
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 2nd February, 1961.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m., today.

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*) and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. BRANCKER entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting which was held on the 31st January, 1961, 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 now taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Barbados Harbours Regulations, 1961.

The Tariff Book of the Barbados Port Department.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances Act, 1948.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances Act, 1948, be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 5

Hon. M. E. COX: Before you call the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Orders Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 under Government Business be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

The question that Orders Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 under Government Business be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. STRAUGHN entered the House and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER called Orders No. 1 to 17 under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no hon. member ready to deal with any item under Private Members' Business, the House will proceed with the consideration of Government Business.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND FOR PLAYING FIELD AT QUEEN'S COLLEGE

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume debate on the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to the Governing Body of Queen's College of lands for the purpose of extending the playing fields at Queen's College.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I should very much like to reply to some of the criticisms, or perhaps allegations, which have been made against the Government in so far as the provision of playing fields for Secondary Schools, especially and so far as the provision of additional school places at the Secondary Grammar Schools are concerned. You will no doubt, remember, that hon. members on the other side of this Hon. House have stated most emphatically that the Government has not built any additional Grammar Schools during its regime. That is most likely true; but I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Government's concern has been the provision of additional places at Grammar Schools. I can assure hon. members that it has been very much in this particular direction.

3.25 p.m.

There are ten Grammar Schools in this country and nine of these schools have had extensions during the period 1955-60. These extensions have provided 837 additional school places, so that if it was the Opposition's intention -

and I have to say "if" because of the fact that I am rather in doubt as to what they wanted to refer - to give you, Sir, the idea that this Government has not at all concerned itself with the problem of the supply of additional places at Grammar Schools, that impression is very erroneous; and I would be tempted to go so far as to say, misleading.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy mentioned in the course of his address that schools such as the Roebuck Moravian, the Alleyne School and the Alexandra School could very well be supplied with additional facilities in so far as the provision of playing fields is concerned. My reason, Sir, for saying that that is an echo, is this: it is just roughly two weeks ago that I visited that Roebuck Moravian Boys' School, or the site of it, for the purpose of inspecting some land around that school, the object being to try to have Government acquire it to use as an extension; in fact, as a means of providing a playing field there.

As far as the Alleyne School is concerned, Government has taken the necessary steps to provide a playing field there; and you know too well, Mr. Speaker, that the Alexandra School has no playing field. So when the hon. member saw fit to quote these schools as examples in order to support his contention, I can only feel that by some means or other it was possible for the news to have got out that Government is really taking steps to acquire land to provide a playing field for Roebuck School; and it has already taken such steps at the other schools.....

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Minister is quite fair in saying that the fact that I mentioned these three Schools implies that in some way or other the news may have got out. I reached my conclusions independent of anything the Minister is contemplating. I am now hearing for the first time that the Minister himself had these things in mind. I never knew it before.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, in so far as that is concerned, I will dismiss that by saying that wise men think alike; fools seldom disagree!

The object of this address, Mr. Speaker, is to give you the necessary information which will enable you to know that Government is very deeply concerned about this matter of the provision of school places and playing fields. You too would know, Sir, that it is not a very easy matter to get land in this country. I have visited and inspected no fewer than twenty odd sites; and I have not been able to get to grips as I would like with a view to acquiring any of these sites.

In so far as this attack on Government for not having provided additional Grammar Schools is concerned, I am to say that it is the difficulty of acquiring school sites which has prevented the Ministry of Education from embarking on the construction of additional Grammar Schools; but we do hope that in the very near future we shall be able to start operations. On Monday of this week I was getting around and visiting one or two sites, and I think that there is a possibility of getting one for use in the construction of an additional Grammar School.

I do not think that it is worthwhile taking what my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. John said very seriously. After thinking carefully on all he had to say, I can only consider the idea that he is not really serious when he tries to castigate Government for providing additional playing fields at Queen's College.

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

THE DOMESTIC EMPLOYEES (HOURS OF DUTY) ACT, 1961.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the second reading of a Bill to prescribe the hours of duty of domestic employees.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, hon. members will remember that on 25th October, 1954, the Government set up a Committee under the chairmanship of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to investigate as thoroughly as possible the plight of domestic servants in this island. That was as a result of a Petition submitted to the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, my colleague, who is now the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing on 3rd March, 1954.

I have been reading, perhaps, accidentally, some of the nonsense that was written in the Press regarding the question of regulating the hours of domestic servants. One of the first things that is misleading is that the Press says this is to revise the working hours of domestic servants. At present there are no fixed hours as far as legislation is concerned regulating the hours of work of domestic servants; therefore, this Bill is not revising anything; rather, it is laying down legislation for the purpose of regulating the hours of these workers for the first time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been living among people in this island long enough to know the feeling of the people, and more particularly the ones from among whom I have sprung in so far as their plight is concerned.
3.35 p.m.

I am one who made my contribution to relieving the oppressed situation wherever it existed among the workers of this island. I also know how some employers feel about some workers; perhaps, in particular, as regards domestic servants. I think I am correct in saying that, when this Bill is passed - and I have no doubt in my mind that it will pass - it will remove once and for all, I believe, the last semblance of slavery in this island; and I say that because I understand that this word "servant" comes from the Latin *servo, servus, servit* which is "slave". That is perhaps why that title was given to these workers who worked in the home of their masters. The masters regarded them as part, not of the family, but of the machinery of his house.

Sometime ago I had occasion to read that famous Dred Scott case. I think the American Constitution lays it down that all men are born free and equal, but the highest courts in America at that time over-ruled the Constitution and said that it could not have applied to slaves because slaves were not human beings; they are not men as such, but chattels, therefore, the Constitution could not apply to them as it was written. That went on all along, and no doubt that feeling still holds good today among a few of the diehards who are left.

This Bill seeks to wipe out once and for all the word "servant". Those people will be now called "domestic employees". Simultaneously with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, the Government has taken the opportunity to repeal the Master and Servants Act. Indeed, I thought it would have been necessary to bring a similar Bill to the House to wipe out that, but I have been told that all that is necessary is for the Commissioner, who is now revising the Laws of Barbados, to exclude that in the revision, therefore, it is not necessary to have a law passed.

This Government intends to wipe out anything which appears to have any relic of slavery. Sir, I will continue to preach as long as I have breath in my body the equality of human beings. I do not believe that anybody because he is of a different pigment is better than another person. To me, pigment has no value whatsoever; and I have absolutely no respect for any colours irrespective of what colours they may be. We respect culture, good behaviour, good morals and things of that sort wherever they may lie, and with whom they may lie.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now move on more specifically to the question of regulating these hours of domestics. Domestics have the same hopes, wishes, desires and aspirations as we have. If we believe that they are equal to us as human beings, well then, it is our duty to do whatever lies in our power to make their position as reasonably well

and comfortable and satisfactory as anybody else. That is why we are taking the stand which we are taking today.

Sir, that Committee, appointed by the Minister, sat and reported on the 11th July, 1957. Among other things that Committee recommended that there should be a 56-hour week. That Committee found that the conditions of these workers were most appalling; that the average daily hours worked were between nine and thirteen hours. They also found that the average weekly working hours were between 66 1/2 hours and 78 3/4 hours. That Committee also found that the wages paid at the time were no doubt miserably low. The Committee found that many of these employees never got off duty or got away from their employment before 9 o'clock and 10 o'clock at night. They found, as far as wages were concerned, that those wages averaged between \$2.77 a week and \$6.50 a week with accommodation; and without accommodation, those wages averaged between \$5.00 and \$8.00.

3.45 p.m.

There was also some variation in granting sick relief to domestic servants who received holidays with full pay, while in some cases, the services of these domestics were terminated. In other words, some domestic servants were paid when they were ill and in other cases they were dismissed when they were taken ill. The Committee recommended that every domestic servant after rendering twelve months' continuous service, should be eligible for fourteen days' leave with full pay in respect of any continuous period of twelve months subject to the production of a medical certificate.

There was another disturbing feature which the Committee found and that is where the Committee dealt with the matter of social security. The attention of the Committee was drawn to the case of a woman who was employed by the same family for twenty years and who retired on account of old age without any gratuity or pension. The Committee recommended that domestic servants should be included in any scheme of social security contemplated by the Government. At that time it was suggested that these proposals should form part of the basis of an agreement, written or oral, between employers and domestic servants, rather than have rigid legislation provisions. Those are some of the extracts of the report and recommendations made by the Committee.

We know that in this island and it may be in other islands too, the position is that after hard-working, faithful people have given so many years of yeoman service to employers, they retire and go home without having anything on which to fall back during the most delicate days of their lives. From representation which has been made to me on several occasions by different people, I can say that is the pattern of employment. I know, from my own experience, of a case where an individual had served for over twenty-five years; he worked with a very wealthy employer in this island, and when that individual reached old age he went home after working for \$2 a week, without either pension or gratuity.

Difficult as it may be to regulate the wages of these employees, we felt that we would not abide by the decision of the Committee in so far as proceeding with rigid legislation, but rather to give the employers the opportunity of falling into line with the recommendations in so far as that was possible. We did so because we know of the difficulty in enforcing legislation dealing with wages in this particular field. I regret to say that after approximately five years little or no improvement has been made in this field. Conditions remain almost the same; a few changes have been made here and there, but nothing desirable in this 20th century of ours today. It therefore became necessary for us to decide to pass legislation to provide, as a first step, protection for these employees against unscrupulous employers; we decided to regulate the hours of work of these employees.

Mr. Speaker, with employers' and employees' organisations as they are today, with the trend for shorter hours of employment, hon. members will see and realise that the

time has come when something should be done for these employees. Normally speaking, the Government would not have intervened in this particular case. In saying that, I mean this: there is an understanding between Government and employers and the Trade Union that, where people are organisable, the Government should not intervene in fixing wages or conditions of work. It is only recently, after the Shops Order was passed, that I wrote the Union as well as the employers in the hotel business and told them that it was my intention to have an Order passed dealing with the wages of these employees in the hotel industry. Both the Union and the Employers' Organisation informed me that they were in the process of organising these people. As a result of that, I dropped the idea of setting up a Wages Council for this particular section of employees. I say that in order that the House can see that, as far as we are concerned, we are one hundred per cent in favour of the Trade Union and Employers' Organisations getting together, if they can, and setting out wages and conditions of work for employees throughout the island. However, where they fail to make these settlements, or where they fail to organise these workers so that they may be able to get some measure of protection and representation in their plight, then it is the duty of the Government to come in and pass legislation for the purpose of protecting these people.

3.55 p.m.

This is one of the fields of employment which has been represented to me as difficult to be organised; so the Government has decided as a first measure to pass a Bill to regulate the hours of these domestics. This Bill provides for a fifty-two hour week. That means that domestics will work normally eight hours every day although being on the job nine hours; they must have an hour for refreshment or rest or whatever the case may be. It also provides that a domestic employee must have one half day every week. In other words, if you went to work from Sunday you would work up to Saturday midday. It also provides for two whole days in every month. And where a whole day is given, that week must not be more than forty-four hours. That is found, Sir, in the Schedule to the Bill.

The Section reads as follows:-

"No domestic employee shall be employed for more than eight hours actual work in any one day, of fifty-two hours actual work in any one week, except that in any week in which a rest period is granted in accordance with paragraph 4 of this Schedule, the hours of actual work for that week shall not exceed forty-four:

Provided that if the domestic employee so agrees, he may be employed for periods in excess."

If however, a domestic employee agrees to work a longer period than those hours fixed in this Schedule for his employer, he may do so provided that the employer agrees to pay him time and a half for the excess hours he works.

I have already mentioned that they will have two rest periods. In addition to the daily break referred to in paragraph three of this Schedule, the domestic employee shall be granted two rest periods, each of not less than twenty-four hours consecutive rest in every month.

Now, Mr. Speaker, included in this Bill you will see provision made for an employer to be prosecuted in the first place if he contravenes this Act. If he is prosecuted for not paying his employee monies due to him as a result of overtime work, the Magistrate finding him guilty will thereupon order him to pay that domestic employee his or her dues. That is done also to assist the employee, Mr. Speaker, instead of forcing him to bring a civil action against the employer, in which case it would be a long drawn-out process, and no doubt she may have to seek legal assistance which may be very costly.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to labour this case, because, to my mind, this is so clear and so reasonable; although as I understand, some people feel, maybe members too, but I have not heard it yet, that this Bill is revolutionary,

that domestic servants are so intimate with their employers and form part of the whole setup that, if you bring in legislation to regulate the hours, you are going to cause unemployment. All I have to say is that, if as a result of this Bill unemployment is caused in this island, the unemployment situation will be thrown back exactly where it has always been thrown by the public as well as the members of the Opposition; that is, on the Government. If by the implementation of this Act, as some people will have us to believe, unemployment becomes rife among that group of employees, well then it is the duty of the Government as in all other cases to try its best to find employment avenues for its people.

As members will see from the Bill, Mr. Speaker, this does not include domestics who are living in. While we regret that we could not have included them, we realise that it would be almost absolutely impossible or impracticable to operate this if one lives in one's house.
4.05 p.m.

We have in this island something between 12,000 and 13,000 of these people, and I know that this section of the community has never been given its rightful place in the community; it has never been put in its true perspective. Too many people regard servants as bits of machinery to be pushed around and as soon as they are worn out in body to be thrown away and forgotten. I am sure that you will agree with me that domestic employees have played and are playing and will continue to play a most important part of our community life. (Mr. WALCOTT: We want to get rid of them.) I hope the hon. member will be the first person to get rid of them.

Mr. Speaker, these people are responsible for rearing some of the most useful citizens of this country. We only have to pass along and see them caring these children, learning them to speak properly and training them to behave well. Parents have to leave home and go to work, and these domestic employees have to care the children from 8 o'clock to 4 o'clock. These domestic employees share the sorrows of their employers from time to time, but, unfortunately, they do not share the joys. I have seen them go to the graves of their employers - in some cases erstwhile employers - and shed tears as though they were part of that family. They prepare meals, wash clothing, keep the house clean, attend to the children and rear some of the most useful citizens of this country. It is true they rear some useless ones too but it is no fault of theirs. But I regret to say that when the time comes for recompense and consideration of their usefulness, these employees have never been adequately compensated; they have never been squarely treated for the service which they have given to their employers.

I do not know if it may be necessary at a later stage to say anything more. It all depends on what I hear from the other side. I want to say that this Bill will fill a gap that has been missing from among us for a long time. It will bring, no doubt, to many people whom it will affect, hope and relief on its passing; and will, no doubt, gladden the hearts of those many faithful, hardworking, loyal people who have done so much for this island but whose service has never been recognised and fairly appreciated in this community.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Hon. Minister made his speech in the tone; that while in doing so he looked to the Opposition benches because, with the solitary exception of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I do not think any of us over on this side can say that they have been raised by servants. All of us have been raised by our parents, and were not fortunate to be raised by nurses. Speaking in this Chamber is different from speaking on a platform.

At the beginning the Hon. Minister spoke of the Trade Union and said that this is a Labour legislation; and that Government has agreed that they should not intervene in

negotiations dealing with workers who are organisable. I would like to say that I have told the Government so on more than one occasion. What I regret is that the Hon. Minister dealt with this Bill like any other Bill which comes to the Legislature; and that he did not see fit to submit it to the Trade Union and say that it was the intention of the Government to introduce such a Bill, and ask if we had any comments to make.

Let me point out the first error in this Bill. The Hon. Minister has been advised that servants living in and sleeping in should be exempted from the terms of this Bill. That is the most stupid exemption which you could have made. Does the Hon. Minister know that seamen live on a ship? Some of the best conditions of employment which exist in the world today exist for seamen. You have the Maritime Code which regulates the conditions of work for seamen. Are you suggesting that you would have to send a helicopter, do it like how they are shadowing the "Santa Maria" so as to see regulations for seamen carried out? The Hon. Minister did not tell us so, but I believe that he was making a political speech. I will give the hon. member a little exercise now on this matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Did I hear the hon. member saying that I was making a political speech?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter did say that he believed you were making a political speech, but may I say that all speeches made in here are always political speeches.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, then, the hon. member was making an electioneering speech, because when you are talking to equals you do not talk to them in that vein; it is when you are not talking to equals that you have to remind them that you are talking to them.

The Hon. Minister talks of "servant". I would like the hon. member to see that there is nothing derogatory in that; the hon. member is fond of saying "we are servants of the people". Now, he sees a vulgar connotation of the use of the word "servant".
4.15 p.m.

Why is it that there is something vulgar about this connotation now? The whole outlook of people who perform domestic service comes as a result of the feudalism of slavery. In any society where you find that they are passing legislation dealing with domestic servants, the economic position is still the same as it was about three hundred or four hundred years ago; it is a question of feudalism because of slavery. You would never have domestic servants if you did not have slaves; part and parcel of slavery is this matter of domestic service.

In Kenya you will have a big, hard-back man with a gown on and you call him a "Boy"; but you go to the United States of America which challenged the first idea of domestic service and you will see that a domestic servant is referred to as Mr. and Miss So and So. When Mr. Ralph Bunche is paying people who are performing a service, he is referring to Mr. and Mrs.; and in the United States of America if Mrs. Jones goes out to do domestic work, she does it as helping the employer and not as being subservient to him. She drives up in a Cadillac.

Do not let the hon. member ask us to pass a Bill exempting people who are living in a house. What has this got to do with living in a house? How many of these domestic servants live in a house or in houses within the context of living under the same roof as the employers? The employers build something attached to the garage or the toilet as some out-office, and the servants are living in this out-office or these out-offices. Sometimes these employees say that they like it in that way because they may have a girl friend or a boy friend - I do not intend to be vulgar, Sir - who may visit them, and they would not have to be breaking and entering the owner's premises. This friend would only be coming in to pay a legitimate visit.

What are the reasons why the Hon. Minister says that these people should be exempted from the fifty-two hours a week? These are people who, at any time that the employer wants them, can be called upon. How can the hon. member expect me to agree to exempt that sort of employee? You have an employee who comes from St. George or Christ Church; she accepts a job and is sleeping in, and you say that because she is sleeping in she is not entitled to the same hours and conditions of work as other employees? Who has advised the hon. member in this matter? Do you say that because a seaman sleeps abroad a ship he is not entitled to an eight-hour working day? Do you exempt him because he is living on a ship? He has the same conditions of employment and hours of work as persons who are working on land; and sometimes it is better for him in view of the nature of his employment.

The hon. member refers to these hard-working people. Well, I am going to make a little fun with the hon. member, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour. That Minister at the beginning of this Session introduced a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. He made that Bill Order No. 2 on the Order Paper, and that is the Bill with which we should be dealing now. That Bill is now made Order No. 7. In that Bill the hon. member, who is now talking about domestic servants for whom he is now pleading, exempts these people. They can be burnt and they get no compensation.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I appeal to the hon. member to repeat what he said just now.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is only an appeal.

Mr. WALCOTT: The reason why I would uphold the appeal is that you must not only let justice be done, but you must let it appear to be done. The hon. member is not listening to me. I thought the hon. member would have treated me with courtesy of listening to what I am saying.

I said that the hon. member introduced a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act and it was Order No. 2 on the Order Paper; now that Order has been relegated to Order No. 7. This Bill, with which we are now dealing, has superseded the Workmen's Compensation Bill. In that Bill domestic servants, for whom the hon. member is now pleading today, has been excluded; in that Bill a domestic servant may be working for an employer, she sustains injury and she does not get one penny.

Hon. M. E. COX: I think I am correct in saying that I informed the House that we have a comprehensive Workmen's Compensation Bill to be introduced in this House which will include domestic servants. The hon. member was responsible for such a Bill in 1953. But did he include these people? And he was the Labour representative!
4.25 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making the most bogus argument that we could ever hear; but when he comes to that Bill he will get all the blows he can take.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member was arguing.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member introduced a Bill which he says went to the Cabinet, and that they have the right to say what Government Business should be done. When I challenged the hon. member for not dealing with it, he said that they will do their business as they feel like doing it. Now he is going back to talk about 1953.

The hon. member never made one speech in this House on the Workmen's Compensation Bill, because we have not dealt with it yet. The closest the hon. member came to mentioning the Bill was on the one occasion when he said that they did not propose to go ahead with the Workmen's Compensation Bill; and while looking at me, and in one of his facetious remarks, said that he wanted to have some discussion with me. What I am saying is that if he is pleading for these people.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is right to say that he did tell the House that he has a comprehensive Bill to be brought at a later date.

Mr. WALCOTT: What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we did not ask the Government to bring down this nonsense. They have it on the Order Paper so it was to be discussed. In the Bill which the Government brought down, domestic servants were excluded. If you are pleading for the domestic servants, then you should have brought down the Workmen's Compensation Bill with domestic servants in it. The Minister was aware when he brought this Bill down that it did not include domestic servants; and from what has been said by me subsequently in the Press, this Bill would have been passed in its present form.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I think the hon. member is unfair in what he is saying. He knows that Mr. Matthews recommended in his Labour Code that domestic servants and agricultural workers be included for the first time in all these things; and he knows we have had discussions with them and they have accepted everything; but it is only a question of time in getting legislation down to the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says he has a Bill to bring down, but I am saying that the hon. member has already brought down a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act excluding domestic servants. That is a fact; that is not a hypothetical statement I am making about if and when you do this. Important as he had said it is, he has not thought it fit to bring the Workmen's Compensation Bill before the House in a comprehensive form to get something in which people....

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I object to that insinuation. The hon. member said that I have not thought it fit to bring the Bill. I have repeatedly told this House that the Bill is not finished being drafted yet. He does not represent people more than I do; I was representing workers before he was.

