introduced the Bill.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member has failed to appreciate.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, either. If the hon. member misinterprets anything you say.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: He accuses me of lack of knowledge of the convention. There are only two possible alternatives and I presented both.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: I repeat, Sir, for the last time that even under the present day convention, the officer administering the Government can summon a meeting of the Executive Committee whenever he so desires. (Mr. CRAWFORD: That is beside the point.) How could it be when the Act sets it out quite clearly? Sub-Clause 5 of Section 3 deals with the summoning of meetings for transaction of Government business, and I

said without the amendment that the Governor or the officer administering the Government can still summon a meeting; if the Governor wants to have a meeting of the whole Executive Committee, he can summon it. This amendment does not seek to prevent him from summoning a meeting, but the amendment seeks to give the officer administering the Government — not the Cabinet because the Cabinet knows its way around — legal authority of meeting without having a meeting if he does not think it necessary.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If who does not think so? 6.05 p.m.

Sir, the Clause reads as follows:—

“Whenever business of any kind shall have to be transacted by the Committee, all the members of the Legislative Council and all the members of the House of Assembly forming part thereof, shall be duly summoned to attend the Executive Council, but they shall not be entitled to attend the Executive Council except when so summoned for the transaction of such business as is provided for by this Act.”

This amendment simply says after the word “Committee”, “and it is considered expedient that there should be a sitting of the Committee.” In other words, if it is considered necessary that there should be a sitting of the Committee. (A VOICE: By whom?) By His Excellency or the person administering the Government. Only then would you summon a meeting. In other words, you are giving the same latitude to members of the Committee. Let us take for example that you are going to appoint Mr. X to the Housing Board, because some member has resigned or died. The Cabinet sits in the first place and decides that Mr. X must be appointed. Despite the fact that all these matters have not been delegated to the Cabinet, the Cabinet still, as I would like hon. members to know, has supreme authority and that authority has been given to the Cabinet not so much by the Governor but by the House of Assembly, because this House of Assembly has agreed to Ministerial system in 1954 and then after that system had worked for some time, this House and indeed the Other Place concurred in it to go a step further to Cabinet system. Under the Executive Committee Act and under the conventions certain powers were delegated to the Cabinet. Well, the Cabinet sits; it does not run to Government House every Thursday morning or evening as it used to do before. The Cabinet sits and makes its decisions on the various questions which comes before it and when the Cabinet decides, that is the decision. All then that is necessary is for the Clerk to send the decision up,

not even the discussion of what we say on it. All the Clerk needs to do is to send the decision on to His Excellency through the Chief Secretary. This is something which has not been delegated to the Cabinet, but yet it originates from the Cabinet and then the decision of the Cabinet is passed on and this decision cannot be refuted by anybody else.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That cannot be true. The question of appointments to Boards is something over which the Cabinet has not got full power.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have not said that at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Minister has given an example of appointments to a Board which the Cabinet has decided on and he said that nobody can interfere with the Cabinet's decision.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister said although the Cabinet has not full responsibility.

Hon. M. E. COX: Let us go back to the old conventions. As long as members of the House who were the members of the Executive Committee sat and decided on anything, that was the decision. We have gone further than that now. We brought in Ministerial Government and since then we have gone a step further and established Cabinet Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is elementary.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was making this point. The Cabinet sits and decides that Mr. X must become a member of a particular Board. I am saying here and now that despite the fact that the decision has to be sent on to be rubberstamped, nobody can refuse to abide by the decision. That is the convention.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order again. The convention specifically prescribes those matters for which the Cabinet is responsible. I am saying that the right —

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The hon. member is trying to make a second speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am doing nothing of the kind. I am saying that the statement is final.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order; that is a speech.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Am I to understand the Hon. Minister

to say that in actual practice, even on the question of appointments to Boards, the decision of the Cabinet is more or less final and the other members of the Executive Committee merely rubber stamp that decision?

Hon. M. E. COX: That is actually what I am saying. If the Cabinet decides on something the other people cannot upset that decision.

Mr. CRAWFORD: But the Committee has to meet on it.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Committee only meets if His Excellency the Governor feels it is necessary for the Committee to meet. What I am saying is, that this authority is not delegated to the Cabinet. If it were delegated to the Cabinet, there would be no necessity to send it to the Governor, but even though it is not delegated to the Cabinet when we decide on something, that is the decision and all I am trying to do is to make this point. You are appointing a member to the Housing Board. Are you telling me that it is necessary for the Council to meet merely to ratify the appointment of a man? That is the height of nonsense, but under the present set up, it would be necessary.

6.15 p.m.

Under the present set-up it would be necessary. You tell me that you are going to send down a Civil Establishment Order to appoint a postman or a Clerk or whatever the case may be, and that when the Cabinet decides that a post should be created, are you telling me that it is absolutely necessary for the Council to meet and say: "Oh yes, this post should be created?" I am quite sure that you cannot reduce the matter to such ridiculous proportions. All this Bill asks for is a discretionary authority to be given to the Head of the Executive to say whether he considers it necessary to summon a meeting or not. This Bill does not give us any power as hon. members first thought, and the hon. senior member for St. George, as usual, thought that we were asking for all the power to do what we want in Barbados (Mr. CRAWFORD: That was your fault.) If we want it, we can get it but that is not what we are asking for. The officer wants to be in a position, if he feels it unnecessary to summon the Council to discuss a matter which was already decided by the Cabinet, to be able to say whether the matter is of so much importance that he should summon a meeting or not. I repeat that a trivial matter like ratifying a decision of the Cabinet to appoint Mr. "X" to a Board is nothing at all for which His Excellency should have to summon a meeting of the Council. I repeat for the last time that in so far as this matter or any other matter of

the House of Assembly steps, are you saying that something like this is still a matter which is left for your discussion only?