Mr. WALCOTT: You should be representing workers long before me because you were born before me. I am making the point that there is a Bill on the Order Paper and I can read it; I am not talking about a Bill which is to be drafted.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not before us today.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is before us in the context that the hon. member spoke about this Bill. I am making the statement that if you say this about these domestic servants, why is it that the Bill that is now before us does not include domestic servants; in the Workmen's Compensation Bill? When I asked the hon. member why they were not included, he asked in a *sotto voce* why I did not bring it down in 1953. Do you think that we are at the end of our stage of passing legislation? If so, we could close down the House of Assembly.

I am glad I am here, Mr. Speaker, to hear that they are bringing down this comprehensive Bill, but I should like to know why they brought down this nonsense. Who in his right senses would not agree to regulating hours for people who have to work, as well as stating the minimum conditions of employment. Whether or not you are sleeping in a man's house has absolutely nothing to do with if you should work eight hours. Why should a man who is living in his employer's house not work eight hours only? Why should he work ten or twelve hours, or why should he be exempted from this Bill? What is the valid reason for the hon. member saying that if a person lives in his employer's house he will exclude him? If you had brought this to the Trade Union and asked us, we would have pointed that out to you. From whom is the hon. member taking advice? He said that he was representing workers before me; lots of people have been living before me and representing workers before me, but they might not have represented them as well as I am doing. That is the only difference; and that is not your fault.

The hon. member has given no reason for excluding these people. All he said is that it would be difficult to administer. All this shows is that the hon. member is continuing discrimination because, only the very wealthy in this island can afford to have servants sleeping in. The average man who employs a servant does not have room enough for his family, so what are you talking about when you say you feel for these people? Who are the people in Barbados employing servants and demanding that they sleep in? The man working for \$200 or \$240 a month is himself a servant though not domestic, so where is he going to get all this house from with servant's quarters?

4.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill speaks about prescribing the hours of duty of domestic employees and provides that if a domestic employee so agrees, he may be employed for a period in excess of the prescribed hours of duty and shall be remunerated in respect of the hours overtime at a rate of pay not less than half as much again as the rate at which he is ordinarily remunerated. The Bill has prescribed no hours as to when an employee should begin and end work. Nobody knows when a servant has to start work in this Bill. You are telling some person the number of hours per day that the employee should work, and without the hours of commencement and the hour to end work being stipulated. The whole Bill is nonsense.

You are telling a man that a domestic servant's working week is not to be more than 52 hours actual work. But what is it based on? Nothing. Which Trade Union, which Socialist Government would pass a Bill in which you talked about hours of work and the hours are not stated? When you talk about hours of work, you have to stipulate the period. If you say that they must have an 8-hour day, the Bill must state that the hour of commencement should be not later than x hour and not after x hour.

I will read paragraph 7 of the Committee's Report. It is as follows:-

"There was much disparity in the hours of arrival at or departure from work which were submitted to the Committee. The hours of arrival ranged from 6.15 a.m. to 8.00 a.m. and those of departure from 5.00 p.m. to 9.00 p.m. The attention of the Committee was drawn to the fact that several members of a household including the husband and his wife, had to leave their homes to get to their work at or before 8 a.m. and this should be borne in mind in considering the hour of arrival at work. The Committee therefore recommends that the earliest hour for commencement of work should be 7.00 a.m. It regrets that unanimity has not been reached on the latest hour of cessation of work."

Although the Committee recommended the hours of work, the Bill has no provision for that. If you are now talking about actual hours, and that means the hours which you are at the disposal of your employer, and the period of commencement and cessation of work is not stipulated, you can be there up to midnight. If you are passing this because employers are exploiting domestics and the employers are rapacious, and there is no clause in this Bill to stipulate the hours of commencement and end of work -

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said something of rapacious employer. I presume that he inferred that I called them that. I said nothing like that.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the hon. member is objecting to the word "rapacious", I will withdraw it. I will say that the hon. member spoke lovingly of them.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said unscrupulous employers. That is different.

Mr. WALCOTT: Under the context of employers, when you say unscrupulous employers, unscrupulous can be placed in the same category as rapacious.

Hon. M. E. COX: "Rapacious" means greedy.

Mr. WALCOTT: And does "unscrupulous" mean that you give? Is the Hon. Minister saying that the difference between "rapacious" and "unscrupulous" in the context of describing employers means that one is greedy and the other would give? Sir, do you realise if you pass this Bill what it would mean? You will be assenting to something which will put domestic servants at the mercy of their employers. If they refuse to work according to the hours prescribed for them by their employer, their employer would say to them that the law stipulated that we must employ you for eight hours a day, therefore, you come in from four o'clock in the evening and work until twelve midnight. Sir, I would be in favour of your passing a Bill with any sensible hours of employment.

What is the earthly use of your stipulating that overtime should be paid for, at the rate of pay of not less than half as much again as the rate which he is remunerated, when you do not have a minimum wage for domestic employees?

4.45 p.m.

You have to state the hours. That is what this Bill will require. You should have a beginning hour; you should say that a domestic servant should not be in earlier than such and such a time, so that you will know the hour at which overtime pay will begin. Let me read from Mr. Matthew's Labour Code on this matter; this is what he says under the Head "Working Days, Hours of Work and Weekly Rest."

"Every day of the year except Sundays and Public Holidays shall be a working day."

You start off on the hypothesis that Sunday is not a working day, so that you may have the exception for days of employment. When he begins to describe this matter of the break in the working day, this is what he says:-

"Wherever the daily hours of work exceed six hours, the employer shall grant workers employed by him a break of not less than one hour in the middle of the working day, the said break not being included in the computation of the hours of actual work."

You have to prescribe the hours of work and say what they are; you cannot just say that a working day is eight hours and you do not say such and such are the periods in which the eight hours must come, it means that the eight hours may come in before six o'clock in the morning. You may have to call in a doctor in the night, and you may tell a domestic servant to come in at three o'clock; or you may tell her that you are coming in late tonight, so she may come in at 10 o'clock. You may tell her to come in at 8 o'clock and work until midnight or you may tell her to come in from eight o'clock and work until four o'clock. Those of us who deal with legislation know that you cannot pass anything like this because it has too many loopholes in it. How many inspectors have you got to see that the terms of this Bill will be carried out? You will have to say that a Sanitary Inspector, for the purpose of this Act, should be one of these inspectors! I give my advice to the Government on labour legislation without being paid one cent, while all I get from Government is abuse.

With regard to the other legislation, nobody can quarrel with it because we have given careful study to that legislation. We do not advise like how a Civil Servant would advise; we advise the Government in the interest of the community whom we serve. We object to the Minister bringing down a Bill like this, as in the case of the Workmen's Compensation Bill, without first having any consultation with us. We are the only accredited organisation representing workers, and in any labour legislation dealing with conditions of work we should be consulted - even if the Government does not agree with our point of view.

The most that hon. members should do is to ask that this Bill be made the subject of consideration by a Select

Committee so as to allow us to make our comments on it so that it may be put into shape. If you are passing something for the benefit of the community you should pass something which is proper. I believe in a forty-eight hour working week; I believe that any person should be able to have one rest day per week. This idea of giving one Sunday in every month is something which we came along and found; it has no relation to these days.

When some people talk about servants they are not domestic servants in truth and in fact. When you have a domestic servant, it is regarded as such in Barbadian parlance as that you have arrived at the state where you say to people: "I am at the stage where I should have somebody waiting on me." Some people still cannot pay anybody proper wages furthermore provide them with food; in the old days you had people carrying breakfast for policemen and they got a dumpling or something like that; they got a cut of coucou! (*Laughter*) You got payment in kind; and that is why you have this idea of feeding these people. The food is not a condition of employment, but here, with the domestic servants, the provision of food is a condition of service; because if you say "none of this food is for you", if you tell a servant that, you do not know what you are playing with. You will get a butt in your stomach, or you may get a butt in a different way!

We know who employs domestic servants. I believe that charity begins at home and I can say that I practise what I preach. I do not have any servant cooking for me alone; the servants eat the same thing I eat. I start off on the basis of equality.
4.55 p.m.

There are some employers in this island who, in giving somebody two weeks off with pay, work out their average pay on fifty weeks; and I understand that the Courts agree that they can work it that way. That is why we agreed with the two weeks on what the actual wage is; but if a man is getting \$10 a week and he is given two weeks off, his earnings should not be calculated on an average of fifty weeks.

Why should a domestic not get a rest period? Why should a Nurse get a rest period and why should a Police get a rest period? Why pass legislation in which you do not acknowledge weekly rest? Does the hon. member realise that ordinarily we ask industrial employers for a forty-eight hour week? Any other member can agree to this but not me. I believe that people regard me in these matters as knowing what I am talking about. I would not compromise our position in the Barbados Workers' Union with a Bill of this character where employers can hold on to the fact that I agreed in the House of Assembly to a fifty-two hour week, and asked them to agree to a forty-eight hour week stipulating the hours at which people should start to work and the point at which they should finish.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you have a Bill in which the hours are not stipulated, at what hour are these people going to begin? I have a maid who will not be affected by this legislation, because she gets half day on Fridays, half day on Sundays and one Sunday per month; but you are not passing legislation for me because when you add up the hours which she gets, it would not affect me personally. I would say to the Hon. Minister, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that he should carry this to a Select Committee and let the Committee go through some of the anomalies. Another thing is that you cannot have this Bill without wages being set out in it. This is what the Committee recommended: that the minimum rate of wages for qualified domestic service should be \$5 a week with meals and \$8 without meals. Why is it that two essential parts of the recommendations have been left out? I am sorry the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is not here today because I would put her on the spot. Under her chairmanship the Committee recommended a minimum wage; and now today you are going to pass a Bill with no wage set out in it; which means that all you are going to ask the House to pass is just a piece of paper saying that the hours of work can be hours all around the clock, and so long as you tell the person he is working eight hours, he has to work under those conditions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, why should we waste public servants' time by allowing them to draft something like this which means nothing? Does the hon. member not feel that he is wasting the time of the Attorney General who draws \$10,000 and the Solicitor General who draws \$8,000 when they sit down and put this foolishness on paper in this year of Grace, 1961? The hon. member knows that the Union has submitted to him what it feels should be a minimum wage for workers in Barbados. What can one say of a Bill like this? The hon. member set up a Committee seven years ago which recommended that you pay a minimum wage of \$5 a week, and now seven years after he cannot recommend this. Yet the hon. member want to tell me that he feels for these people. How can I sit down here and agree to the passing of this? On what are you going to pay overtime rates?

The Minister must not preach something which he does not want to practise. Do Ministers want to employ people and not give them a rest period? Do they feel that domestics should not have one day a week in a forty-eight hour period? I would agree to a forty-eight hour week for domestics, that is, eight hours for six days, and for anything over that you should pay overtime. Our recommendation would be that domestic servants should be employed on a forty-eight hour week basis with a rest period each day; you do not have to stipulate a Sunday. Sometimes they can get a Sunday, or you can work it to give them a Monday or a Tuesday like a Policeman. If you are having a forty-eight hour week, you should stipulate the hour at which work should begin and the hour at which it should stop. I have a maid who goes home like some civil servants; when I get home at 5.30 p.m., she has already gone because I do not have anything after that for her to do.
5.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, having this Bill as it is is no good to any person. Of course, we can pass it as it is, but we should pass something which is good for the people. I know that hon. members on the other side do not like Bills being sent to Select Committee. They are always afraid of Select Committees. Let me say that I am not asking that it be sent to any Select Committee to kill it. I believe that I know more on this subject than what the Hon. Minister of Labour knows about it. It is absolute nonsense when you are not going to stipulate the hours to begin and to finish work; and when you do not put in minimum wages from which you can calculate overtime.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, I could not agree more with the hon. senior member for St. Peter than when he proposed that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee. It is pre-eminently a measure which calls for the proper analytical picture which a proper Select Committee will give it.

When I first read this Bill I could not help feeling that, if it had not emanated from the Conservatives or the fertile brain of that community, it would still have had their blessing, because the last paragraph of the Bill reads as follows:

"This Bill does not apply to a domestic employee who lives on the premises of the dwelling-house at which he is employed."

Obviously, that is exempting a certain type of employer - the employer who is best positioned, an employer like the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the hon. junior member for St. James, or those employers who can provide living quarters for domestic servants. It is exempting those persons who are in the best position to pay adequate wages and provide the shortest working hours for their workers.

Sir, you will notice today that there is only one-third of the B.N.P., the local Tory Party, sitting in when a measure like this is on the Order Paper, and so highly placed on it. I am not counting my friend, the hon. junior member for St. James; I mean the members of the Conservative Party. Obviously, the reason why they are not here is because they do not have any objection to this Bill, and are quite happy for it to go on the Statute Book. They are the people who have in their luxurious homes, in their elaborate

mansions, servants' quarters; and they are the people who are entirely exempted from the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. For the benefit of the hon. member I have never been a Tory; nor have I any conference with any Tory other than with the hon. junior member for St. Lucy!

Mr. BRANCKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to refer to recent improvements in any buildings in any parish which the hon. member lives, or even to suggest in this Chamber that the hon. member was showing his own cheque book which was responsible for those superb renovations for that property in.....

Mr. SEARLES: I think that he would know more of the cheque book than I do.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What cheque book are you speaking on?

Mr. BRANCKER: Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, reference was made by the Hon. Leader of the House in opening this debate, to the Committee which was appointed in October 1954 which is almost seven years ago and which Committee reported in July 1955. That was the Committee to which the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was Chairman, and which was comprised of a fashionable leader of local welfare committees, Mrs. Florence Daysh; Mrs. Julian Mahon; Mrs. Emily Patrick; and also on that Committee there were a representative of the Workers' Union, Mrs. V. Lynch; the Organiser of the Housecraft Centre, Mrs. I. Alleyne; a representative of the Women's Club, Mrs. C. B. Stuart; and the Assistant Labour Commissioner, Mr. R. N. Jack. They reported as far back as 1955, which was the year before the last General Election; and now, for the first time, we are having legislation on this measure which by a mere coincidence happens to be the year of another General Election.

You will remember the terms of reference of that Committee. They were:-

"To enquire into the conditions of work of Domestic Servants in private residences, with particular reference to hours of work and weekly rest periods and to make such recommendations as they may think fit."

When I read this Bill and saw no mention of time of arrival, I said that such time should be set out in this Bill; and no domestic worker should be required to remain later than a certain hour. There are so many obvious omissions from this Bill that, unless it is referred to a Select Committee and that Committee makes drastic alterations, we would not be doing anything to make the domestic workers feel that they are getting something. In other words, this Bill is just a loose thing. The only thing about it is that it refers to the hours of duty which are to be an actual working week of 56 hours and a working day of not more than eight hours. And in respect of this 8-hour day, an employer who wants to make it difficult, can require an employee to come at eight o'clock in the morning and work until 12 o'clock and then go back home and come at six o'clock in the evening and work until 10 o'clock. That will be permissible under this Bill.

Among the recommendations of the Committee headed by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew made, it will be recalled, was that hours of commencement and of cessation of workers should be mutually arranged between employer and employee. So far as that recommendation is concerned, I do not think we will be acting in the interest of the workers to leave it to be a mutual arrangement between the employer and the worker. You will remember what the hon. senior member for St. Michael said on this Bill. He said that after the Committee reported, the Government decided not to proceed with any legislation; but, inasmuch as after five years very little or no improvement has been made, hence this particular Bill now before us.

5.15 p.m.

The hon. senior member for St. Michael was at pains to point out that, normally the Government would not have intervened; but now it is clear to the Government that intervention must take place, I submit that there is no point in having any lukewarm, timid sort of intervention such as this Bill proposes. There should be a proper and adequate intervention by means of absolutely fool-proof legislation defining not only the minimum working hours, but the earliest hour of arrival and the latest hour of departure.

This Bill refers to a daily break of not less than one hour. You will recall that the Committee headed by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, in respect of a daily rest break, recommended at least two hours including one of at least one hour's duration. The Committee also recommended that no continuous period of work should exceed four and a half hours, and that the breaks should be determined by the employer in consultation with the employee. In my submission, that has been ruled out now. It should no longer be left to the determination of the employer and the employee; it must be the employer and the representative of the Union to which the employee belongs, because that representative would have no fear when dealing with the employer and making him know what is what.

This Committee reported in July 1955, and since then little or no improvement has been made. The only way in which we will have any improvement is by strengthening legislation as a result of the putting together of the heads of various interests in the community with representatives of all parties in this Chamber, not only the hon. senior member for St. Peter, but the other representatives in the Union as well, in order to ensure that this Bill is put into shape. This Bill may be vote-catching, but it is of no real advantage to the worker. We are prone to say that so much legislation is passed in a particular year, and, in so far as this year is concerned, that this Bill has been duly passed; but when you ask what is the longest break which this legislation permits, the beginning hour of duty and the latest, one has to remain on duty, the answer would be that there is absolutely nothing about that in the Bill.

It has also been pointed out that this Bill does not provide, as in the case of Antigua, for domestic workers to be eligible for Workmen's Compensation. Unless this Bill is referred to a Select Committee it cannot be properly thrashed out. If we cannot get an assurance from the Hon. Minister, who is in charge of this Bill, that he will agree to refer this Bill to a Select Committee, it would be entirely immaterial in so far as the worker is concerned, whether or not this Bill is put on the Statute Book of this Island. If the hon. member has been told that you cannot put this or that in this Bill, that you cannot put in the earliest hour for the commencement of work or the latest hour for stopping work, it would be good to hear that in Select Committee. Of course, there is nothing wrong with the title of the Bill; but, apart from the title, there is very little worthwhile in the Bill.

Private Members' Bills have been quite recently referred to Select Committees, and it has been amazing to those who have been in this House for a long time, to see how promptly these Committees have met and reported. The longest period taken on a Bill is a fortnight. This Bill might be referred to a Select Committee with instruction to the Committee to report back to this Chamber within a maximum period of fourteen or twenty-one days at the outside. That is absolutely essential to make this Bill of any advantage to the domestic workers of this colony.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the manner in which this Bill was introduced seems to make out that there is only one section of the community which is employing domestic workers who are now to be known as domestic employees. There is much in the Bill to commend it, because I do believe that all workers, no matter in what category they may fall, should have their working hours controlled; however, in doing so we should look around and see what the reactions will be among sections of employers towards that. The hon. Introducer has said that there are

about 12,000 or 13,000 domestic employees; that is quite a large number.

As you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, almost every household in Barbados employs some form of domestic help; and those householders of the upper class can so arrange their help as to meet the requirements of this Bill. On the other hand, there are other sections of the community who have to be considered, and who must be considered. You have the school teacher, you have the policeman, you have the middle income civil servant and the clerks. Today domestic help is not only in respect of cooking or cleaning a house; it is also a matter of somebody looking after children, somebody who looks after the house. All these problems should be gone into; they cannot be covered in a Bill just like this. 5.25 p.m.

I agree with the two previous speakers that this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee. The Bill has its weaknesses; and I think more could be pointed out to that Select Committee comprising a large number of this House on being able to get evidence from the Labour Department; because, I am sure they may have a number of complaints down there that would be relevant to the working of a proper Bill.

So often it is thought that these Bills are brought in, especially in an election year, to appear to be getting at the wealthy class; it was introduced in tones amounting to that; but the wealthy class of this island can take care of itself. These people can employ another servant or so adjust the working hours that it would not be a burden on them; but the great number of employers of domestic help is, as I said, in the lower bracket. They will want to continue to employ domestic help, and for that reason their views should be considered.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, because of the high cost of living, many housewives have to leave home and go out to help their husbands make two ends meet, and there is not always a mother or an aunt to stay at home with the children, so they have to employ someone. That was not as pressing five years ago as it is today. Five years ago a lot of domestic help was not as good as it is today; since 1955 there has been a great exodus of both men and women to Great Britain, and the plight that existed in 1955 I am sure is not the same today. Unless an employer treats a domestic servant properly, he just cannot get one. The domestics regulate things today. I think that the Government in bringing this down, has not even taken into account the change of conditions in the last five years as a result of migration to Great Britain.

I know many householders who have been without help for months and months; and there are others who have help and who have had it for years and will continue to have it. It is a matter of how the servants are treated. Servants often make the demands today. They will tell the employer that they will come to work at 8 o'clock, and not before; and that they will want a day off each week; so the conditions that are being laid down here may be less than what some of them are already getting.

The other two speakers said that this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee, and I am going to move, (Hon. M. E. COX: Why don't you learn the Rules of the House?) I do not like to learn from somebody who does not know anything. (Hon. M. E. COX: I know them better than you.) — after the second reading that it be sent to a Select Committee. The hon. member is annoyed because every speaker so far has told him that he has brought in an election Bill, a Bill to try to fool the electorate because of his failing popularity; he is trying to regain something that is lost, but he cannot do it all of a sudden. I can see that he is worried, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This Bill, and the way it has been introduced, is not going to regain him his popularity. I will move at the proper time that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee whether or not he accepts it. I assure him that if it is sent to a Select Committee, we will produce a better Bill than this, because it is strange that five years have passed before any form of a Bill as a result of that Report could have come down. Why wait until this year? It is so obvious to everyone. We will take care of that in its right

place. I contend, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that conditions among the domestic help of this island is not nearly as bad as he pointed out; domestic helps today can take care of themselves by demanding from the employers better conditions of work and of pay. We who employ help know that only too well.

What I would like the Committee to go into most carefully is how this is going to affect the aged. Many of them have their relatives overseas, but they need to be taken care of; they are not enough public homes in Barbados to which we can send them; they have to be taken care of in their homes and somebody has to do the job; and taking care of the aged is an important matter. It is well that the Minister takes these notes. There are categories of old people who are in homes, or in a room, who need some form of attention; and since this also falls within the scope of domestic employees, and unless you want these old people to end their last days in misery or maybe before their time, you will not pass this Bill this way.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to support the principle of the Bill, but the Bill is far from being complete, concise, precise and comprehensive. 5.35 p.m.

I regard this Bill as an attempt — I would not say a vague attempt — to do something to assist domestic servants in the first place, by calling them domestic employees; and then, secondly, an attempt to improve their lot. This Bill is not sufficiently comprehensive, although it may be a genuine desire of the Government to assist domestics, having enquired into their plight since 1955. The Bill does not grant them the protection which they require. In the case of domestics who sleep on the premises, they do not fall under the provisions of this Bill, therefore, they are not protected. It is for that reason, without even going any further, that I agree that this Bill has not been thoroughly conceived. It should be sent to a Select Committee to be improved on, not to be killed, and brought back in a better shape, in a more comprehensive manner, and granting more protection and assistance to domestic workers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that I am qualified to some extent to speak on this matter because, it was in 1946 when I was associated with the Party which I was in at that time — the Congress Party — that I had occasion to go to the assistance of hotel workers. The constituency which I have the honour to represent is one in which there are large hotels and guest houses, and it is one of the best residential areas in the island. I came to the assistance of domestics even before I was in this House. I came to their assistance when people were afraid to be seen around with them; and by my instrumentation a better wage was granted them, generally speaking. The recommendations which are contained in the Bourne Report do not carry the conditions of domestics very much further than in 1946 when the Congress Party and myself intervened after the strike of Hotel Workers in that year. It culminated with the granting of a \$5.00 wage per week to domestic servants and accommodation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Sir, I was at the point when I was going back to 1946 when domestic servants were granted a wage — I would not say a minimum wage — of \$5.00 per week along with accommodation and better conditions. I said that to prove, to some extent, that the Report as submitted by the committee of which the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was Chairman — if I may call it the Bourne Report — did not carry the domestic servants very much further.

What is needed in this Bill is the incorporation of a minimum wage rate, whether it is \$6.00 per week or more; this Bill is empty, void and worthless without incorporating a minimum wage which the average domestic servant can demand. Unless you do that and let them know what they are entitled to, you will not be doing anything. You have to be specific and say that the minimum wage is so much, and that their working hours would begin from 7.30 a.m. or

whatever time it is and end at whatever time you fix it, with their working an eight-hour day. I would suggest for domestic work that the employees come in from 7.30 a.m. and work until 1.30 p.m. and then go home. They return at 4 p.m. and work until 6 p.m. If you leave that out of the Bill, as you have done, you will leave these domestics to the mercy of Tiberias — the employer, so to speak.

I overheard my colleague saying that this Bill will work a great hardship on the rank and file, and those people who employ domestics. I believe my colleague is willing to see something done for domestics but, in answer to my colleague, I would say that I agree generally speaking that the number of people who employ domestics within the last ten years has increased; in other words, by your putting Policemen, Postmen, Clerks and people like those in the category of the middle class, so to speak. Most of them now employ domestics, thus causing the number of domestic servants to be increased; I would not say that in your attempting to do something to protect domestics that you will be doing something to hurt the middle man.
5.45 p.m.

People in the lower brackets who employ domestic servants cannot afford to have these servants for any longer than a period of eight hours in the course of one day; I am referring to the rank and file, people who employ domestics. In the first place, you would have to feed that employee. The average person employs a domestic servant who gets to work about eight or eight thirty o'clock in the morning for the purpose of cleaning the premises and cooking one heavy meal, and by three thirty o'clock in the afternoon the work is all over.

What this Bill seeks to do is almost in existence already. I am not saying that the Bill is not desirable, but I am saying that it will not work any hardship on any middle class persons today, those persons who are in the lower brackets, because they cannot afford to have domestic help for longer than eight hours; there is not enough employment for these servants. But this Bill will affect certain categories of persons who go in for the entertainment of people; and in that case they will pay over time.

This is one of the platforms on which I stood throughout my political career, and I feel that I have done more than any of the Ministers in assisting domestic servants and hotel workers. Speaking for myself, I feel very happy that something is at last being done, whether it is just a gesture or an appearance of doing something; but I am glad to see that the plight of the domestic servants is at last engaging the attention of the Ministers, the Cabinet and the Government as a whole. It may be that the average domestic servant in 1961 has become more politically astute and is not the domestic servant of 1941 or 1942 who could not be seen around a polling booth. Today the domestic servants as a class are making their presence felt as a community and are demanding their rights. Although the Minister and the Government might feel that they are doing a lot for these domestic servants, they are certainly not doing as much as would be expected of them. The average domestic servant today expects to get a day in each week; they not only expect to get that day, but they demand it. This Bill says that if a domestic servant takes that day she will be fired, and therefore this Bill is not good enough.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but what he has said is misleading. This Bill does not say that these people will be prosecuted if they take that day.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, if we are going to interpret legislation then let us interpret it. What I have said is not expressly stated, but if we want to interpret legislation, I repeat, let us interpret it. I am saying that if a domestic servant attempts to take a day, she will be fired. Mr. Speaker, I will expose the Bill if they want that. Let us read Clause 4 of the Schedule. This is what it says:-

"In addition to the daily break referred to in paragraph three of this Schedule, the domestic employee shall be granted two rest periods, each of not less than twenty-four hours consecutive rest, in every month."

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. That means that the individual can have more.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that at this stage we are discussing the principle of the Bill and assenting to or disagreeing with it. Hon. members will have much time at another stage in which to dish out the merits of the particular Clauses. This is not the right occasion to argue on the details.

Mr. TALMA: I quite agree with Your Honour and I accept Your Honour's ruling, but if you had heard that the object of my speech is to support the proposed motion that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, you would grant me some latitude to show why the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. There are some glaring defects in this Bill, and unless I speak in this way and show them up, how can I show that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee?

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion for referring the Bill to a Select Committee cannot be made until the Second Reading of the Bill has been passed.
5.55 p.m.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the principle of the Bill as I have said already, but I feel the Bill in many respects does not go far enough. It is far from being comprehensive and certainly does not grant the protection to the class of domestic workers that it has the pretext or appears to help, in that there are no hours stipulated of duty and no time when they should depart from work. There is no minimum wage incorporated in the Bill to state what they are entitled to per week or per month; and even on the question of off days per week I am saying that that is far from satisfactory in that at the present time domestic servants are demanding at least one day in each week, and if you do not give them, they are taking it.

You should not come with a Bill like this which does not set out those things. This is just a harem-scarem piece of legislation; it is a veneer and a make-believe of helping domestic servants when in truth and in fact they are not being assisted. I helped them since 1946; and that is why I can represent them now and, if necessary, alone.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am never annoyed with my opponents politically if they are wise enough to seize an opportunity to bring something which, on the face of it, in their opinion, will give them support; and in their opinion will cut away support from other people. Sometimes these things boomerang.

Now to begin with I am saying that I will support the motion for sending the Bill to Select Committee. Those of us who support it going to Select Committee might be wasting time, but I shall try to be logical, without being unduly critical of anybody in this Bill, to show the wisdom of why it should go to Select Committee. You must enact legislation for the unscrupulous; you are never worried about those persons who have a human soul and know how to treat human beings. My remarks are not only directed to the fairly well-off but to those who are not so well-off. In all walks of life and in all shades of political and other opinion, you have unscrupulous people dealing with people who are beneath them socially, financially and economically, and therefore when the opportunity presents itself we must enact legislation for them.

There would be no point in my coming here and blowing my own trumpet, because my own actual success in dealing with people is in itself an indication of what my personal attitude towards domestics would be. I am one of the people who feel that, but for the grace of God, I or my children might have been relegated; and therefore whether in my home, whether in dealing with public matters, or whether it is advising my well-to-do friends, I have always adopted the attitude that if you are kind to people, then you will get the best out of them.

Mr. Speaker, there are some people in this country who are not at all considerate to domestic servants; on

the other hand, you cannot say that there are all people who employ domestic servants who are inconsiderate, but I think myself that in this election year - (Hon. D. D. GARNER: Everyday is an election day for you.) - with what I consider to be undue haste in bringing this Bill without having it properly prepared, you leave it open for the lawyers and for employers to drive a carriage and pair through it.

Now what is this Bill to do, according to the Objects and Reasons? "This Bill seeks to prescribe the hours of duty of domestic employees and provided that if a domestic employee so agrees, he may be employed for periods in excess of the prescribed hours of duty and shall be remunerated in respect of the hours overtime at a rate of pay not less than half as much again as the rate at which he is ordinarily remunerated." When I was a boy, Sir, the usage, customs and habits of the well-to-do was that they would take dinner at 7 o'clock. A domestic servant went to work at 7 o'clock in the morning and left at 9 o'clock for home at night.
6.05 p.m.

Very few people in this country, even those people who can afford to keep mansions and those whose incomes have been made larger by their ancestors leaving something for them, have changed their habits and conditions of eating; and you will find that they are living according to the times. I believe everyone of us in Barbados of African descent had a way of aping; and, as a matter of fact, we still do it; therefore that custom came down the line, and some of us who should know better still indulge in those habits. Therefore, it is not surprising that such a Bill should come before this Chamber. None of us in this 20th century moving among the people and realising how conditions have changed, can afford in public or private to say that domestics can live in conditions of employment as existed in the pre-war days, before 1914; and I know that even my colleagues, whom you say quite rightly are people with a conservative outlook and hardly would want to have a Bill of this nature passed into law would agree with me when I say that. I will only just ask you to examine the question of the various classes of people whom you have in this country and the various types of domestic servants.

Because of the number of classes and categories of domestic servants, I agree with the Government that you cannot insert a minimum wage rate. I do not see how that can be managed. You have various classes of people who employ domestics in this country. You start from the small School Teacher, the Clerk, the Policeman and people like them; and, as Your Honour knows, people usually pay their domestics according to their ability to pay. A tremendous number of people who keep domestics keep them as helps and can only pay them out of the salary which they get.

There are people in humble walks of life who have to employ domestics, and if you pass a Bill in here which has as its object the fixing of a minimum wage for domestics, I say that it would create a tremendous amount of hardships. I am also in a position to say that there are some people in this island who can pay \$16, \$8 and \$20 per week to their domestics. I wonder if hon. members of the Government know this. When I examine people who come before me, some of them say that they still get \$3.00 a week. When I hear that, I usually ask them who are their employers, and from the answer I get, I find that the person with whom she is working is only getting about \$80 a month.

This Bill in its Interpretation Clause speaks of a domestic employee, and it says clearly and distinctly that "domestic employee" means any person employed for reward for the purpose of performing household duties in a private dwelling house, but does not include any such person who lives on the premises on which the said dwelling house is situate. This is one of the reasons why this Bill should go to Select Committee. You must have some statistics to prove and satisfy the public of Barbados that there is such a small percentage of domestics who live on premises, that it does not matter whether you include them in this Bill or not. You cannot leave it to the whims and fancies of the employers to work such domestics as they like. It is my considered opinion however, that there is such an appre-

ciable number of employers who provide on their premises quarters for servants, that you are really not passing a Bill which can do justice to the majority of domestic servants.

But even if that was all and the Government could very well say: "here are our figures, they show that it is a small percentage who sleep on premises," let us take another thing. Can any Government be so serious as to come into this Chamber in this 20th Century, in this year of grace, 1961, and think it can hoodwink the people by saying that only those who work in private dwelling houses we are protecting by this Bill. We are not protecting those who work in hotels in St. James because they can work for \$40 a week. It also means that if I turn my place into a boarding house tomorrow morning that I can work domestics for 16 hours a day.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member was present when I was speaking on the Bill, he would have heard me say that as far as hotel and guest house workers were concerned, the Union / Catering Association had notified me that they are negotiating for better wages and conditions of work for these workers, and therefore, they are excluded from what I said.
6.15 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member for enlightening me as to what he has said. However, I do not accept that as any justifiable reason for excluding any domestic servants from this Bill. You have domestic workers in private houses, you have them working in cook shops, and they are not included in this Bill. You have these servants under the guise of shop girls and they are not included in this Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I am sure that they are covered under the Shops Act.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is not one domestic servant who is covered under the Shops Act. I am quite willing to sit down and let the hon. member bring the Act.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Act says anyone who works in or around a shop. (ASIDES).

Mr. MOTTLEY: You can grant the Labour Party an allowance and you can break the Shops Act. As I was saying, Sir, this is a very important point; when you come to the Clause which excludes certain domestic employees, the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill state this:-

"This Bill does not apply to a domestic employee who lives on the premises of the dwelling house at which he is employed."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Hon. Minister who is in charge of this Bill has really studied it. Anybody in this country who can afford to live in a house provided with quarters for a domestic servant, can work that servant for as long as he likes; but if you are a school teacher or a policeman who has not got quarters for a servant, this Bill applies to you. When you come to domestic servants, has the hon. member ever heard about baby-sitters, what you would call nurse maids? Do you mean that you can work them for twenty-four hours a day? They are asking us to pass legislation to penalise one section of the community and allow the very wealthy section of the community to get away; they are saying that all the big people who can afford places for servants to remain in and work, can work such servants for any number of hours which the employers like; but where people have not got any place for these domestic servants to remain in, they cannot do that.

The Hon. Minister has held this portfolio for sometime, and if he can rise on a point of order, he can tell me what the first part of Section 2 of this Bill means. This is what it says:-

" 'Domestic employee' means any person employed for reward for the purpose of performing household duties in a private dwelling house, but does not include any such person who lives on the premises on which the said dwelling house is situate."

What does that mean? I am drawing to the attention of this House something which will affect me. You can pass any legislation you like, but you cannot get my servants to leave me. (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member on the Government Bench seems to be in a very light-hearted mood, but that should not affect the hon. member who is speaking.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That does not affect me. I am asking the Minister to tell me something for statistics. Will he say how many domestic servants are so employed by persons who rooms on the premises in which these servants can live?

I was referring just now to baby-sitters or nurse maids who are domestics; I am saying that you have left the gate wide open so that these persons can be made to work for any number of hours. I do not believe that in this 20th century anybody could be so stupid as to think that you would afford to pass legislation of this nature.
6.25 p.m.

I will tell you something, Mr. Speaker. The truth is that with the exodus of people to the United Kingdom, now that the horse is out of the stable, you are now beginning to close the door. I am not now talking about the people who are looking for a job today; but the majority of good domestics are heading for London. In closing the door you are only saying let us penalise the lower middle-class fellow: the person who must go to work in the morning and might only be working for \$120 a month, rents a house with a small gate door at the side, but has to employ a domestic servant because both she and the husband work and there are two small children to be taken care of. There is not even a servant's latrine in the yard, far more a servant's room; and you are saying that is the man who cannot employ a person for more than eight hours a day; but not so with the Brydens, the Bowrings, the Goddards and the Mottleys. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: Are you in that group too?)

I have a house at which I have people on the premises, but this cannot affect me. (A VOICE: They are exploiters.) The hon. member should not make that assertion. If the hon. member lives to be as old as Methuselah he cannot treat people as I treat them; and who can stop that? Only God! So do not make those assertions. (A VOICE: Oh you can afford it.) Yes. Some people use their money in other directions, so if I choose to use my money in that direction, that is my business. Some people use their money among men.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage I think the hon. member need not bother about the asides which may engender too much energy. Let us confine the debate along the lines of the second reading motion, and I think we will do pretty well; but if we just stray to the personal, I think we might find things are not proceeding so well.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sometimes when they have Bills before the House and I offer my criticism and draw things to the attention of this House, as in the case of the Town and Country Planning Bill, I get no credit for it. They have amended that Bill, and it is really now working. I am too old to become a lawyer, but I have prospects of having one of my family so qualified.

I will tell you another thing, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is such that an employer can call on a domestic at any time to come and clean the house or the windows; and I defy any judge or anybody else when it is done as a job for \$40 to say anything about breaking the law. According to this, if I lived in a house which had no servant's quarters, I could get around this and call my servant at midnight or any other time. I do not believe the Minister of Agriculture has read this Bill. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: There is no slavery today.) All I am saying, Sir, is that you can run a horse and pair through this Bill, and I am suggesting that it should go to a Select Committee. Not one member, and least of all myself, would oppose this with the array of women behind me.

Mr. Speaker, for people who are inhuman and treat domestics as though they were not human beings, you ought to make legislation to make them treat their domestics well; but, unfortunately, some of the people whom the Government think they will get at through this are the last inasmuch as they treat domestics better than anybody else. If the Police or other Departments carry out this law, people who are closely allied to members of the Government, and some of those in Government, are going to be hauled before the Court, because you cannot prevent women from coming out and talking; and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph knows that well enough.

The Bill goes on to say that every employer shall keep a record of the hours of overtime worked by every domestic employee employed by him. I would like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to listen to me; it used to be said - I do not know if it is still so - that anything you write down can be used as evidence against you. Do you mean therefore that if an employer keep a record and it is wrong it can be used as evidence against him? I am addressing my remarks to this Chamber, but the only legal person I see in here at present is the Leader of the Opposition, and I am addressing these remarks to him.

The Hon. Minister said that domestics are so protected under the Shops' Act, but I contend that they are not protected. The hon. member says that the Union is bargaining for Hotel Workers, domestics and so on, and I feel confident that the hon. senior member for St. Peter will do his best in that direction; but I would like to ask the hon. member about nurse-maids because according to this definition, they are domestics. The Hon. Premier should be able to tell the Minister that these nurse-maids must live on the premises to attend to children, so I feel that their hours of work should be set out. As it stands now they can work any amount of hours because they actually live on the premises.
6.35 p.m.

This is not the type of legislation which you should run hastily and enact. What the hon. senior member for Christ Church said is true. Domestic servants today are demanding better wages, shorter hours of work, and so on. Every domestic today knows that she must get a day off per week. According to this Bill, there are a tremendous lot of people who will cause their domestics to work longer than what they call on them to do now. That is so because we have reached the stage in Barbados where you have people who, as soon as their children have grown up, fail to cook on Sunday at their homes, therefore, they go to a hotel for dinner and send their domestics off that day. There are some domestics who get every Sunday off.

I want to point out to the Hon. Minister that there is a high percentage of domestics in this island who are unmarried and who, because there are no other means of getting a livelihood, have a tremendous lot of illegitimate children. You are passing a Bill to say that any person hiring a domestic can only work them eight hours a day of actual work, and they must have a working week of not more than fifty-two hours actual work. What about a person who had a cook working with them for over ten years and has gone home? Is there anything for that person? What about a domestic being sick after being on the job? What are you doing for a domestic who has been working for two or three years with an employer?

The Committee recommended that every domestic servant after twelve months continuous service with the same employer should be eligible for fourteen days' sick leave with full pay in respect of any consecutive period of service of twelve months, subject to the production of a medical certificate. Let me tell you something. A decent person may, but according to this Bill do you think that everybody who employs a domestic servant and that servant gets sick would pay them? They will say that the Government has brought in a Bill to protect domestic employees and it does not say anything of giving you 14 days' sick leave.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: You cannot put that in here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Not only that, Sir, but a domestic came to me the other day and said that her mistress had one of those new model gas stoves; she was using a pressure cooker on it and it blew up on her. What about her benefitting under the Workmen's Compensation Act? Sir, I see some hon. members on the other side laughing. I am sorry that some of these domestic servants do not poison some of you who are responsible for this.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I see that the hon. member is in pain. He does not know what to say. I know that Your Honour would not have liked him to have said those words. Knowing the hon. member as I do, I know that he would like to try to edge out of this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is that a point of order?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am only asking the hon. member not to let the records remain like that. I do not think he meant that in good faith.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. senior member for the City say that he meant that?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member knows that I do not mean that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member have those words withdrawn?

Mr. MOTTLEY: What words?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member used the remarks that he is sorry that domestic servants, or some of them, would not poison some of them who are responsible for this Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, Your Honour,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It is so simple. I am only asking the hon. member if he thinks that he should withdraw those words. Those words are not against me; they are against the House, and I think the House would want them to be withdrawn. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you take something out of the context and put it as you do, should I withdraw it?

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not take anything out of the context. I put to the hon. member my best recollection of the words as they were said. He said that he is sorry that some of those domestic servants could not have some of those who were responsible for the Bill poisoned. In my opinion, that phrase is complete.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If Your Honour says that it is to be withdrawn, I will withdraw those remarks. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture took them out of the context. I referred to the fact of the absence of any provision in this Bill made for domestics receiving Workmen's Compensation as was recommended by the Committee. Then I went on to say what I came across a few weeks ago when a woman came to me and told me that a pressure cooker blew up and injured her. Then I went on to say that some of the domestic servants have a conscience. I am not saying that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture should have been poisoned for bringing the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said that some of the people who were responsible for bringing it should be poisoned.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, Sir, I withdraw those remarks. If I saw a domestic servant doing anything which would end the freedom of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, I would be the first person to protect him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why I am saying that this Bill should be sent to Select Committee is because the Bourne Committee dealt with hours of work, with sick leave with pay and with wages, although I do not agree with the wages part.
6.45 p.m.

Years ago when an employer had a coal stove and a domestic servant used wallaba wood, there was no chance of any injury being done to that domestic worker. However, today you have gas stoves, electric stoves, pressure cookers, and so on. Mr. Speaker, I received a telephone message one day to the effect that a stove had blown up, and fortunately for me nobody got hurt. My colleague has said that domestic servants were exploited and advantage was being taken of them for years. I quite agree with the hon. member that things were hard. Years ago they set up a Committee and that Committee recommended that every domestic servant should be eligible for fourteen days' sick leave with full pay in respect of any consecutive period of service of twelve months with the same employer, subject to the production of a medical certificate; whereas in the old days, the employer would say that that employee should go into the Almshouse. Why do they not bring down some legislation in that connection? But you have some people in respect of whom you would have to break off their hands in order to get them to give their servants three days' sick leave at home.