What I do not like about these measures is that I do not like your dealing with legislation unless it is going to rest with a particular body. Let me say if you have reached the stage where the Governor must say that the Executive Committee must sit or when it does not need to sit, then you do not need the Executive Committee. I hope the Governor will read this. You see that Ghana is fast becoming a republic, because the people there are not afraid to tell you these things. I think too many of us are afraid of ourselves. I think too many of you are afraid of yourselves. You want certain people to meet and take your advice. You have an Executive Committee functioning alongside the Cabinet with no powers at all. What is the point of having it? It is a waste of money. Why pay its members? (Hon. M. E. COX: They need not take the money.) The Hon. Minister says that they need not take the money. I say that the Ministers need not take theirs either.

I want the Hon. Minister to understand that my objection to this is merely because it is stupid. Sometimes you have to give a man full power even if you think that you should not give him full power. This is something which rebounds. A man gets up in here today and because he feels somebody else cannot do the job, he says that he should not be given the power. Why say that when it is something which you may be put there to do? That is foolishness. My attitude to this is that I do not care who is running the Government because I do not regard the running of the Government in the same way as the hon. member. The Hon. Minister thinks that they are here by divine decree and nothing can happen to them. Hitler and Mussolini thought so too. All of them ran Governments and fell through. What I want to point out is this: can you not see that you are working a constitution which is stupid and wasteful? You only do this, because in these particular territories they work on the basis of doing away with things gradually; therefore, you come down here with just another step towards doing away with the Executive Committee. Why not delegate these authorities to the Cabinet and finish with the Executive Committee altogether? If it is a question of your making decisions, what is the point of delegating authority to the Executive Committee or the Head of the Administration? This is only telling the Head of the Administration and the other members of the Executive Committee and wasting the people's money. We do not need them. Let us say so far as legislative powers are

concerned, why should we be giving the Head of the Administration powers? That is only a joke. It is unnecessary and the Cabinet should be in a position to say that. Perhaps, hon. members may be afraid to go so far on the basis that they believe you may misuse the power, but I say you have already been given a lot of power which you have misused. We hope when somebody else is put in your position that you will accept it in good grace and do not undermine the position. Let me tell hon. members over there that whenever they see us in here we have come in here through the same process as they have come. We are all elected members in here and I do not like this nonsense of your giving authority to do something other than doing it by meetings. All constituted bodies should be prepared to meet at a particular meeting place to transact business. If the business becomes so slight that they do not need to meet, then I say you do not need them. I take the view that you should tell the Secretary of State for the Colonies that the Cabinet System should be given more power and to you who are members of the Cabinet you should have the constitution rewritten and you should be in a position to delegate your authority in such a manner as you think fit. Let us take the United Kingdom Cabinet. The Cabinet runs the country. The Queen has powers in the Privy Council, but the functions in the administration of the Government is left entirely in the hands of the Cabinet: and if there are to be certain administrative changes, Parliament meets and decides those changes which you should put into effect.

I feel that at this stage this is the time when members of the Cabinet should be asking for greater powers; they should not be delegating little bits of power here and there. I feel that any Government in power as long as it has been elected by the people should be given the maximum power. Just as I say that the Trade Union Movement should have maximum power and that we should not restrict the maximum power to another constituted body, I feel the same way as regards the Government in power. I will not say like the Hon. Minister of Trade that we must admit that we are backward and we are not advanced as people in other countries. I say we can govern ourselves in like manner as other people can govern themselves. The day you cannot govern yourself you should not be given power at all. What I would say is that you do not need to be afraid of who is in power as the hon. senior member for Christ Church seems to fear.

6.45 p.m.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. At no time did I convey the impression that I am afraid

of those in power. I merely warned the Minister that the amendment was not in order, but I am fully in agreement with the spirit of it.

Mr. WALCOTT: That shows that the spirit of the amendment is a laudable one. If the time has come for Cabinet changes, then say so; say that the Governor need not be the Governor in that sense, but at the same time you feel that the Cabinet system should be run on the basis of maximum power. I want maximum power for you because I feel that maximum power for you is maximum power for the country in which I live. I am a Barbadian; I do not live in Honolulu. You do not have to run affairs from Government House. I make my contribution to this place just as any other Barbadian is making a contribution to the country in which he lives.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise to accept the motion for the postponement of this Bill, not on all the points which have been made, but rather on one ground; that is the ground put forward by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, as to increasing the amount which the Governor-in-Executive Committee will be authorised to advance to persons who may have lost their relatives, their breadwinners, so to speak. I think that the point which the hon. member has raised is a very good one and I accept the motion for the postponement on that ground. I should just like to say that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not afraid of granting power to the Government because he has always fought for that; therefore I have no doubt as to his stand in this matter. As a matter of fact,

I believe that the hon. member would willingly agree to the system which exists in Jamaica today where there is no more Executive Committee but a Council of Ministers in which case.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: We have the best Constitution in the Empire.

Hon. M. E. COX: What I am referring to is a recent thing. We will amend our Constitution in order to get a little further. That is all I need say at this stage.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like to say.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has accepted the motion for the postponement.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, — I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 20th instant, at 3.30 o'clock, p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 20th instant, at 3.30 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
6.55 p.m.