I am not speaking about maternity leave now; I am saying that there are some people, may be members of the Government, whose hands would have to be wrung off before they would give three days' leave to their servants. (A MEMBER: Call names.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member should refer to members of Parliament, nor should he be invited to name anybody. That sort of invitation should not be given. The moment that any such disclosure is made, this debate will take a turn which is not desirable. I ask the hon. member to try and ignore asides which may come from my left, except those of the hon. member who is in charge of the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if you lie with dogs you will get up with fleas.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is defensive talk.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Defensive talk what? I will not allow them to get away with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may tell the Hon. Minister of Communications that his asides are reaching me. I would like him to curb them, in volume, at any rate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Government is asking us to pass a Bill regulating the hours of work of domestic servants whereas these hours have not been stipulated. The Hon. Minister of Communications talks about my being on the defensive and I cannot help hearing these things. You are pressurising somebody to pass this Bill which deals with hours of work for seven days. I am not a lawyer; the Government has got the best legal brains. You are passing something dealing with hours of work but what about the conditions of work? I feel that if you work with somebody for a year and you are ill, you should be given sick leave. We are not afraid of any such legislation because we feel that if you work for somebody for a year you should get sick leave on the production of a Medical certificate. On the other hand, there are those of the Socialist outlook with whom people have worked for a period of three or four years, those people would become sick and you would have to wring off the hands of such employers in order for them to give their employees this sick leave. The hon. member seems to be getting worried.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I am not worried; I merely want the facts to be known.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, have I yet said that the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is worried? I was not referring to that Minister at all; I was referring to the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries. I am saying that if you have to regulate hours of work without stipulating what those hours are, what is wrong with stipulating the conditions of work?
6.55 p.m.

If you are going to regulate the hours of work, what is wrong with stipulating the conditions? You yourself set up a

Committee six years ago, did nothing about its recommendations, and now you come along and say it does not matter what the stupid Committee said. The Committee said that anybody who worked with a person for twelve months and became ill should have two weeks' pay; this Government says that is foolishness.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will remind the hon. member that there is a Rule which deals with tedious repetition. I am sure that the House including myself is very much impressed; in other words, we cannot hope ever to forget that the hon. member has made the point that sick leave allowances appearing in the Memorandum or Report does not appear in the provisions of this Bill. I am certain that has been repeated in my hearing often enough. I would ask the hon. member if he thinks he has given enough of that, and I think he has, to go on to some fresh new points which may also be very interesting.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I quite see that you feel it is a bit tedious. Now, Mr. Speaker, this Bill also deals with a daily break of not less than one hour. I heard that referred to by the hon. junior member for Christ Church. If the Government has not taken that part out because domestics demand such from their employers, I cannot see how you can come to the conclusion that the other parts recommended by the Committee are such nonsense that you need not put them in. The Government should be able to tell us tonight why they have not taken the most salient recommendations of the Committee they set up to go into this matter; and although it might be tedious, I do not agree with the hon. member who said that you could at this stage fix the actual wages. I see a difficulty there which you would create due to local conditions. I do not see any difficulty in Government making provision not only for people who cannot afford to have servants living in, but for all domestic servants.

I feel, Sir, that the Government should send this Bill to Select Committee because there are things in their recommendation which we should be able to go into; and then we could see what the true position is and produce a better Bill for the benefit of domestic servants generally - not only those who do not sleep in, but for nurse-maids, domestics, persons who work in cook shops and the like. We could also provide Workmen's Compensation, sick leave and sick pay for them if it went to Select Committee.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7.05 p.m., o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock, 7.05 p.m.

On resumption,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I see that there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will conclude by giving my reasons for asking that the Bill be sent to Select Committee. I think that the Bill should include all domestics and not only those who work in private dwelling houses. In view of the fact that the Government has set up a Committee to make recommendations, and that Committee met and made recommendations for sick leave, that is something which I strongly support and would wish to see in the Bill. I also feel that the Bill should be sent to Select Committee in view of the fact that the Bourne Committee did not consider that, with the new method adopted in cooking with the new type of household appliances and so on, we should support domestics getting compensation when they are injured according to the Workmen's Compensation Act. We feel that the Bill should be sent to Select Committee so that both sides of the House would be able to express their views on it.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for the City described the process under which this Bill has been brought before the House as a new system. No doubt, the hon. senior member for St. Michael who introduced the

Bill envisages that he will popularise himself with the voters of the municipality of Bridgetown and the constituency of St. Michael by bringing this Bill and therefore detracting from the present popularity of the hon. senior member for the City. The hon. senior member for the City by his speech seems to have taken fright, and did not have the courage of the hon. senior member for St. Peter whose interest in the workers of this Island is beyond dispute. It may be also that the hon. senior member for the City belongs to a party which is loosely described as the Conservative Party, and knowing the vituperations of the hon. senior member for St. Michael on a public platform, also took fright and did not express his disapproval of the Bill as the hon. senior member for St. Peter did.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member suggested that I took fright. I do not know why he should suggest that. I have been so accustomed to meeting them in public life that I do not see why I should take fright. I think the hon. member should be the last to say that I took fright. I said that I was not in favour of the Bill. I do not see how the Hon. Minister of Labour can frighten me.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I entirely agree with everything that was said by the hon. senior member for St. Peter on this Bill. The International Labour Office presented the Government with a report on proposals for a labour code as far back as 1956; the Hon. Minister of Labour himself stated that the Government intended to have taken steps five years ago; that they still have good intentions of introducing comprehensive labour legislation; why then should this particular measure be pitchforked particularly to the head of the Order Paper, even in front of the much wanted Workmen's Compensation Bill? Am I to assume that the motives behind the bringing in of this Bill are entirely lacking of sincerity? I would not say by whom.

As a person interested in labour legislation, I would go so far as to say that I am the only legal practitioner in the West Indies outside of three members of the Government Service - one in the employment of the Federal Government, one in the employment of the Jamaica Government and one in the employment of the Barbados Government - who took the time and trouble to specialise in this type of legislation. Without even such specialisation I do not think that it would take such acumen to see that this Bill is full of ill-considered trivialities. The background of this type of legislation is that in Barbados we have perhaps no less than 23,000 persons employed in the domestic service. It may be between the figures of 23,000 and 26,000. The latest census figures have not been made available to members of the public or even members of the House yet. We have in the island a total labour force of 125,000 people of working age. We have also 26,000 unemployed people and we have perhaps 26,000 working in agriculture; therefore, you will see that the domestic population in a small island like ours constitutes a good 20% of the working population of the island.

Now, Sir, it is notorious that by the very nature of the occupation, as you yourself would know, where you have a multiplicity of workers, a multiplicity of employers and a multiplicity of firms and institutions employing a certain type of labour, the organisation of that labour force into a Trade Union is an extremely difficult, if not an impossible task.

7.55 p.m.

It is for such a situation that any strong supporter of trade unionism would attempt the establishment of Wages Boards and Wages Councils. The very rationale of the existence of a Wages Council is that it is to provide for basic minimum conditions of employment and terms of employment for persons who are outside the Trade Union Organisation, and by the nature of whose calling such organisation would be precluded. When one begins to attack a particular industry of avenue of employment, apart from the general provisions of what is loosely described as the factories Acts and the Protection of Wages Acts, one always begins to ensure that there is a minimum remuneration paid to the people in that particular avenue of employment or industry

as the case may be. This Bill does not seek to protect domestic workers who are employed in hotels. Perhaps I should not call these employees domestic workers, because that is a contradiction in terms; but this Bill does not seek to protect maids, sweepers, bell boys or people who are working in the hotel industry.

One would have thought that the Government would have made some attempt to put the platform of assistance under the feet of those employers in the hotel industry, especially in the light of the enormous subventions, the financial assistance which the Government has been rendering through the Hotel Aids Bill directly and indirectly, directly by loans which they will have on mortgages, and indirectly by the increase in customs exemptions. One would have thought that the Government would have taken the opportunity, as has been so often done in the United Kingdom, to put in a condition in this legislation to the effect that basic wages should be paid of not less than so much and so much. However, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour has now excelled himself in his abysmal lack of appreciation of the finer intricacies of labour legislation; and it is apparent to me that the one person in Barbados employed by the Government who should have been in a position to assist them was not even consulted in the circumstances.

I happen to know about the particular gentleman's ability; and I doubt very much that the Learned Attorney General knew that he is an expert on the aspects of labour legislation and a specialist in industrial law. Having some grasp of the elementary principles of labour legislation, he could not have advised the Government to come down to the House with the nonsense which has been presented here.

The first point which I want to make is this: you would have expected from anyone who is not merely concerned with scoring a political point in electioneering, and who was sincerely distressed about sweating labour in the domestic service, that the first thing which he would have stipulated would have been a minimum wage. Let us accept that he did not consider it feasible, even after the Report submitted by the Committee which sat under the Chairmanship of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, to set up a Wages Council for domestic servants; that he considered it more politically spectacular and flamboyant to present a Bill on the floor of this House in which he would be established as the champion of the under-privileged domestic servants, belatedly, of Barbados. You would have thought that he would have put in the Bill a minimum wage before he even went on to consider the other matters of the Bill.

What is the point, if I may ask this question, of saying that an employer must pay an employee overtime when, in the first instance, the basic remuneration has not been expressed; neither has any provision been made for the setting up of machinery which would guarantee that basic wage which domestic servants are to be paid? No country in the world, that is to say, the civilised world, not the world known to the Government of Barbados, has tackled the question of domestic employment by making a frontal assault in this way; no country which is concerned about the living standards of the people creates an economic atmosphere wherein the level of wages and conditions of employment of domestic servants automatically adjust themselves. One of the most benighted areas in the British Commonwealth of Nations is the island of Bermuda which is some seven hundred miles off the eastern seaboard of the United States of America. There was no labour legislation at any time in Bermuda; if there is any legislation which may indirectly refer to labour it is repressive rather than being of a progressive nature.

8.05 p.m.

In Bermuda, Mr. Speaker, the domestic workers themselves because of the general economic atmosphere which prevails in that country lay down conditions of work which are more or less standard, but which do not emanate from group organisation; it is a standard between employer and employee throughout the island whereby they are much better off than the average key-scale worker in Barbados, the average Government employee in Barbados, or the average Civil Servant in the Long Grade of the Clerical Service.

The position in Bermuda today, Sir, is that you cannot get a domestic servant unless you are prepared to pay \$1.50 an hour which is \$10. U.S. currency per day for that domestic service. I invite the Minister to check those figures. Furthermore, since you are paying by the hour, it is immaterial to the employees at what hour they go to work; they decide what hour they are going to work and what hour they are going to stop working, because they work by the hour. That has not been super-imposed on the economic structure of Bermuda by any imperial edict coming from the Minister of Labour or anybody like that; that has come about because of the general economic well-being which persists in that island; so that a person compares what he or she could get in other avenues of employment with what a private employer is willing to offer, and lays down conditions which are not less favourable than those enjoyed by workers in other industries, enterprises and avenues of employment.

Mr. Speaker, this is just like the way in which the Government of Barbados is tackling the population problem by talking, concentrating and spending money on birth control; this is the same kind of approach that we find in the introduction of this legislation. As long as you have an industrial army of the unemployed of 28,000 people in Barbados, of which most of them are women, I do not care how omniscient the Minister of Labour or the Legislature may be in drafting legislation of this nature, I do not care how far-seeing and how infallible any Minister or Cabinet might be, it would be impossible to enforce or impose the sanctions of this Bill in the economic climate which prevails in Barbados. You are tackling the matter from the wrong end.

Now the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said that we all know the propensities of the Minister of Labour. If you say anything critical about the manner in which they have introduced this Bill or the motives behind it, any criticism is treated as an attack on the Minister's livelihood. Like all professional politicians they are very sensitive about criticism. It will be held out to the members of the general public that domestic employees will get a better break than they are getting now, but I think that we would be dishonest with ourselves and with the very domestic employees if we allowed the Minister to get away with this type of murder.

Having given the general background, I will now demonstrate what I meant when I said that the Bill was filled with ill-considered trivialities. In the Objects and Reasons it is stated that the Bill seeks to prescribe the hours of duty of domestic employees and provides that if a domestic employee so agrees, he may be employed for periods in excess of the prescribed hours of duty and shall be remunerated in respect of the hours of overtime at a rate of pay not less than half as much again as the rate at which he is ordinarily remunerated. Nowhere in the Bill nor in the Schedule attached to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, will you find the hours of duty prescribed.

Anyone who has read Sir Frank Tilleyard's well-known treatise on "The Worker and the State", anyone who has read Sir William Beveridge, anybody who has read Maurice Dobb on the "Economics of Labour" or even Sir Arnold Clarke, would realise that the one thing which is not prescribed in this Bill is the hours of duty. If you are in the Police Force as a citizen of Barbados your hours of duty are not four hours; your hours of duty are from 10 o'clock to 4 o'clock, or from 4 o'clock to 8 o'clock, from 8 o'clock to 10 o'clock, from 10 o'clock to 2 o'clock and so on as the case may be. You may be doing a two hour shift or a four hour shift depending on the nature of work you are doing.

If you go to work in any store in Broad Street, your employer tells you that your hours of duty are from 8 o'clock until 4 o'clock; your hours of duty are not eight hours and you can come to work when you like. The employee is not concerned in the first instance with the number of hours which he is working; that comes in after because, from using his hours of duty, he sees that he will be working an eight hour day. It is only now in the Twentieth Century that we are getting this emphasis on the length of period of work and that kind of thing; but your hours of duty represent the time when you start and the time when you

knock off; and there is not point in talking about overtime as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said unless you are going to prescribe the hours of duty.

During the 19th Century in the United Kingdom when the *laissez faire* economic theory was accepted by nearly all politicians, the Reformists, even the Liberal Reformists, did not seek to make a frontal assault on the very bad conditions which existed at that time with the Lancaster textiles mills and so on. The first bit of labour legislation they started with was the protection of women and young children; the reason being, that you had a general atmosphere of religious euphoria; and having this general Christian feeling in the country, you could always attack an employer by saying that he was very hard on children under the age of twelve, and that he should not have children under the age of twelve working later than 5 o'clock in the afternoon. What they did was to pass a Bill in the House of Commons saying that no child should be employed for longer than four and a half hours a day, and no woman should be employed for more than eight hours a day. In the case of the Lancaster cotton mills, most of the work was done by women and young children because they could pay less to the women, and because the women were better at the spinning of the wheels and combing of the textiles and so on. Having attacked the problem there, the factories had to close down as soon as the women knocked off from work, because there was no work to be fed to the men who did the heavier work such as driving the looms and so on.
8.15 p.m.

They prescribed the hours of work, and they started off by stating the time at which the work should commence and should finish; and it was also stipulated that there should be no night work for children and young women. That was the first important bit of labour legislation which was enacted in the 19th century. Here it is the Ministry of Labour is trying hard to get into the 18th century and he has not even got a toe-hold in the 19th century type of legislation!

The second thing which they tackled was the spread-over, and there is no spread-over in this Bill. You say that eight hours are the hours of work, but you do not say that you should not work before such and such an hour and after such and such a time; you have that prescribed for in the Shops' Act. What is the reason for the Shops' Act? The reason for the Shops' Closing Act is to protect the workers in shops, and we have had that Act on the Statute Book of Barbados for some considerable time, at least from 1945. Up to now, the principle behind labour legislation has not dawned on the Hon. Minister of Trade. The Shops' Act does not only say that you must employ shop assistants for eight hours a day, but it says that no shop in the urban area should be opened before the hour of so and so and after the hour of so and so on a late closing day; therefore, by that you protect the employees in shops within the urban area. Of course, up to now we have done nothing for employees in shops in the rural areas.

You limited the period in which shop assistants have to work; and, after that, labour councils came into being. The Union started off in this direction, but after it was found that there were so many classes of these workers and the financial status of the employers varied so that there was a large group of these employees who were outside of the Trade Union organisation but who had to be provided for, it was found to be an impossible task for the Union to undertake, and that is where labour councils came in; and those councils have held enquiries between the employers and employees and have established a minimum wage for shop assistants. This is a principle which probably should be borne in mind; the Crown Law Officers or someone in the drafting department should have a knowledge of labour legislation. Someone should be approaching this matter in a way to try and do something good, and do it in a constructive way, and not in a way that the legislation would be a laughing stock not only of those inside but those outside of the island.

This legislation starts off by saying that they are prescribing the hours of duty of domestic employees, and they prescribed in the schedule the maximum number of hours

during which a domestic worker may be employed without any kind of additional pay. As it stands now, if you are rich enough, you can work that person for 24 hours a day - until he drops dead - and there is nothing in this Bill to prevent that. Now, let us take the policeman who gets his breakfast brought from his home by a little girl. Can he afford to pay the girl for over eight hours work? You must also bear in mind that in Barbados, in many instances, the dividing line between a domestic servant and a reputed wife is very fine; so you will find that in Barbados there are more reputed wives and less domestic servants.

Now, there are two things which you protect in labour legislation. You protect sweated labour and underpayment. Sweated labour is when you make people work indefinitely, when you tax their physical resources. According to this Bill, you can work domestic employees for 24 hours a day. The next thing which you protect is their standard of living. Where is the provision in this Bill saying how much you must pay them? Let us say that there are 14,000 to 15,000 employers and some have two, some have three; some may have one domestic employee and some may have one working part time. When this Bill comes into operation, these employers can say to their employees that their basic wage from now is \$2.00 a week for an hour day. The mistress then turn to the employee and say to him that you know the master does not come in until 6 o'clock and we eat dinner at 7 o'clock, therefore, you can go off from 4 o'clock and I will pay you for working from 7 o'clock until 10 o'clock.

Sir, if you are going to legislate for workers to protect them from exploitation, let us try and make some kind of sense out of this Bill. There is no basic wage being provided for, therefore, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, because he is a captain of industry, can afford to pay his domestics \$20 dollars a week even though he has six of them. As a legal practitioner, I can only afford to pay \$10 a week and to two only. But another person, let us say a policeman, can only afford to pay \$2.00 a week to his domestic employee.

Now, if there is an emergency and that employee who is getting \$2.00 a week is called to work overtime, that is only six cents an hour at normal rate; therefore, you will pay nine cents an hour for overtime. What kind of nonsense is that? It is looking through the telescope at the wrong end. There is no protection at all here in this Bill for domestic servants. I doubt whether of the 15,000 employers in Barbados, 20 of them will need this Bill; but, of course, they will get a scare about it from the newspapers' headlines.
8.25 p.m.

With the economy under which we are now suffering under the Labour Government, everything is done in a sort of lackadaisical manner. Economic matters are approached in a sort of care-free manner; they talk about cricket; they have a cup of tea and so on. The domestic servant here talks with the domestic servant next door, and the servants will tell you that they are stepping down the road. Nowadays you are having a rate and the employers will have to stand over their servants with their whip and see that they get their pound of flesh out of them. Domestic employment is not the same kind of thing as the operation of a lever in a factory where, because of mass production methods, you operate in the factory and you dare not leave your work for a minute because the whole factory will be thrown out of gear. When you put in this period of eight hours for domestic servants, it means that sometimes you were doing something and for the rest of the time you were having a little cool breeze.

Most employers in Barbados are conscious of the fact that domestic servants are not paid on the same scale as people employed in industries. Employers here employ more servants than they actually need because they feel that they are preventing these people from prostitution and from suffering. That is what is happening in Barbados. (Mr. MOTTLEY: That is true. I did not know that you knew that so well.) Where do you think I was born? I was born in Barbados. Grannies who have been with families for forty fifty or sixty years, will bring along their nieces, and

when the neices have their babies, those babies become members of the households. If you bring down this legislation, by arithmetic of working hours, you may be doing a disservice to the very people whom you are seeking to protect. I am against sweating labour, but my quarrel with the Bill is that there is no protection for these servants.

Let us come now to the question of the spread-over hours. When the first Factory Acts, the Protection of Wages Acts and Young Persons Acts were enacted in England in the 19th century, there were eight principles set out; and hours of work was the first principle. You must not have children and young persons working at night and you cannot have children of a certain age working before a certain time of the day because they were the periods when the Methodists in the North of England would be wishing to provide education for the children. Therefore, the hours of work for children would be different from the hours of work for adults. The spread-over period would be the time within which a group of people were supposed to work. It would be legitimate for a factory to employ people from six o'clock in the morning until six o'clock in the afternoon, but the maximum number of hours of work would be no more than eight. It would therefore be seen that the spread-over period is defined when they prescribe hours of work and even in the spread-over period you prescribe the maximum number of hours which should be worked during that period. The reason for that is that in particular industries it would be difficult to say that every industry must start work at seven o'clock in the morning and work for exactly eight hours until three o'clock in the afternoon. You cannot say that every industry should be worked like that. The employers or entrepreneurs would be able to arrange the hours of work, but they would not be more than eight.

There is no spread-over period in this Bill, no time for starting work; there is no minimum age or minimum wage prescribed in this Bill, so that you can start off a fourteen-year old child to work at midnight and work it through until the morning in the preparation of everything - killing the chicken, cleaning the house, cleaning the yard and other things until eight o'clock. When an employer is ready to go to work in the morning, she can tell the servant: "You can go home and sleep and return tonight and put in your eight hours of work." Does the Minister feel that this matter has been given any mature consideration? 8.35 p.m.

Now does the Minister really think that we believe this matter has been given what the Premier himself is fond of saying, mature consideration? Has he heard of Sir Frank Tillyard or Sir William Beveridge, or has anybody read to him anything on labour legislation? Has he perused the Report of the Government of Barbados on proposals for a Labour Code drawn up by Mr. C. O. J. Matthews of the International Labour Organisation? Has he read the Geneva conventions on spread-over and things of that kind? It is not evidenced by the Bill if he has done so.

The Bill also in Clause 3 of the Schedule says that the employer shall grant the domestic employee employed by him a break of not less than one hour in every working day. Any such break shall not be included in the computation of the hours of actual work. The principle behind labour legislation is to protect the conditions of employment, not only the terms, but the conditions of employment of people who cannot be provided or catered for by Trade Union organisations because of the nature of the work, the multiplicity of establishments or variations in conditions and all those other factors which are almost impossible and difficult to measure and ascertain accurately. In this particular Clause of the Schedule something has been taken piecemeal out of the labour legislation, particularly out of the Factories and Shops Act, and inserted in the Schedule to this Bill, which is purely nonsensical.

Mr. Speaker, the idea behind stipulating that there should be at least one hour's break in a working day was the question of physical endurance; that a man should not be kept at a machine or doing one job for eight hours; because accidents are likely to occur when you have people driven to work the eight hours that they have prescribed

without making provision for an interruption in the maximum hours of work. You will find in any of the English legislation that not only do they prescribe the maximum number of hours which should be worked in any twenty-four hours and the spread-over, but they prescribe the maximum number of hours you should work before you get a break. According to the Geneva Convention, speaking purely from memory, four and a half hours is the maximum period which you can work before you get a break. Where is that in this Bill? Let us examine the Bill as it stands in relation to that particular Clause. You are supposed to grant a break of not less than one hour in every working day. I know what the Minister is applying here; he is applying the sort of thing that is done with Government servants when they go on pre-retirement; that is, you must return to work even if it is for one day. I have always considered that as being ridiculous because, sometimes a man may want to take his leave passage and go and spend the year in Europe, or travelling around the world; but because of this provision in the Government Service he must return here and work even if it is only for one day, and then he can go again and be a free man.

You must state the maximum number of hours the worker will be employed on the job continuously before he gets a break, because if you do not do that you are not doing anything. The purpose of the break in the spread-over period is to ensure that at a reasonable time the worker will have a certain amount of relaxation and be able to return to his job, quite apart from the considerations of taking breakfast or lunch and matters of that kind. During that period of time the worker should be free to leave the premises; but you can have this hour now, according to this Bill, right at the end of the day, because once you give an hour in twenty-four hours, it does not say when the hour is to be given.

There has been no public outcry by domestic servants. The one thing we have had which has not been acted upon is the Report by the Committee as set up by the same Government to make recommendations on domestic employment in Barbados five years ago; and we also had a Report by Mr. C. O. J. Matthews of the I.L.O. five years ago. Neither one of these has been acted on. We have the conventions of I.L.O. to which I understand we in Barbados are supposed to subscribe; none of these things is acted on; but an election is coming up, so he invests himself with the cloak of righteousness and says he is the only person in Barbados thinking about these poor, mute, dumb, underprivileged, exploited domestic servants, and he is going to introduce a Bill to put an end to the gloating capitalists like the members in the Minority Opposition. He means to stamp them out politically forever; but he is not hurting them; I refer to people like the hon. senior member for the City, the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. and gallant member for St. George.

There is no labour legislation that you can introduce in a place like Barbados that would hurt them. If you told them to pay \$100 a week they are not going to employ domestics at all; they would bring in labour saving machinery. There is nothing which says you are bound to employ domestic servants. Let us get down and tackle the real economic problem and take the women with the dung-baskets out of the fields and put them in factories. You will then be doing something. Take the women from blowing coal fires in anybody's house; make it difficult for me to find a domestic servant to employ; that is what I would like to see.

Mr. Speaker, you can judge the culture of a country by the respect you pay to your women. You will always have women with dung-baskets, and women heading canes during the crop, as long as you do not make any provision for them in industry, but continue to train them to be the hewers of wood and drawers of water, because everything the Minister thinks of is domestic.
8.45 p.m.

He says: "Oh, we have to send so many domestic workers to Canada!"; "The hotels have promised to take on a few more domestics!"; "We have a training centre for domestics." Let us hear something about the women

with dung baskets, heading out canes; let us hear when you are going to take them out of the fields; let us dignify them with the kind of labour which people in other countries enjoy. Of course, the only kind of people whom he is fooling is the people who do not think for themselves.

The greatest glory of my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. John, was on the occasion when he opened the Domestic Science Room in that parish. He took a pride in saying how much he bought the refrigerator for, and all that kind of thing.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to understand what is wrong about that. He is yet to do to people, and to endow them, with the outlook of that which I have done. There is no disgrace in honest labour.

Mr. BARROW: There is a glory in that type of labour which people do not want.

Hon. M. E. COX: You are a snob.

Mr. BARROW: You would like to see everybody in Barbados including the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, the General Secretary of the Trade Union, and even Your Honour, as domestic servants. He would like to see us coming to him for a chance to go to Canada as a domestic servant. I am against reducing all the people in Barbados to domestic servants. He is accusing me of being a snob.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just let us leave that out. Let us shift it from the personal emphasis. Let us get back to the requirements of the substance of this Bill which is before this House.

Mr. BARROW: All that I am saying is when you see ill-considered legislation of this nature brought in here, you can only come to the conclusion that the Minister of Trade has got domestic employment on his mind; that he is living in an atmosphere of domestic employment. Because of that, I cannot see any future for the people of Barbados. Bermuda is one of the worst places in the world sociologically, yet you do not have any labour legislation there. Because of the general economic atmosphere and well-being of the country, you will find that although there is no legislation for domestic servants, yet they enjoy a better standard of living than what obtains in Barbados generally. Some of them drive to work in their own cars.

As the hon. senior member for St. Peter said, when you talk about dignity of human labour, he knows about it; because he has been in the house of my family in New Jersey and he can tell you that the cook sits at the table and eats dinner with all of us. That is the standard of a country as such. You do not have to legislate people to do that kind of thing. The hon. senior member for the City can support me in that.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I should like to know from my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. John, if he is putting into practice what his father or father-in-law has done in New Jersey.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, that is not a point of order. However, you can come down at my home and eat with my cook.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. junior member for St. John to be able to continue without any interruption for the rest of his speech.

Mr. BARROW: Let him get up in St. John and ask that question. As far as I understand it, who a person eats and drinks with has nothing to do with the kind of work the other person does. I will draw a line against eating and drinking with the Minister of Trade, not the Minister of Education. It is a question of choosing your friends. I may not want to eat with the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You will not be able to eat with me because I do not eat!

Mr. BARROW: Let us stop being petty. Members on the other side feel that for you to be a socialist you must wear dirty clothes and walk about bare-footed and you must go and eat corned beef in a cook shop. That is not our conception of a socialist. We feel that these things will adjust themselves automatically.

Sir, I personally look to the day when it would be difficult for anyone in this House to find somebody to come and work in their house for even eight hours a day. It would mean that our standard of living has improved because of labour saving devices; and that there will be so much alternative employment in the community, the people will pick and choose whether they want to go and do domestic work. When you have improved the standard of living, you will get domestics thinking twice before going to do domestic work. That is what happens in America.

The people in the United Kingdom now have got to the stage where there is so much alternative employment that the back-breaking work of domestic employment is thought of as almost an anathema; therefore, they send here for the Minister of Labour and let him come and make a speech to make him feel important, and then let him get our people to do those low standard jobs. When are you going to aspire to a position where it would be normally difficult for us to get domestic servants? I am not interested in this kind of pettifogging Bill which the Minister has brought in here.
8.55 p.m.

In this twentieth century you come in here with this sort of legislation and you want us to believe that this is sincere legislation. The very workers for whom they want to legislate in this Bill are not provided for in the Workmen's Compensation Bill, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has already so rightly said. I have the Antigua amendment here with me, and I would be glad if the Hon. Minister would read it. I am prepared to allow any member of the Government to see this Act. When you have people like the Hon. Mr. V. C. Bird, who are interested in the workers, they get down to brass tacks.

I should like to ask how many times has money been thrown back into the laps of the insurance companies because people were not eligible for compensation under the Act. If there is one thing in which the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is consistent, it is the lack of analysis of what is the evil which we are trying to protect these people against, and how we can best set about doing that. There is no controversy in a place like Barbados about domestic servants; forward-thinking people do not think in terms of domestic servants at all. This is a kind of necessary evil, which, unfortunately, in a country like Barbados, many of us endure. This is something which both employers and employees have to endure, but the proper situation is one in which all that kind of drudgery will be eliminated altogether.

We are now in the twentieth century; we have machines which vie with people. Washing machines are now in evidence in almost every civilised country. We have to face up to the fact that we have to take these 23,000 people and lift them up and give them alternative employment. The country will be teeming with people and, in time, you will find it difficult to get a woman to come into your house and do a little cleaning for you; in order to do so, you will have to give these people all kinds of perquisites; you will have to give them good wages and short hours. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What kind of perquisites?) A trip to the "Drive-in" and all sorts of things.

When we come to the fourth Clause of the Schedule to the Bill, you will find that this is what is set out:-

"In addition to the daily break referred to in paragraph three of this Schedule, the domestic employees shall be granted two rest periods, each of not less than twenty-four hours consecutive rest, in every month."

You will give these employees two days off in every month, but they have to work for seven days a week. That

is what they call progressive legislation! I had one employee whom I dismissed and the Minister of Labour called him and asked him if he had got his week's pay. When that employee told the Minister that he had got six weeks, the Minister's countenance fell.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. That is a calculated lie.

Mr. BARROW: I object to that statement, Mr. Speaker. The name of the employee was Mr. George Bayley. I wrote out the hour of the day when the Minister called him and asked him if he had got his holidays with pay. When the employee told the Minister that he had got six weeks, the Minister's countenance fell.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. That is an unadulterated lie; I was not even the Minister of Labour. I know the hon. member well; he cannot speak the truth even by mistake. He is an inveterate liar.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Hon. M. E. COX: All right Sir, I withdraw it.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, that is the mark of a coward; he makes statements which he now has to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have both the statements and the denial; let us go forward now.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member thought that he would have been able to get up on a public platform and say that I dismissed a messenger; but I pay my messengers on a higher scale than that on which messengers in the Government Service are paid.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us go ahead with the Bill.

Mr. BARROW: This is the level of the hon. member's thinking. As I was saying, Sir, this paragraph in the Schedule of the Bill says that in addition to the daily break referred to in paragraph three of this Schedule, the domestic employee shall be granted two rest periods, each of not less than twenty-four hours consecutive rest, in every month. This is the year 1961. There is nothing in this Bill which says that a working week is three, five, six or seven days, but, by implication, since they have said that there are to be two rest periods a month, it means that a working week is to be seven days. I want to say that there are those domestic servants who get more than what is in this Bill, therefore there is less in this Clause than what some people are already getting.
9.05 p.m.

If the hon. member wants to do something, why does he not bring in legislation saying that no person in domestic employment shall be employed for more than six days a week, not more than eight hours a day and not after the hour of 6 o'clock in the afternoon or before 6 o'clock in the morning. He will find every single Clause of that set out in Sir Frank Tillyard's "The Worker and the State", one of the most elementary treatise on labour legislation.

If the Minister considers it such an important matter, he had it over the Christmas period to cogitate; he had the whole panoply of legal talent in the Attorney General's Office; he must have had access to the Public Library and to the Report produced by Mr. Matthews five years ago. Do you mean to say that not one single principle from any of these several sources has been sanctified in any of the Clauses in this Bill? Does he want us on this side of the House to consider that he is making something other than a political gesture? Does he want us to consider that he is really concerned about the conditions of employment of domestic servants in Barbados? What about the people who work in hotels in Barbados and do not even get food and have to work in and around the food all day long?

The most pathetic thing about all, this, Sir, is the fact that they see fit - and this is what I am saying it amounts

to - to include a provision that if you have somebody in a little shedroof attached to the fowl-house sleeping in at night, the provisions of this Bill does not apply to him; he could be sleeping on the floor next to the fowls with all the nimbles flying around him at night, it does not matter where he sleeps or how he sleeps so long as he is sleeping in, this Bill does not apply to him, and he by implication can be worked twenty-four hours a day. You can have a telephone from your room to your servant's room and come in drunk at night and say "James, come in and take off my shoes; draw the mustard and let me take a mustard bath!" Because you are sleeping in, he can do all that.

Sir, most of the married couples I know in Barbados who have young children prefer to have a servant sleeping in anyhow; and those are the people servants would have to work hardest at. If you want to protect sweated labour, you have to protect those poor young girls, some seventeen and some eighteen years and even fourteen years of age. Neither age nor wage has fallen under the considerations of this Bill, and I cannot get tired of saying that. You may have four or five children and employ a girl of fifteen, sixteen or seventeen years of age who is sleeping in, may be, on a few bags in the corner or in the fowl-house, but this Bill offers her no protection at all. Those are the very people who are in a position to be exploited, and you should say that when work is done, it is done.

To allow a worker to contract out of the minimum wage being paid to the worker is nonsense; she may be given \$2 a week, so overtime will be only six cents an hour; so you can contract out on the provisions of the Bill and have a spread-over period lasting twenty-four hours so long as you are paid time and a half. Sunday is not time and a half; and there is nothing saying that she should not be employed on Bankholidays.

Mr. Speaker, under the Shops Act, shops have to close on Bankholidays. Fortunately, today, in many respects a progressive minded people in Barbados are a few million light years ahead of the Labour Government; you cannot say a few steps, you have to think of astronomical figures. There are employers who give employees Bankholidays without legislation, half day on Saturdays; some give half day on Thursdays and all that. There are some who let their servants go into town and spend three or four hours shopping any day of the week they want; and that is why I say in many respects that even the most reactionary of employers are sometimes a few million light years ahead of the legislation which the hon. member is now seeking to introduce.

I do not know whether to call the hon. member a Don Quixote. Sancho Panza used to hold the donkey while Don Quixote used to fight with the windmills, believing that he was charging an army with his full armour; but nobody would wake him up out of his dreams to let him realise that he was not holding back the armies who used oppressed gentlemen as galley-slaves. All he was doing was charging a few blades of windmills. The Minister of Labour can be Don Quixote, and the Minister of Agriculture can be Sancho Panza, holding the bridle of the donkey; I would not go on to say that one was the donkey and the other was Sancho Panza but one can use one's imaginations sometimes!
9.15 p.m.

I will join with those hon. members who say that, if there is a case for legislating for domestic employees, then this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee; and when that Committee convenes, I hope that the grievances of the domestic servants - not imaginary grievances - would be gone into. As a matter of fact, I feel that even a fact-finding committee should be set up on that. The whole mistake of this Socialist Government is that it is geared to domestic labour. I say so because of the nine years which I have been in here off and on, the emphasis has always been on what we have done to train people to be domestic workers.

You cannot have workmen contracting out. In no social legislation you do not let the employer or employee contract

out. You cannot contract out under the Workmen's Compensation Act. The motive behind it is that you must save them from exploitation, because, they may go and contract out when you do not want them to work for too long hours. You cannot have it both ways.

Sir, I was thinking of referring to something which happened in another island but, as the matter is sub judice and as I happen to be in the awkward position of giving advice to a party in the dispute, I will refrain from talking of it. You say that you can contract out by going to the employer and saying that you will work overtime tonight. The employer on his part undertakes to pay time and a half, whatever that is, and that is left entirely to the employer. Now, there is a case where a worker says: "I have a dance to go to tonight and I am not working overtime." What is the position in a case like that? Nowhere in the Bill does it state that the employer cannot make the worker work overtime unless he wants to; and as a result of that, you will find it happening that a worker's refusal to work overtime can be a basis of grounds for dismissal. The whole dispute in Barbuda was because some workmen went to a political meeting and refused to work overtime.

There is no law in Barbados which prevents an employer from dismissing an employee who says that he is not going to work overtime even if you are going to pay him time and a half; therefore, are we protecting these poor, benighted, ill-treated, downtrodden people in the way we should? An employee has to work overtime because it is a question of the employer telling you that he wants you to work overtime; and so long as he pays you for the overtime, you can be dismissed.

When the Minister of Labour introduced this ill-considered legislation I heard that he fulminated against the employing classes. He is doing absolutely nothing to people like the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the hon. senior member for St. George, the hon. senior member for the City or the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. There is no kind of legislation which you can pass which they cannot comply with. I think hon. member have read recently in the newspapers that you can even have a magic eye to open the doors before you walk through, like what they have at Sandy Lane Hotel.

There is no law in the island to compel an employer to continue to employ people. An employer in Barbados does not even have to give the reason why he dismissed you. All he has to do is to comply with the Holidays with Pay Act by giving you the twenty-sixth part and telling you that he had decided to employ you no more. He can even tell you that he has no particular reason why he has done so, and that he just woke up and felt like employing people no more. There is nothing to prevent any merchant in Barbados from closing down his business tomorrow.
9.25 p.m.

Suppose you employ fifty people in a store in Broad Street; there is nothing to prevent a merchant from saying: "I am closing down my business, thank you for your service." *A fortiori*, when you get that kind of relationship between master and servant in industrial employment, even less do you need to maintain domestic employees if you do not want a bigger establishment. It is a matter of your personal convenience.

The bulk of employers of domestic labour in Barbados will not read this Bill. We do not have the machinery which there is in England, we do not have the machinery for legislation to be brought to the attention of the Electorate. We do not have the kind of competition in the national press which will ensure that every thinking member of the community knows from the newspaper the accurate details of a Bill of this nature. The majority of people in Barbados will not read this Bill and they will say that the Minister of Labour says that when we are ready to go to work is the time when you should come to work; and in that case you are keeping the house for us.

That is not an argument against the Bill. I am suggesting that very often we do a great deal of damage to the very people whom we want to protect when we do not approach the

job with sincerity, without canonising questions on all sides, investigating complaints and grievances, and letting public opinion play an important part in reflecting the measure which you propose to introduce.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make a few comments and get a few clarifications which the Minister will be able to give in his summarising address. It is quite evident that this Bill is quite far-reaching in its nature, even if you take the conservative figures which have been given by the Minister when he refers to about 12,000 and 13,000 domestic employees in Barbados. If the number of domestic servants are more than that, it means that the number of persons affected in households would be nearly 100,000. The question as to whether we will reach the day when we do not need domestic servants, is a bit of idealism for the future. We do hope that that day will come, but at the present time, there is need for legislation of this sort. The Schedule to this Bill has a Proviso in respect of overtime. I have a note here and I am wondering if Public Holidays will be considered as grounds for overtime as well.

There is apparently some concern about the social connotation which we will give to the terminology of domestic servants. The Minister was quite concerned about the connotation; and the only comment I would make on that matter is that the connotation has its effect in a particular society. If certain economic conditions are changed for a particular set of people, then the connotation has not got any adverse effect on them. I happen to read that in Hollywood domestic servants drive to work in Cadillacs; I have actually seen them driving in Buicks and Fords, and it is difficult to get these people. On the other hand, here in Barbados, you have a large number of persons doing domestic work and therefore you would need some legislation like this.

I would like to know if it is entirely the business of the Labour Department to see about the administration of this Bill, or if there is going to be some other department or machinery to which we would look to carry out the administration of this Bill. If we do not set out specifically and in particular terms, who are to be included in this Bill, then the matter of the administration of the Bill is going to be a very technical one.

There is a point which has been made by the hon. junior member for St. John and I am wondering if he could not be challenged on it. He said that there is a specific Clause in the Bill which says that you can dismiss a domestic servant if she refuses to work overtime, but there is no Clause which specifically protects a domestic servant from being dismissed. If there is a specific Clause like that, I am wondering how anyone could be dismissed justifiably, in view of the proviso which is here. In Clause 2 of the Schedule to the Bill there is a proviso which says this:-

"Provided that if the domestic employee so agrees, he may be employed for periods in excess of the prescribed hours, in which case he shall be remunerated in respect of the hours overtime so worked at a rate of pay not less than half as much as the rate at which he is ordinarily remunerated."

You do not reach the stage of working overtime if the employee does not agree. He may be employed for a period of time but what I am saying is that you do not reach the stage where.....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, I said that there is no Clause by implication, specifically or otherwise, which prevents an employer from dismissing an employee who refuses to work overtime. Furthermore, I said that it is a part of the common law and statute law of Barbados that you can dismiss an employee without even giving him any reason for so doing, whether it is a question of overtime or otherwise. I thought that I had made that point abundantly clear.
9.35 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: You are making a speech now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is speaking on a point of explanation at the request of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I beg your pardon, Sir; I cannot remember making a request of anybody.

Mr. BARROW: I am quoting now, Sir, from the *Industry and Labour*, Volume 24, No. 12 dated 15th December, 1960, published by the I.L.O. in Geneva.

Mr. SPEAKER: Why is the hon. member going to quote? All the hon. member has to do is what he has just done; that is, to explain to the hon. member for St. Joseph what he said before.

Mr. BARROW: He further invited me to clarify or recant or something like that; why it is I should make that statement; meaning that one would not normally expect such a provision to be under an Act of this kind. There are only three or four short lines, and I am sure the hon. member would be interested in hearing this. The lines are: "A final provision of the Act (The Payment of Wages Act, 1960, of Great Britain) is that an employed person may not be required by the terms or conditions of his employment or otherwise to make a request for his wage payments to be made in any of the ways authorised by the Act, or to refrain from cancelling a request made." In other words, a proviso like that makes it clear that a person cannot dismiss you under the conditions as put in the Act. His refusal to accept his payment, say, by cheque could not be made the occasion for dismissal. I cannot explain it any simpler.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, with all that, I think it still comes down to this: that it certainly would be pretty difficult for any employer to say that he is using the fact that the worker did not agree to work overtime as the grounds for dismissal. In other words, if the worker gets dismissed on another pretext, the underlying reason in the breast of the employer may be something that is hidden. People do not give you the true reason why they acted in certain ways. If this Bill says "provided the domestic servant so agrees", you cannot then specifically come and say that because he did not so agree you will dismiss him. You may dismiss the person feeling in your mind that you dismissed him because he did not work overtime, but you cannot state that because your case could not be upheld.

Sir, it is quite understandable when the Union gets conditions from management, that you will expect the conditions to be written in a way that it talks about the benefit of the employee; but when one is making legislation, one gets the impression that the legislation is actually coming from on top and covers everybody.

Clause 5 talks about any employer who fails to comply with the provisions of the Act. I do not know if there is the possibility of an employee failing to comply with the provisions of the Act, but certainly from the point of view of legislation it looks as if there is a law which could be broken by any number of persons not only on one side. I think the biggest difficulty about this Act is going to be the administration of it, but perhaps we can get some explanation on that.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to think that the Opposition which, I suspect, hopes at some future date - I do not know how far away - to capture the imagination of the people or the electorate of this colony, would have displayed such an irresponsible position in an act such as this this afternoon. I think there are times, Sir, when level-headed people will realise that they cannot always oppose everything that comes before them. I happened to be associated with a Party that is now defunct, and we practised those tactics and methods until the people of Barbados caught up with us. I predict that that is going to be the same case with this new Opposition. In fact, so many of the members of that defunct organisation are now members and co-leaders in this Party that they have passed on the legacy.

There are times when people must rise above what to them seems to be the other fellow getting through; I would not say "prejudice" because I do not believe there is any prejudice. In a matter like this every person in Barbados who knows the economic situation knows that there are domestic employees who would welcome a Bill of this na-

ture. There is a plantation not far from where I live in St. Philip, and I have looked through my window when the rain was pouring at 5.45 in the morning and seen two or three servants wending their way to work, because they had to make that specific hour. I can assure you, Sir, that whether or not the rain is falling, these people have to hustle and get to work at 5.45 a.m. and they never return home until after the family with whom they work have had their dinner.

I am saying, Sir, that hon. members over there know in their heart of hearts that that is so, and yet they get up and would like the people of this island to believe that we are so dishonest and so insincere that we are only doing something for electioneering purposes. You cannot fool the people all the time. The number of things we have done for the benefit of Barbados is too great; therefore, everything we do will be for electioneering purposes. We have a programme to carry out, and I would inform the hon. junior member for St. John that we are not Utopian; we have a solid work to do in Barbados. Why try to inflict us with insincerity and say this is vote catching?

Mr. Speaker, the Minister intended to bring this down for a long time. (Mr. WALCOTT: Who prevented him; you?) He said it on the floor of this House and if you look at the Debates you will see that he has said so. He has now brought it; but the timing of these things is left to the Government. You cannot tell me when to do my business; I have certain Bills to bring too, but you cannot tell me when to bring them; the people of this country has given us the right to do that, and you have not the right to do that, so you cannot tell us what to do.
9.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: When the hon. member says that we do not have the right, let me say that we have as much right as he has. The hon. member has only got the right because he was elected in here. The hon. member was over on this side and was giving the Government hell too.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw that word.

Mr. WALCOTT: I withdraw it, Sir.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am not a sort of weakling. I can stand here until morning and argue with you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to warn the Hon. Minister that he is not addressing the Chair.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member cannot scare me and I can go on arguing for weeks. Mr. Speaker, speaking on this issue, I wish to say that it is serious business. Some of the other things which the hon. members spoke on, I will not pay attention to them. This is a good Bill and the Opposition realises that it is a good Bill. They know the value of it, and that is why they have paid so much attention to it.

To hear the hon. junior member for St. John, you will believe that at long last, they want to bring in a Utopia in Barbados. He says: "Get away with this; get away with that; get away with people with dung baskets." He talks about that as if it were something to usher in with a magic wand.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Does the Hon. Minister rely on magic for his conduct of public affairs? The Hon. Minister said that I talked of doing this and that as if I could usher it in with a magic wand. I want to know if their policy is guided by magic - black magic or otherwise.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Perhaps, if he had anything to do it, he may usher it in with a magic wand. It is all right to fool people and put things in that manner. I want to assure the hon. member if he has forgotten that he is dealing with hard-headed Barbadian commonsense. The people will not believe that he is sincere when he says that sort of thing because it is absolutely impossible. It could not be done.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to get this clear. Is he saying that one cannot plan to

get Barbadian women out of the canefields and put them in more congenial living standards?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that in an economy like this, you cannot do away with these things overnight. Gradually, as we increase the standards of living, these things disappear. It just does not happen as the hon. member says. (*Loud Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that at this stage I should warn hon. members that their asides are too loud; and when they are so loud, they are liable to infuriate the hon. member on his feet. I will ask the hon. junior member for St. John to keep his asides under control.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am showing, or trying to show, this Hon. House that the bringing of this Bill is a sincere move on the part of the Government to do something which it has pledged to do for the workers of this colony. There are many things which we are trying to do. Let us say that up to now the British Government cannot do away with the miner; and if you pay me \$20 a day, you could not get me to work in a coal mine, but they still have people doing it.

I went as far as India and saw some ordinary people living in very deplorable conditions. Does the hon. member want me or anybody in Barbados to believe that he loves Barbadians better than those people who are leaders in their country love their people? Does he want me to believe that he is more kindhearted and more socialistic than the Indian Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, and all those other people who are fighting for their people?

Sir, we have legislation to bring down to this House which is going to stun hon. members on the other side. This is the beginning of their sorrows. When the other side is trying to give the lie to what we are doing, intelligent people in Barbados weigh these things. I will invite some of those hon. members on the other side to visit some gatherings like whist parties and listen to some of the people who are discussing politics, and they will see how intelligently they are discussing them. It is marvellous and it makes me feel proud to hear them. Sometimes the man in the street can teach you something. This sort of flamboyancy by the hon. junior member for St. John cannot appeal to that hard-headed Barbadian.

Mr. WALCOTT: You better wait until the next election and see what happens to you.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member says that I better wait until the next election and see what happens to me. He said in here that nobody could stop him from being a Federal Minister. He said that only God could stop him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to make two appeals, one to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I am asking him not to bother about the animation of the hon. member who is speaking; and secondly, I am asking the hon. member who is speaking not to be worried about the next general elections. I am trying to control the asides; I just want the hon. member who is speaking to control his direction to me. 9.55 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to make a speech so as to take away the Hon. Minister's reply, but when I sit here as a member of the Government Party and hear all of these conditions being put on the good intentions of this Bill, I must speak. No such motives are behind what we do for the people of this colony. We realise that we have to govern the people.

The question has been raised as to why do we not stipulate what the hours of work are. I have had a chat with a man who made certain enquiries of me as regards this Bill. He said that he employs three domestic servants; he does not allow each one of them to come in at six or seven o'clock, because all of them would have to go home at the end of the eight-hour period. He spreads out their hours; one servant comes in at seven o'clock, one comes in at eleven o'clock and the other comes in during the afternoon, but

they do not work for longer than eight hours. If we stipulate an hour in the Bill, that would not do the population any good. We may have to use stronger measures if this Bill does not work. I may say that this Bill is the thin edge of the wedge for the purpose of helping these domestic workers.

Everybody knows that certain wealthy people are snobbish; and certain middle-class people are snobbish too; they are more conceited, more exacting and domineering than those who have enjoyed these privileges for a long time. Joan is asked to stop in for a little longer and clean up the dishes because her mistress is going to have a cocktail party; but "No", she will say, "I have to work for eight hours. I have something to go home and do." Mr. Speaker, if you were to know the attitude of people — the whole thing has been transferred; people are dictating terms. People cannot get domestic work as they really want to get it. You have to be very careful with these domestic people today because they are calling the tune.

The hon. senior member for the City has put the Government's point of view. There are those domestic employees who get fairly good wages and, on the other hand, there are those who cannot demand a very high wage. Therefore, if we were to put in a minimum wage, we might be bringing down the wages of those who are fairly well paid. It is all very well to say things in theory, but in practice they do not always work. We are trying to curb people from believing that they can take human beings and make them do all sorts of things; we want to have harmonious relations existing among people.

We would like to do for our people what other people have done for theirs; and to make a good job with the material which we have. I would invite the hon. junior member for St. John to let us talk things over together in the interest of Barbadians. When we pass over these lovely gardens coming in from the West Indies and landing at Seawell, we must feel proud that we are Barbadians. When we go to the other West Indian Islands and we come back to Barbados, we feel that we are in a big-time country. We feel that we are in a small America. (*Laughter*) 10.05 p.m.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying that yesterday the Deputy Leader and I were coming through the Ministerial Building and he was approached by two people who read about this thing in the *Advocate*, and who wanted to know how soon it was going to become law. I make that point to show that there is a crying need for such legislation in Barbados. For instance, I did not know that there were still people who employed chauffeurs at \$10 a week. There are some people who have just come into their own, the newly rich as I call them, with no sense of propriety or sense of human dignity; and they would use people at will like machines; but this Bill will control some of them. This law is not intended for the kind-hearted householder who treats his servant as a human being; this will not have the slightest effect on him because the workers will continue to work twenty hours a day so long as he is kind. But this is for the unscrupulous who would suck their blood from their veins.

If you feel we are playing politics and not rectifying an evil, that is your business; but the people of Barbados will not feel so. There was this same difficulty when the Shops Act came about, but today some of the shopkeepers are glad we have redirected their lives and have saved some of them from getting flat feet. (Mr. WALCOTT: You opposed the Maude Bill. You did not want Adult Suffrage.) Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have told the hon. member before that when I am listening to him, I will stand up and talk to him for four hours; he can throw all he wants to throw, but he cannot put me off my stride; he is too small. As I said already, even the shopkeepers appreciated when we brought in the Shops Act, although some of them thought they would be losing business. It gave them better health and the business came in just the same. People realised that they had to go to the shop at a certain hour, and if they did not they would find the shop closed; and this saved the shopkeeper unnecessary hours along with his attendants.

I am not a businessman in here; I am here because of politics, and I am playing the game of politics just as you; and if I play my game and use my strategy well and it hurt, it does not mean that sincerity is not behind it. When one soldier goes to war against another country for something that has happened between the two of them, he uses strategy. Not one of them on the other side will vote against this Bill. (Mr. WALCOTT: I will vote against it.) I am not talking to the hon. member because he says only God would stop him from going to the Federal Parliament. Anybody who feels he is so omnipotent and can use an oracle, will tumble right down. The hon. member is not indispensable; and the people have so much commonsense that when they feel he has done his worst, that is the time he falls.

I think that in fairness to the Opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can realise how they feel because I was once associated with them; and the least they say on this the better it would be for them lest they be misunderstood. I know they dare not vote against a Bill of this nature; if they did, they would not be doing the people of Barbados any good. You may have your differences or dislikes against any of us over here, but you cannot vote against anything that comes here in the interest of the working class. As I said before, there is only one thing wrong; it is long overdue. This Bill should have been here long before.

I do not share the view that we should stipulate the hours; it is absolutely impossible. You just cannot inflict people, and you must still leave people to make their own terms in domestic employment. It is not industrial employment; it is domestic and the lady of the home may want to get up and make her tea and attend to the children, but she may want somebody to come in when she is ready to go off to work and spread the hours over until she comes home. We are not dictators.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The whole gravity of the hon. member's argument is legislation; this is legislation prescribing hours of work; so he is not leaving it to anybody's will.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, all the points he has just raised is that we have an eight hour day which is stipulated, and it is left for the

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The eight hours is not stipulated. Any part of the day can be eight hours from this; but we said it should be stipulated. Any part of the day can be eight hours; it could be from midnight until morning, but the gravity of the Government's argument is that they are leaving it to the people's will.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, the people will decide themselves what part of the day they want their domestics to work and give the conditions. It is not for us to fix legislation affecting a home; that would be part of slavery. 10.15 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Is the hon. member saying that to prescribe the hours would be a part of slavery?

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sir, let me draw an analogy. I am a domestic servant and you want me to work with you. You say to me: "instead of coming in at 6 o'clock, I would like you to come in at 8 o'clock because it is my habit to wake up and make my own breakfast. I want you to come in at 8 o'clock and take care of the home when I am out." Sir, if we prescribe the hours, we would be interfering with the contracting parties. What we are saying is that you must not work your domestic more than eight hours.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be associated with a Government which has been so mindful of those domestic employees who have been working in drudgery all these years. In spite of what may be said by those people who may not like this Bill, or those who speak against it perhaps because

of prejudice, they will find to their sorrow that this Bill is an act of humanity. This is relieving people of certain conditions with which they were not able to cope; this is true and proper representation. Domestic servants cannot speak for themselves because they want the little pittance. Today, we are bringing in legislation for them and even though the conscience of some employers may have changed, more will be changed because they may fear the law. All of what went on before would have to be revised because of this enactment. We are not so unmindful of what happens to human nature and human consciences. We are sure that what we have done here in the first place for domestic employees is a good thing and is going to bear good fruit.

Hon. M. E. COX rose to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must be absolutely sure that every member has the opportunity to speak before you reply. When I am sure that every hon. member has the opportunity to speak on this measure, well then, the Minister can reply. Are there any other hon. members who desire to speak before the Hon. Minister replies? (After a pause).

I am of the opinion that no hon. member desires to speak on this question. The Hon. Minister can reply.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief in replying to some of the remarks made by some hon. members. I think that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has no doubt answered to some extent some of the points which were raised by the Opposition. I think I will deal with what the hon. junior member for St. John said, first.

Everybody, no doubt, knows that he is one of the members of the legal profession; and, of course, those who do not know him as well as I do, may be inclined to the view that his words are not only words of wisdom but words of truth. The hon. member talks about an employer who, is now employing three domestic servants, if this Bill comes into force, will have to get rid of two and keep one; and then he will have to use the whip to see that these people do some work. That gives us the feeling the hon. member knows, perhaps from his experience, that these people do not work faithfully for the money which they get. That, no doubt, brings us back to slavery.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Michael will make mistakes in quoting. It is certainly out of the bounds of legitimate debate when, deliberately, the hon. member says things which I have not said. During the course of my remarks, I merely pointed out some of the evils which are attendant even without the passing of the Bill. I said that there was nothing to prevent an employer from dismissing an employee without giving reasons at all. Then I went on to say that if this Bill is passed, an employer may decide if employing three people, that he will now employ two; and I went on to say that there is a type of employer who will feel that he will have to crack his whip. I was speaking metaphorically. I hope the Hon. Minister will refrain from misquoting what I said.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am quoting the hon. member correctly. He said that you will have to get over them with a whip.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I said that there is a type of employer who may feel he may have to get over them with a whip.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, no doubt the hon. member has in mind what I had in mind when I was referring to those slave days. I know that there are some like him who believe that these workers are inferior to them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would be grateful if the Hon. Minister would refrain from using the words, "like him".

Mr. BARROW: I rise on a point of order. I would never accuse the Hon. Minister of having an inferiority complex. He is just plainly inferior to me. Nobody in Barbados knowing me would say that I believe a worker is inferior to me; but I know that the hon. member is inferior to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John said that he would never accuse the Minister of having an inferiority complex, but that he is just plainly inferior to him. That is a personal reflection on the hon. member. 10.25 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I am merely pointing out what the hon. member introduces in the debate when he says, "They are people like him."

Mr. SPEAKER: I am speaking. Will the hon. member be quiet? If the hon. member was listening to me, he would have heard me ask the Hon. Minister to leave out the words "like him". When the hon. member says that the Hon. Minister does not suffer from inferiority complex but that he is plain inferior, that is a personal reflection on the Hon. Minister. Two wrongs never make a right.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not worried about what the hon. member says; he cannot help for being nasty.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave out the hon. member.

Hon. M. E. COX: During the consideration of the Estimates last year, when the Hon. Premier mentioned that there was a faint possibility of domestics going to Germany, the hon. member in reply to the Premier, said that domestic servants will always be second-class citizens.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. If the hon. member is going to quote from a debate in which I made a statement, I would like him to quote at least six lines of the debate. The hon. member cannot say that a person said such and such a thing during the course of a debate; let the hon. member give chapter and verse for what he is saying just as I would do.

Hon. M. E. COX: I took particular pains to write down every word the hon. member said.

Mr. BARROW: I would not call the hon. member an unmitigated liar; I would ask him to quote the debate. We now have before us the report of the debates which took place in this House last week; that is a very refreshing feature, and I must congratulate the Clerk and everybody concerned in this matter. The debates of last year must have been circulated by now.

Hon. M. E. COX: I repeat that during the consideration of the Estimates last year, when the Hon. Premier said what he said, the hon. member replied that domestic servants will always be second-class citizens.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member could not have said that in this world.

Hon. M. E. COX: As regards this Bill, the hon. senior member for St. Peter is worried because the Bill was not referred to him.

Mr. WALCOTT: I never worry. I said that, in connection with Labour legislation, the normal practice is that such legislation is referred to the Trade Union whose comments on it are asked for.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will repeat what I said. Throughout the hon. member's speech, every now and then he referred to the fact that this Bill was not submitted to the Trade Union which is the only workers' Organisation in Barbados. The hon. member refers to the fact that this Bill has not been sent to him; in that connection, all I want to say is that he knows, as well as I do, that the Union does not represent these workers.

Mr. WALCOTT: We do not represent everybody who gets holidays with pay, and why did they send legislation dealing with holidays with pay to us? Why did they send the Labour Code to us? They sent those and other Measures to us and asked us for our comments on them.

Hon. M. E. COX: Just because this Bill was not sent to him, he opposes it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Only a man who is not emancipated from a low level would say that. I say that the practice is to submit labour legislation to the Union for the Union's comments.

Hon. M. E. COX: One of the things complained of is that the hours of work have not been set out in this Bill. I think that that point has been quite effectively answered by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I have legislation which is existing in some parts of the West Indies and, in that legislation, all that is prescribed is that the period of a week shall be considered as beginning on Monday and ending on Sunday afternoon. The hours of work do not exceed ten in the day; breaks of two hours are allowed, and they include one hour for meals. It does not say that an employee should work from one, two or three o'clock. As the Hon. Minister of Agriculture quite rightly puts it, there are employers and employees who have different arrangements for work, and therefore you do not want to pin down anybody to anything. 10.35 p.m.

As far as the hours of starting and ending work are concerned, that is better left to the two contracting parties rather than to pass legislation since it is domestic. It is not like opening a foundry or factory door; therefore, there is no reason why the hours should be fixed.

As far as the minimum wage is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I think that ever since in 1955, and even before that - when the hon. senior member for St. Peter was a member of the Government and wholly responsible for matters of labour; and whose advice was always accepted by the Leader of the House at the time who afterwards became Premier and now Prime Minister of the West Indies - it was agreed that the Minimum Wage Act should be repealed and be substituted by a Wages Council Act. We found that in prescribing the minimum wage, the minimum for the most part became the maximum; and, therefore, we decided to abolish that Act and to establish in its place the Wages Council Act, in which case you would set up your Council to deal with the various groups or sections of labour if there was no organisation existing on behalf of that group to regulate their wages. That is what obtains today. Are you telling me now that we must go back from whence we came years ago?

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation; it is legislation which obtains in England and in many parts of the world today. Are you telling me that we must go back to the days of minimum wage instead of having a Wages Council?

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not ask the hon. member anything. What was told to the hon. member is that the Government set up a Committee which recommended a minimum wage for these people but there is nothing like that in the Bill; so what the hon. member says is not valid.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member went a little further and said that he had already drawn to the Minister's attention that there should be a minimum wage for everybody.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I said that there should be a minimum wage for everybody as there is in the United States of America where the minimum wage is \$1.25 an hour. In reply to that, the hon. member said that he would prefer to have that negotiated. Can you negotiate for domestic servants? Who will negotiate for them?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is admitting that his organisation is not as potent as it should be.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. There is no organisation in the world that represents, as he said, something between master and servant. The Government does not find itself in a position to prescribe an hour, but say that wages should be negotiated!

Hon. M. E. COX: I take it that the hon. member is asking the Government to bring in legislation for the purpose of establishing a minimum wage for every group in this island.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Not every group. I said there should be a minimum wage for everybody. There is a national minimum wage in the United States of America for which the Trade Union does not have to negotiate; and nobody in the United States of America can employ a person for less than that. There are fifteen million workers there.

Hon. M. E. COX: At one time the hon. member tells you that the Government must have nothing to do with these people because the Union is there to do that, and at another moment, in the same breath, he tells you that the Government should bring in legislation to provide a minimum wage for everybody.

Mr. WALCOTT: I must rise on a point of order. I have a letter in my pocket which the hon. member wrote some time ago. The hon. member is making a statement in relation to a letter he received from the Union in which they want to set up a Wages Council in the catering industry, and the Union stated in the letter that it did not agree to setting up a Wages Council because that is a group which is negotiable; but in another paragraph it stated that we are in favour of having a national minimum wage as a floor for all workers in Barbados so that a person would not work for less than a certain amount. That would be applicable to Tom, Dick and Harry; and nobody would be able to pay less than that, just as we say the hours of work should be prescribed.

Hon. M. E. COX: I appeal to Your Honour. When the hon. member was speaking I did not interrupt him, but he is interrupting me every time I make a point.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. If the hon. member says I am interrupting him, I must say that when he uses my name in the debate saying that I said something, I have the right to clear up what he purports to say I have said.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am going to say more now. As far as these hotel workers are concerned, the hon. member has just referred to a letter which he wrote to the Ministry. (Mr. WALCOTT: I replied to the Ministry.) The hon. member wrote the Ministry to the effect that the Hotel Caterers Association had reached an agreement that the workers instead of working forty-four hours a week as prescribed.....

Mr. WALCOTT: That is a lie.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not yet finished.

Hon. M. E. COX: Instead of working forty-four hours a week as prescribed in the Shops Act.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member repeat that?

Hon. M. E. COX: As a matter of fact, in addition to the letter, a delegation headed by his Assistant Secretary came to the Ministry and discussed it with representatives of the same Hotel Association; and they told us that they had reached an agreement that the workers would work forty-eight hours instead of forty-four hours as prescribed in the law; that the additional four hours would be at the normal pay, and that over and above the forty-eight hours the employer would pay time and a half.
10.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, can I rise on a point of order? The Union did not write the Ministry that letter. What the Union found out was that we were negotiating that for the last ten years, since the Shops' Act was passed, and the Ministry of Labour never knew that there was such a law applying to Barbados; and the hotels in Barbados not knowing that it was there, were working people all these kind of hours - 80 hours a week. When the Union started to negotiate with the people concerned, the Union negotiated on the basis of a 42-hour week. When the employers wanted the employees to accept a 54-hour week and the employees refused to accept it, the matter was then referred to the Labour Department stating that a dispute had arisen. When we got there, we found that there was this Act on the Statute Book which stated that these hotels should be closed like a

shop, but the hotels did not appear to know of it neither were these hotels inspected.

Since the Union was operating on the basis that a hotel was not a shop, our position was that when you establish a hotel, it should operate on the basis of a 48-hour week. In so far as overtime was concerned, we had a private arrangement stating that we should work six hours overtime at normal pay and above that at double pay. Do not say that the Union had a 42-hour week. When we were disputing the question of the 66-hour week, we said that we would write the Ministry of Labour. We wrote and the Minister has not replied to the Union one way or the other. That is why I say that I would not meet with the Minister any more. The Minister of Labour will have his own meeting by himself.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member, on the one hand, while arranging for a 44-hour week for one category of workers, was arranging for a 48-hour week for another category of workers, and that is the case of the different set of circumstances. That is all that I am trying to bring out. He knows what I am saying is true. You took them out of the Act yourself in order to allow them to work 48 hours.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you will remember, it was said that the only basis on which you could work this thing was with a joint statement coming to the Ministry from both parties, and for an agreement to be reached on 48 hours because the law said 42 hours. It was stated that we could not make an agreement to break the law.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is exactly what we said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Minister carries on, I would just like to tell him that so much of that is of private interest, I do not think it should be aired on the floor of the house.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I have a right to reply on behalf of the Government; and more so when the matter comes under my head. I was merely pointing to the fact that there was an agreement reached by the Union; they agreed to it and they asked the Government to put it into legislation for them because the hours were 44. They fell under the Act. If they were violating the Act, that was no fault of mine. They have asked us now to exclude them from the provisions of this Section so that they can bring in 48 hours to be paid at normal rates, and what is over that to be paid at time and a half. That is done because the hotel business is different from that of a foundry or a store in Broad Street. Similarly, is the case with the domestic employees.

Tomorrow, I will check whether the Union did say anything as regards the time which the individual should be on the job and when the individual should leave the job.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I just rise on a point of explanation. We have fixed the hours of coming in and the hours of leaving. We were not asking him to fix the hour in which the people operate; we said that the time between which the people should operate was from 6 o'clock in the morning to 6 o'clock in the evening; after that you could not work them any more. That is why I say as regards this Bill that you should come in from 7 o'clock to 7 o'clock. You should not make it any earlier than that.

Hon. M. E. COX: However, Sir, that is something to which we have given serious consideration; and it is Government's view that it is not practicable. It is not good business to fix the hour of arrival at work in this Bill or the hour of cessation of work.

Everybody knows that if you fix a minimum wage, you will have a minimum wage to which everybody will fall in line. You have to bear in mind the people of the low income group. If you fix it, what would your minimum be? Suppose you make it \$10 a week. What will the fellow who is getting \$150 a month do? If you fix it at \$5 a week, is it fair for the fellow who is able to pay \$10 a week to pay only \$5.

Now, as regards the nonsense which I heard from the hon. junior member for St. John. Of course, the hon. mem-

ber knows better, but he is just playing to the gallery with the hope and feeling that they would not understand what he is saying. If you arrange to work with your master and you are getting \$8, \$10, or \$12 a week, all it means is that the law says that you must work a period of 44 hours or 52 hours, as the case may be. Let us say 44 hours because the remainder is rest period. You divide your \$12 by 44 and that forms the basis of your hourly rate. If it works out to 50 cents an hour or whatever the case may be, all that you do, if you work an hour overtime and over your period, you say 50 cents and 25 cents which amount to 75 cents for that hour. It is as simple as that.
10.55 p.m.

You do not have to fix any rate in any law in order to determine what time and a half would mean. The hon. member must understand, as the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has told him, that as to much of the nonsense that they talk about our being nit-wits, we have as much commonsense and as much intelligence, in fact, we have more, than the hon. junior member for St. John. Because the hon. member had an opportunity to learn, therefore he feels that nobody knows anything but he. If you say that an individual must work for eight hours a day and after eight hours you ask that individual to work for a longer period and he works for that longer period, that individual must have his remuneration at the rate of time and a half. It means that whatever wage you agree to, one half of that must be added for overtime. I should like to say that when I bring forward any Measure in this House, you cannot run any carriage and pair through it; I give any Measure I bring forward a lot of study.

On the question of domestic servants sleeping in, I thought of that too. Employers may be able to call upon these servants; but, if you take the argument of the members of the Opposition, they have told us that the domestic servants are calling the tune. Well, you cannot tell me that in one breath, and in the same breath say that these people can be fired.

I have heard the argument used by the hon. junior member for St. John about an employee refusing to work overtime for his employer. The hon. member says that there is no provision in the Bill to prevent an employee from being fired; and I quite agree with that. But I would like to see what he would put in this Bill so as to prevent that. Suppose we had even put something like that in the Bill; what would prevent an employer from saying: "You are five minutes late and therefore out you go." The employer can dismiss an employee at any time and under any pretext. Therefore there is no necessity to put in the Bill any provision to prevent an employer from dismissing an employee.

In paragraph 2 of the Schedule to the Bill, this is what is stated:-

"No domestic employee shall be employed for more than eight hours actual work in any one day, or fifty-two hours actual work in any one week, except that in any week in which a rest period is granted in accordance with paragraph four of this Schedule, the hours of actual work for that week shall not exceed forty-four.

Provided that if the domestic employee so agrees, he may be employed for periods in excess of the prescribed hours, in which case he shall be remunerated in respect of the hours overtime so worked at a rate of pay not less than half as much again as the rate at which he is ordinarily remunerated."

That is provided that the domestic employee so agrees. If the employee disagrees to work and the employer fires him, then that employee has a case for wrongful dismissal. This Bill gives him protection. If you dismiss an employee...

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The Bill provides that the employer shall pay overtime.

Hon. M. E. COX: Not "shall", "may".

Mr. WALCOTT: I am referring to the Schedule. This is what it says in the proviso to Clause 2: "Provided that if

the domestic employee so agrees, he may be employed for periods in excess of the prescribed hours, in which case he shall be remunerated in respect of the hours so worked at a rate of pay not less than half as much again as the rate at which he is ordinarily remunerated." This is statute law which you are passing. The common law right that you can dismiss a man without notice does not mean that, if you had a statute law which says that for this particular cause he could not be employed, that would be unfair dismissal. If he refuses to work he has no case.

Hon. M. E. COX: We have our legal advisers. One is as good as the other; and in some respects, he is better than the other. We say that the employee may agree to work overtime; if he does not agree to work overtime, he goes home, and if you dismiss him after that, you can be prosecuted for wrongful dismissal. That is what my adviser tells me and that is what I am guided by.

I did not include in this Bill those domestic employees who sleep on the premises for various reasons; in that case, it is impossible to carry out the provisions of this Bill. I have given the matter some thought, and I know it is difficult to include these domestic employees, but I am quite willing to include them in this Bill.
11.05 p.m.

I am not prepared to send this Bill to a Select Committee, because it will be a waste of time both of this House and of hon. members. This Bill has been gone into very thoroughly and we have reached agreement. With regard to the point raised by the hon. senior member for Christ Church about breaking the law, we make all sorts of laws but we cannot stop anybody from breaking them. We have laws on the Statute Book that if people receive money on false pretences they would go to gaol, and yet people receive money on false pretences. Because it is difficult to administer a law as the hon. member said just now, it does not logically follow that no law should be enacted.

With regard to that cheap nonsense about bringing the Bill at this time, I would say that if you put a pipe in Black Rock during this year, it would be for political reasons. Mark you, we have an almost perpetual programme to carry out year after year until it comes to an end; we have to repair roads and things of that nature; but if we come and do them now although they were on the list to be done but have only taken their places, some will say that we are fixing these roads because of elections are this year; and that if there were no elections, there would be no pipes and no roads. We do not do it that way.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, was being worked on since 1959. When we come with simple Bills and Resolutions and think that in half an hour the item will be passed, there are all sorts of criticism and nasty slanderous remarks being used; that is what they substitute for argument. When we put up a logical, reasonable and sensible argument, from that side we get nastiness thrown upon us.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. As I still happen to be a parliamentarian, I would like to point out to Your Honour that if the word "nastiness" becomes part of the vocabulary of Parliamentary usage it will be very difficult to deal with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are certain English people who use the word "nastiness" very politely; but in Barbadian society I think "nastiness" is considered a little hard and extraordinary.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the hon. junior member for Christ Church is not present. In his speech he referred to the Shops Act and asked why we do not get houses for old people and give them this and that; and said that I merely brought this because my popularity was slipping. If it was slipping it would be slipping all the time; and surely I would be getting all of his support, because I would be slipping away from the people who put me here. However, I want to assure him in no uncertain manner that as far as I am concerned, I have not the faintest doubt in my mind as to what the results will be as long as I am alive and have breath in my body. I have never been doubtful

of what the outcome of any election would be; that holds good for the hon. junior member for St. John who was dropped in 1956 and no doubt will be dropped again in this election.

There has been all this nonsense talked to the effect that employers will lay off these people and there will be so much unemployment. What was the position with the Shops Closing Act? The girls and men in Swan Street worked in the stores until midnight; the doors were closed at 10 o'clock, but at midnight and one o'clock in the morning people were still coming through the doors. When we were moving the Bill through the House in 1945 we were told that it would throw a lot of these people out of work. Whom did the Bill throw out of work? People were able to come out at 4 o'clock in the evening and go home and recoup to meet work next day. It has been a blessing to those people including....

Mr. WALCOTT: Man, I was a fighter for that. I was the leader.

Hon. M. E. COX: When Swan Street was allowed to open until 4 o'clock on Saturdays while Broad Street closed half day, I was vilified and abused - that happens to be my fortune - for bringing in the Bill to amend the Shops Act to make them all close at half days on Saturdays. (Mr. WALCOTT: Hutson Williams went into Queens Park and talked against that.)

I got quite a lot of criticism on that Bill and the merchants were up in arms as usual; but the Bill brought relief to a lot of workers, and today everybody is happy. The same thing will apply in this case. I repeat that the employers will realise that these workers have somebody to speak on their behalf.
11.15 p.m.

I have said all the time that I believe in the equality of human beings. The domestic employee has her family to go home and look after, her children to send to school, and to do everything at home just as everybody else. That domestic employee must have time to do this, and not to be left to go home at 12 o'clock in the night and then to be back out to work at six o'clock in the morning. The hon. senior member may not know but I am one of those unfortunate people who, in my early days, had to get myself in at the Barbados Foundry at six o'clock in the morning, and I got away at five o'clock in the evening. If there was any overtime work to be done and you worked until 12 o'clock in the night, the people with whom you worked could not care less. There was no overtime pay. As a matter of fact, the most was undertime pay. I know what it means. I was not born in any big palace or anything like that. I am a son of a humble shoemaker. My mother, fortunately, did not have to work for anybody but for herself. I do know, Sir, of the sufferings of the many people in all categories of work.

The question of dealing with sick leave will be coming behind this. As I have said in my opening remarks, this is preliminary in order to get something done. This is a start. Under the Wages Council Act, the Wages Council is now giving consideration to sick leave for workers in shops and so on. All I need to do is to place this question of sick leave for domestic employees also to the Wages Council. (Mr. WALCOTT: That means that you are going to set up wages Councils for domestic employees.) I can do that. I do not want hon. members to feel that this is a catch. We are prepared to follow this up.

As far as wages are concerned for these workers, I must repeat that there is difficulty in fixing these wages. If conditions are not changed as a result of the passing of this Act, I will not hesitate to set up a Wages Council which will prescribe wages and conditions of work for these people. I have done my duty to these suffering people, and it is left to hon. members on the opposite side to say whether they will do theirs if they feel they have a duty.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Sir, before you put the question, I would like to make an amendment to the motion which has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour. My amendment is that this Bill be now referred to Select Committee.

My reasons for doing so is....

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member cannot speak on that motion.

Mr. TUDOR: Sir, I am not surprised that the Hon. Minister does not wish that a speech be made on this motion.

Hon. M. E. COX: As far as I remember, if you make a motion for a Select Committee, it is moved and seconded and then put to the vote. How can you make a speech on it?

Mr. TUDOR: Why can you not make a speech on it?

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to be absolutely sure on that before I rule the hon. member out of order. As far as this motion is concerned, it is not dilatory according to the Rules; but my memory is that before we had these new Rules this was a motion which was regarded as dilatory. If practice is begun that speeches are allowed on motions of this sort, I think it would not be so good. I do not believe that any speeches should be made on it.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, if I do not agree with the motion moved by the Hon. Minister in charge of the Bill and am moving an amendment, should I give my reasons for moving the amendment?

Mr. SPEAKER: It means that the entire House will be able to speak on the whole thing again. It has never been done before. There is no point in making a speech. What I would like is that the Standing Orders be changed to make the motion dilatory.
11.25 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Am I in order to speak now? The reasons for our wanting this Bill to be referred to a Select Committee are many. There is the reason that the consideration of a Bill by a Select Committee enables members of both sides of the House to make a bad Bill into a good one, and in the case of a good Bill, to make it into a better one. This Bill, as we see it on this side of the House leaves much to be desired, and what it leaves to be desired can only be made good by the concentrated effort of discussion which only a Select Committee can give. I stress the word "discussion" because only a few minutes ago, when the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was making his contribution to the debate, he assured us that legislation is coming down, presumably of this nature, which would stun us. Since I believe in government by discussion and not in government by concussion, I think that there will be ample opportunity for this Bill to be discussed. I do not think that sending this Bill to a Select Committee could make it worse than it is. The only valid argument against referring this Bill to a Select Committee is that the best of its features may be lost; but what little it does offer can be preserved by our side. I am interested in making some of the bad features of this Bill good and in making some of its good features better.

I would like, for instance, legislation of this sort to show as precisely as it can, the nature and scope of the protection which is to be given to people. I do believe that by having the democratic process of discussion in Select Committee even the very limited objective which the Minister has said is in the Bill should be safeguarded. As I see it, this Bill, in its present form, can scarcely be described as vote-catching. I hesitate to think that there is any section of the community in Barbados who would be caught by this. I remember reading somewhere a story which comes from American politics which illustrates what I mean. An election was approaching in the United States of America some years ago and the Chairman of one of the Congressional Committees found that he had at his disposal a large amount of unspent money. He said to

his Committee: "I know of a way in which to spend this money which would get us hundreds and thousands of votes." He said: "The way in which I will spend this money would be to build a bridge over the Mississippi." One member of the Committee said to him: "You would not need to spend one hundred million dollars, one million dollars would be sufficient."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. What is a bridge or the building of it to do with this Bill? I know that the hon. member is good at filibustering, but he is supposed to be moving that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. TUDOR: I do not need the hon. member to tell me how to make my speech. As I was saying, Sir, the Chairman of that Committee said to his colleagues: "The way in which I would build the bridge is not across the river but lengthwise of the river. Although nobody can benefit from it everybody would see it." That is exactly the matter here; the people for whom this Bill is intended will not only see it but they will enjoy its provisions.

When we come to deal with the details, we have heard from the Hon. Minister of Trade himself, that it is impossible, under the existing circumstances, to make provision for these domestic servants who live on the premises.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I did not say that at all. I said it is difficult or almost impossible to make provision for these people.

Mr. TUDOR: It is this difference between finding it impossible and finding it almost impossible which could be made good in Select Committee. If this Bill remains as it is without a thorough pruning and improvement which only a Select Committee can do, then large employers will take advantage of the people and make living in a condition of employment. That, presumably, is what the Minister does not want; and it would militate, if it came about, against the interest of domestic employees.

It should be possible, for instance, to know as nearly as possible how many people are employed in domestic service. Only a Select Committee would have the time and patience to find that out. Having found that out, then it would be a question of finding out the total number of these people who are employed under conditions of sleeping in and who are not; and decide, when you know the facts, that the Bill could be improved. Then there is this vast and important problem of how to make sure that employers will not seize the opportunity given to them by the plain words of the Bill to impose conditions of work which are not intended by the Bill.

11.25 p.m.

In his winding up, the Minister said that he wanted to prevent the old system of people staying in until 12 o'clock at night, because domestic servants quite rightly have their children to look after and their own affairs to manage; but, Mr. Speaker, if you do not tighten up on some of the interpretations which you can only do by a thorough investigation of the problems involved, the very thing that the Minister fears will come to pass, because the eight hours can be taken any time. So if this remains as it is and you do not take steps to tighten it up, you cannot prevent..

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The hon. member is making a second reading speech and not speaking on the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: He is speaking on the motion that the Bill should be sent to Select Committee.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is going all over the Bill and talking about tightening up. He said that an employee might be asked to work from 6 p.m. until midnight. Would anybody want a servant to be working when he is sleeping?

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the Minister's anxiety to get this Bill through, but no matter how

anxious he is he cannot stop me from giving my reasons why it should be sent to Select Committee. He does not have to agree with them, or appreciate them, and though it may appear to him that it is a second reading speech, the reasons given for sending the Bill to Select Committee have got to be reasons which are based on principle. If weaknesses did not exist in the structure of the Bill, there would be no need for further investigation, but the whole tone of the Minister's speech was an attempt to answer the charge of weakness.

Mr. Speaker, the most telling argument for this is that you have a large number of people, often put between fifteen thousand and twenty thousand, of varying degrees of efficiency and varying standards of work with varying conditions. The Minister should be in a position to say that those people who are going to live in are one-eighth, one-tenth or one-seventeenth of the total number, and being a minority of them they can be dealt with or handled at its leisure. As I said, Mr. Speaker, whenever you pass legislation which opens loopholes so wide as to say that nothing in this Bill shall affect the category of persons who sleep in, the employers themselves who after all are not fools and who can read as well as any of us.....

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for the hon. member to develop that point; he is just wasting time and filibustering. I have already told the House that I am prepared to remove that part.

Mr. TUDOR: When does he intend to remove it?

Mr. SPEAKER: He did not say in Committee, but that is the only place he can do it.

Mr. TUDOR: My colleagues tell me that it is the first time they are hearing of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is the second time for me. He did not have to say it would be done in Committee.

Mr. TUDOR: It is true he cannot do it any other way. Well, Mr. Speaker, here again my point is even clearer, that in the Bill itself, we manage to draw to this attention that there is something wrong. There are other things of equal import which he should be in a position to remove almost as soon as he removes the other. That is how we feel about it, and I heard the hon. member say in refuting the argument for Select Committee.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear him say anything about that.

Mr. TUDOR: He said in his winding up speech that he was not prepared to let the Bill go to Select Committee because it would waste time. That is a very narrow view to take of it. Since the House did not divide on the second reading, no great question of principle can divide the House in Select Committee. I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I need no person to tell me, that if some of the things we have drawn to the Minister's attention are not put right every soon, it is going to create some difficulty. I throw this challenge out to the Minister; I personally would have no objection to a Select Committee of the House which is terribly weighted on that side. If they feel very strongly that this is a matter of policy for them and they cannot risk having their basic intentions or basic policies changed, the Select Committee could be so composed as to be heavily weighted in their favour; but I am sure that in such a Select Committee arguments which they might reject now because it is convenient to do so would receive greater attention round the table.

In the last analysis, Mr. Speaker, we have Party Government and Party Government is based on majorities. If they reject this amendment, there is nothing left than for us to move amendments in Committee and speak on them hoping that our arguments will be reasonably enough taken to convince them that we want to make a better Bill. I would have preferred, Mr. Speaker, if the whole Bill could have gone through in a more minute and sensible manner so that all of these aspects which have been overlooked up to now, and which have been the subject of such prolonged

debate could be gone into and settled to the satisfaction of everybody. That is why I move this amendment, Mr. Speaker, which I recommend to the House not in any Party spirit, not because I wish to obstruct him in any way, and not because I am now seizing an opportunity to give my views on the Bill not having spoken before.
11.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I second that motion. After hearing the Hon. Minister of Labour, I do not think it is anything unfair to ask that the Bill be sent to Select Committee. The Hon. Minister said that he agreed with what the Hon. Minister of Labour said, but I do not think that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was clear on what he was talking about.

The Hon. Minister in charge said that he is going to set up Wages Councils, and all that is something which we should know. Let us know what will be referred to the Wages Council in order that we do not put it in this Bill. Quite frankly, I think that the most scientific thing which the Minister should have done in these circumstances was to have set up a Wages Council by which conditions of employment would have been in a Wages Council Order.

I do not think the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would understand the theory of Wages Councils which the Government has carried out. There should be hours of work prescribed and there should be provision for sick leave and minimum wage rates; but you hear the Hon. Minister of Agriculture making a statement that you cannot prescribe minimum wages.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a reason for seconding the motion.

Mr. WALCOTT: Minimum wages among any section of workers mean minimum wages. The Shops Order deals with minimum wages for people who work in shops, but you will find that the people who work in stores in Bridgetown get more than \$16 and \$18 a week. It is not a point that because Cave, Shepherd & Company and DaCosta & Company pay more that you cannot fix a minimum wage. What I cannot understand for the life of me is how hon. members can say that you can have this Bill but then you do not have to prescribe for minimum wages, and -

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a second reading speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, my intention is not to go over what has been said on the second reading. My view is that a Select Committee should be set up for the precise purpose of knowing all of these things. It is really asking too much to accept the recommendations of the Committee which was set up on this matter, when you are not carrying out the Committee's recommendations. The attitude of the Government has cost us a lot of money already.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not let us go into that now.

Mr. WALCOTT: You know what was the overhead cost of the Transport Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not before us.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I do not subscribe to the view that sending this Bill to Select Committee is a waste of time. The Hon. Minister of Labour said that this legislation was before him since 1959. If that is so, why do we not have the right to examine it in a more careful way than we are asked to do now? It will do the workers no harm in dealing with this by a Select Committee; it will do the workers a good by having something which will do them a good put on the Statute Book.

The question that the Bill be referred to Select Committee was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. TALMA and Mr. BRANCKER - 4

NOES: Mr. BRYAN, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, Mr. SEARLES, Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. SMITH - 8.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:-

In this Act -

"domestic employee" means any person employed for reward for the purpose of performing household duties in a private dwelling-house but does not include any such person who lives on the premises on which the said dwelling-house is situate;

"employer" means any person employing one or more domestic employees and includes any agent, manager, or representative of such person, who is responsible directly or indirectly for the payment, in whole or in part, of remuneration to a domestic employee.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to delete from "domestic employee" the words "but does not include any such persons who live on the premises on which the said dwelling-house is situate."

I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

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

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

Clauses 3 to 7 inclusive were called separately and passed.

11.55 p.m.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this be the Schedule to the Bill.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there are many points in the Schedule to this Bill which should be re-examined. I shall deal firstly with Clause 1 which says this:-

"The time during which the domestic employee is at the disposal of the employer shall be deemed to be hours of actual work."

As many hon. members of the Opposition have pointed out, there should be a specific time for coming to work and a specific time for leaving work. Any hours which are outside of this period will be regarded as overtime, but if you leave the matter open like this, you would not know what is overtime. This Clause should go on to say "and the same shall commence not earlier than seven o'clock a.m., and shall terminate not later than seven o'clock p.m." In other words, there should be a specific period set out; there should be any eight hours within that period, and any hours outside that period will be regarded as overtime. After seven o'clock p.m. the domestic employee can be on the premises, but you will have to pay overtime. Before the hour of seven a.m. would be overtime and after seven p.m. would be overtime as well. In that case, everybody will know what is overtime.

I beg to move that the following words be added to the end of paragraph (1) of the Schedule: "and the same shall not commence earlier than seven a.m. and shall terminate not later than seven p.m."

Mr. WALCOTT: I beg to second that. The hon. senior member for Christ Church is an old time Trade Unionist. What he has said is what we have been saying all the time. In the old days you would say that the minimum hours would

be forty-eight or sixty. By contract, people would say: "Well, you must work sixty hours." We had to say that the period of forty-eight hours made up the period of six days which had to be counted by itself. (ASIDES)

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph will learn because he wants to be the Assistant Secretary of the Union; but he would have to resign from other activities. He says that it is difficult to deal with this matter in this way. This period of twelve hours has been suggested and out of this twelve-hour period you can have a servant employed for eight hours; but before or after this period is the prescribed period of overtime. You may say that this is something between the employer and the worker, but if you have legislation, then it must have a meaning.

The hon. junior member for St. Philip says that he saw a woman going to work at six o'clock in the morning, but the number of people in St. Philip who go to work at six o'clock in the morning can be counted on your hand. It is in this metropolitan parish where the bulk of the people live; there are not many households in the country which employ domestic servants because the requirements are not there. If you say that you want to help these people and you say that they are exploited, how can you, in the same breath say that you will leave the hours of work to them? How are you prescribing that they will not do any late work?

With this Bill in its present form, you are leaving the matter so fluid that employers can call in employees at any time and they can call such normal time. We are objecting to that; we can see that there is something wrong. Let me ask this question: would you have any person at work on the basis whereby after eight hours they must be at your disposal on the basis of twenty-four hours? Any part of twenty-four hours would be this person's day. When we had the hotel business before us, this same problem arose. The hotels wanted a fifty-hour week because the employers said that it was impossible to get things done. We have produced a Schedule to the employers on the basis of work for eight hours a day.
12.05 a.m.

I would like to ask the Minister why he thinks that in 1961 a domestic servant should be at the disposal of any person seven days a week. He is one of the people whom the Minister of Agriculture talked about who got somewhere suddenly; they are more rapacious than a person who came along and found something. You get more difficulty with the fellow who thinks you want to prevent him from getting rich quickly. That applies to the Minister's Party because the Leader said that I was the boy from obscurity. I can understand that you did not want to bring this down because the Prime Minister did not feel you should bring it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I object to that. As I said in my opening remarks, we were given these recommendations, but we allowed people a little time to apply themselves to these recommendations. If these recommendations could be carried out without having to legislate for them, that would be all well and good; but I told the House that I was satisfied that after five years little or nothing was done to carry out these recommendations, and therefore it was necessary to bring in legislation.

Mr. WALCOTT: When the Minister says that little or nothing was done, he did not call anybody and ask what he thought about the recommendations. The Committee made recommendations and subsequent to that I came here one day and wanted a debate on these things; and if I am not mistaken I think I did start a debate; but the hon. member never made a move from his Ministry.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was not in charge of this Ministry. Those recommendations were made in July 1955. I took over the Ministry on the 17th December, 1956.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member suggesting that I should not say what I said? I was referring to his Ministry in the collective sense. What I meant was that his Ministry, not he as a Minister, meaning the Ministry of Labour, did nothing about it. (Hon. M. E. COX: What?)

About calling people together. (Hon. M. E. COX: Like whom?) People in the community. You set up a Committee; do you want me to read out the names? Mr. Chairman, the Committee set up was Mr. E. E. Bourne, Chairman, the Hon. Mrs. N. G. Daysh, M.L.C.; Mrs. Julien Mahon; Mrs. Emily Patrick; Miss I. Alleyne, the Organiser of the Housecraft Centre; Mrs. V. Lynch, the Representative of the Barbados Workers' Union; Mrs. C. B. Stuart, the Representative of the Women's Club; and Mr. R. N. Jack, the Assistant Labour Commissioner.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that after the Committee made these recommendations, the Ministry did nothing about informing anybody about proposed legislation; therefore, there is no point in the Minister saying that nothing was done although he waited to see what people would do. What we are doing now is something which should have been done.

Mr. Chairman, when the Minister of Trade says he is helping these poor people and the Minister of Agriculture says that he looks through his window and sees people going to work at 6 o'clock, I will tell him that there are people other than domestics who go to work at 6 o'clock, so it is nothing unfortunate. The factory worker goes to work at 7 o'clock so he has to leave home earlier; but he does not have to work from 7 o'clock until 7 o'clock. We prescribed the hours and said a man shall be employed eight hours and these are the hours. In the hotel industry and in the bus transport we stipulate the hours that people should work. You do not tell a man his time is 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock; you stipulate what the hours are.

Do you realise that in 1961 we should pass the stage where we are passing legislation which in itself connotes that a person should work a seven-day week. Why should I agree to legislation which makes a man work everyday of the week? If you believe in Christianity you would know that Sunday is a day of rest. I went to Israel and their Sabbath is a Saturday; in Tunis their Sabbath is a Friday; in Barbados our Sabbath is a Sunday; in India their Sabbath is a Monday. I say that to show that there should be a day off every week; and that is a Convention of I.L.O. What I want to know is what the Labour Party is going to tell the people that really know.

Mr. Chairman, the Ministries close on Sundays whether or not there is work to be done; so why should we pass legislation for domestic servants to work everyday? Why should they not get a day off like a Policeman or like a Nurse? Some of them work for \$5 or \$6 a week and others less, but all the Minister has said is that they are ill-treated by rapacious employers who exploit them.
12.15 a.m.

In 1947 we went to a conference at Jamaica and we stated that there should be a 60-hour week for this class of workers. That was 14 years ago. I feel now, as a matter of social legislation, that we should put on the Statute Book hours of work which are the normal hours of work that exist and the normal hours of work which exist are 48 hours. If we put 48 hours as the normal hours of work we still will be conceding to the people four hours. Your production has gone up by having your modern appliances; therefore, it would not effect your production by having a 48-hour week, and we know that automation is going to bring about that.

Another thing is that the wages paid to these people are too low. There is no fun about that. Some of the people who have domestic servants spend a lot of money badly, and some of them spend money which they could very well pay to domestic servants and make them happy. The Hon. Minister of Communications says that I am making a second reading speech.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I have not spoken. If the hon. member is listening to asides, he better be careful. I have not told the hon. member anything.

Mr. WALCOTT: If he says that it is a second reading speech, it is a second reading speech. We are making an amendment to the Schedule which is the kernel of the Bill.

The whole idea of your prescribing hours is that you want to stop the employers from keeping these girls in their house until 10 o'clock at night. Some domestic servants have to work and live with their employers for such long periods that they do not know what it is to see sunshine outside.

When you are passing labour legislation, you have a right to pass legislation which cannot be abused. If you cannot agree to these hours, then what is all this talk of these workers being exploited. I do not see any reason for your giving any employer any more latitude than having a working period for employees within twelve hours. What is all this idea of your not saying from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.

I have just worked out some figures on overtime and do you know what overtime you are talking about? It works out to 18 cents an hour and 36 cents for two hours. Do you think that I would work overtime based on those figures? I would not take it. When somebody works for \$6.00 a week it is less than 12 cents an hour. Time and half for overtime makes it 18 cents an hour.

A man who smokes buys a package of cigarettes for 15 cents, and if he is a big smoker, he will smoke out more than a package of cigarettes in an hour. In Barbados, very few employers pay servants more than \$6.00 a week; the report of the Committee stated that the wages were as low as \$2.77 a week, in some cases, and some people in the country do not even pay that. You know very well that some pay these employees \$3.00 a week and give them an old dress every now and then. Do not think that this overtime is like what one gets on the waterfront. This is 10 cents an hour for overtime. That is why I say that we are really still living in a primitive society.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would not be long. The hon. member in his remarks earlier on suggested that this should be referred to a Committee. This is what the Committee which reported and made recommendations said at Paragraph seven:-

"There was much disparity in the hours of arrival at or departure from work which were submitted to the Committee. The hours of arrival ranged from 6.15 a.m. to 8.00 a.m. and those of departure from 5.00 p.m. to 9.00 p.m. The attention of the Committee was drawn to the fact that several members of a household including the husband and his wife, had to leave their homes to get to their work at or before 8 a.m. and this should be borne in mind in considering the hour of arrival at work. The Committee therefore recommends that the earliest hour for commencement of work should be 7.00 a.m. It regrets that unanimity has not been reached on the latest hour of cessation of work. Four members were in favour of 8 p.m.; while the remaining four favoured 9 p.m. The Committee further recommends that the hours of commencement and of cessation of work should be mutually arranged between the employer and the worker within the limits finally decided on." 12.25 a.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: All that says is that the Committee was of the opinion that there should be a beginning or starting hour, and that they could not reach unanimity. If the Committee had reached unanimity, the Committee would have made a recommendation. If you were to go on to read this Report, you will see that the Committee also said that you should not pass any legislation at all. I may say that these were pious people; these were women who studied the problem; but for the average Barbadian the domestic servant has a domestic relationship and that is not the sort of thing for which you can legislate. As soon as you begin to legislate in this matter, you have to touch every part of it. You cannot touch one part and not the other.

Because this Committee could not mutually agree to something, does that mean that we cannot agree on anything? This Committee could not make any recommendation, but we, on this side, are saying that a period of twelve hours is long enough for any man. My experience is that when you treat domestic servants right they do not want to leave your house; I mean by that that they do not want to

leave your employment. You can go home at me and you would not find a servant in my house at six o'clock unless I am having a party. Do you think that I would have a person in my house and I would give her any 18 cents or 25 cents? That is not the kind of money which we pay. In our Trade Union, we have a maid who receives wages at the rate of \$15 a week.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. This Bill prescribes the minimum conditions; it does not limit you in any way.

Mr. WALCOTT: It limits you to the amount which is calculated on the wages. Any man who has a social conscience apart from a politician - I might say that my dog is my mate and I spend more than eighteen cents on him. Therefore when you come to the matter of a human being you will understand. My labour turn over is too small; I had about four servants in my time. I do not have any servants' food; my servants eat the same food that I eat.

In 1943-44 I was standing before the Chamber of Commerce telling them that they were not paying people proper wages. I was a boy in obscurity then, and there was no Labour Party. I was telling them that they had to stop people from working up to ten o'clock on Saturday nights. The hon. member has said that his mother did not have to work, but mine had to work. 12.35 a.m.

Nearly everybody who employs a domestic servant is better off than the domestic servant; he has to be. And speaking about pigmentation, more servants in this island work for black people than for white, because black people have risen to the stage that they are in the employing class; so there is no question of pigmentation. When you pass this you will find that more small people are affected by it than anybody else.

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is saying that he cannot prescribe the hours to be between 7.00 a.m. and 7.00 p.m., I do not know what he wants.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. senior member for St. Peter first spoke on this particular Clause, he said that I had said that setting the hours was difficult. That is erroneous. I have not said such in my remarks; it was the Minister who said that setting the hours would be difficult. I said that if there were no set hours there would be further difficulty in administering it; and if the Government thought that it was so irregular a process and that they did not intend to set the hours, the problem would be in administering the Act. I am aware of the difficulties in working or negotiating for domestic employees. I have had the experience of negotiating for dining hall employees who would come in a category like this, not only working a 48 hour week; but they got an additional wage because of the additional shift which they did.

Mr. WALCOTT: Therefore I have the hon. member supporting the idea. All I am saying is that if you want the period of work to be eight hours, you should tell every employer in Barbados that the normal working period for a domestic servant is between 7.00 a.m. and 7.00 p.m.; and anything before or after that would be considered as overtime.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Schedule stand part.....

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I would like you to put the Clauses separately, because there are amendments to each Clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question was put that the Schedule stand part, so you have to deal with the whole thing. The motion made by the Leader of the House was that the Schedule stand part, so you cannot separate it.

Mr. TALMA: I thoroughly understand that. Now, Mr. Chairman, there are numerous proposed amendments; the first was dealt with and now we are coming to Clause 2,

and my whole point is to say enough to impress the Government that the amendments are strictly necessary. I thoroughly agree with the suggestion of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the hon. junior member for St. John and other members that domestic servants should not be expected to work for longer than six days a week; in other words, there is no reason why a domestic employee should be treated on a different basis from any other employee. At present, for that matter, domestic employees are demanding a day in every week, and if they do not get it they are taking it, so this Bill does not carry it any further. We are saying, therefore, that instead of stipulating a fifty-two hour week, it should be reduced to 48 hours, that is, six days of eight hours each; and at the end it should read "forty" instead of "forty-four".

We have heard enough argument on that to convince this House that a six day week is desirable, so I will not repeat all the arguments used. I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and is an authority on matters of this nature has pointed it out clearly enough; and the point has also been explained and stressed by the hon. junior member for St. John who is an Economist and an authority on labour and industrial relations legislation of this nature. In furtherance of the arguments adduced by the hon. senior member for St. Peter to the effect that the princely sum for overtime would just be 18¢ or 25¢ — I know it is very negligible — I think it is only fair and right that in order to assist domestic servants we should make it double time and not time and a half for overtime. I am moving therefore that the penultimate line in the Proviso should read "at a rate of pay as much again as the rate at which he is ordinarily remunerated". I will leave the balance of the amendments for my colleagues to deal with. If you want to do justice or mete out any assistance to domestic workers, you will have to knock this Schedule into shape, because you cannot claim to be helping them in this Schedule.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise to second the amendment to Clause 2 of the Schedule made by my colleague. In seconding it I have no new arguments because all that have been used have been good ones. But I will say this: now is the time for hon. members opposite to say whether they really intend to help these people. All the amendments offered from this side are practical ways in which we are suggesting the Bill should work.
12.45 a.m.

We are telling them, Mr. Chairman, on the other side, first of all, if you want to carry on an eight-hour day to give the day a starting point and an ending point. Secondly, if you want domestic servants to enjoy the standard which they should be enjoying, give them a six-day week; and thirdly, we are saying that since the rates of pay are not going to be made the subject of the Government, at least not immediately, and since they are so small and so low, the least that you can do is to offer and make provision for double time as overtime rates. (A VOICE: You are a real joke!) You will see who are jokes.

There is one other amendment which I myself am in favour of and that is an amendment to Clause four of the Schedule. The Clause at present reads as follows:-

"In addition to the daily break referred to in paragraph three of this Schedule, the domestic employee shall be granted two rest periods, each of not less than twenty-four hours consecutive rest, in every month."

In order to bring this into line with the amendment which we have suggested, I beg to move that in line three of Clause four of the Schedule that the word "two" be deleted and the word "one" be substituted therefor and the words "each of" be deleted; and in the last line that the word "month" be deleted and the word "week" be substituted therefor.

The Clause as amended will read as follows:-

"In addition to the daily break referred to in paragraph three of this Schedule, the domestic employee shall

be granted one rest period, of not less than twenty-four hours consecutive rest, in every week."

Sir, I beg to second the amendment moved to Clause two by my colleague and move on my own behalf the amendment to Clause four.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not think that we can argue that a man or woman should not have a six-day week. This recommendation is that she can work six and a half days which means that this person must come out every day with the exception of the day she is given off. What we should say is that Clause four of the Schedule should be deleted particularly because, if you have a 48-hour week of an eight-hour day, you will not need to have to make provision for a rest period; therefore my view of the matter is that we should agree to a 48-hour week.

The mere fact that these employers were asking us for a 54-hour week was based on this sort of domestic business because some of them employed girls doing domestic work, and those girls who were accustomed to working seven days a week when they got into hotels and worked these shorter hours, thought that they were princesses. As the hon. junior member has said, when you have a reserved army of the unemployed to call on, it makes it so difficult that the Government even today has told us that you do not even represent the workers in this business today. It is true that we have one or two of them in our Union whom we represent, but we do not go out to those who are not in our Union. As a matter of fact, the amount of wages which some of them receive cannot even pay their dues.

What I would like to know is what objection the Government has to a 48-hour week. Why state that you consider this revolutionary to give these people a six-day week. When the Hon. Minister of Labour has the guts to look at us over here, knowing what we have really done for these people, and say that they are the people who have done something for these people, I would like to know where he was years ago when we were doing something for them. We got money from these employers away back for these workers. The members of the Government have got the effrontery to get up and say that they are the cause of it. Every time we get a wage increase for them, they say: "Look what we have done for them." Every time we get more money for workers and there is an increase in the spending capacity of the people, they say: "Look what we have done." It means that they do not give the Union which negotiates for them any credit; they take the credit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe what you are saying is in passing.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like it to be in staying too, and not in passing only! For what are you keeping us back all tonight? It is your resistance from doing what we have suggested to you to do; and the very Committee which you are appointed told you so. It is just like the little boy who went to sit an examination and failed and his excuse was that when he was going to pass, they stopped work.

The Hon. Minister says that they are going to bring down a measure for sick leave for these people and that they are going to bring down legislation which is going to stun us. I say that you all have stunned me already; because, I am so stunned to think that the Minister would bring down a Bill like this.

Are you going to bring down a Bill to stop Leave Passages? Are you going to bring down a Bill to increase Old Age Pension? I would like you to stun me with these things. Stun me now by giving these people a six-day week. Some of us are the products of these people. We have reached the stage where we have self-government but we have not reached the stage that the minimum week should be a 44-hour week.
12.55 a.m.

The Ministers are running the country; let the Minister of Agriculture get up and say what are the hours he works

in his shop. I put it to you that he is breaking the Shops Order. You cannot say that you are more willing to help people than we are to help them. I could not sit down here and agree to legislation which is going to provide a working week in excess of forty-eight hours. The poor people have a lot of cooking to do. These are the days of the washing machines and so forth. If you pay people well, you should have basic hours and you will have your work done. Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for a forty-eight hour working week for these people.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I may give reasons which I did not develop during the second reading of the Bill. As to what has been said by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture or what I understood him to say - he said that it was impossible to tell people that they should start work at nine o'clock because of their employment - I have taken some time off to search up some notes which I have made, and I have discovered that in 1833 by one of the Socialist reformers, Jerry Bentham, the principle of socialist reform was introduced and that is 127 years ago. It is not strange that I said that the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour seems to be struggling to get into the nineteenth century. The factories legislation which is analogous to the legislation which we are introducing now to control the conditions of employment of certain categories of workers developed at that time.

If the Minister says that we cannot put in certain things, or that we cannot do certain things as to an arrangement between employer and employee, the very principle of legislation is that you want to whittle down the rights of people who contract freely in the interest of the general welfare of the community. You do not want an exploitation of labour, therefore you decide that people cannot contract out of the provisions which you enact in the labour legislation. To do that without incorporating a spread-over period in your legislation is paradoxical in the Bill itself. In 1833 legislative machinery was enacted and made an inroad into this principle of *laissez faire*. The very fundamental basis of socialism is that you believe in Government interference. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture referred to the question of bringing in a Utopia in Barbados -

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. I referred to the baskets of manure and the various other things.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. junior member for St. John confine his remarks to the Schedule to this Bill.

Mr. BARROW: You are anticipating it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not anticipating the hon. member, but it appears to me that he is developing his remarks along the lines of a second reading speech.

Mr. BARROW: I thought that you were the Chairman of this Committee; I did not think that the Chairman of the Northern District Council was the Chairman of this Committee.
1.05 a.m.

(Mr. STRAUGHN: Order.) Now who is the Chairman? You are Chairman of the Northern District Council, I did not know that you are also Chairman of the House too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to confine his remarks to the Schedule with which we are dealing instead of attempting to reply to speeches made during the second reading.

Mr. BARROW: In other words, I should read over the Schedule again and again! If you look carefully at the Act, you will see that Sections 1 to 7 inclusive are general provisions stating how domestic servants should be employed; and Clause 3 says that without prejudice to the provisions of the Holidays with Pay Act, 1951, every domestic employee shall be employed in accordance with the provisions set out in the Schedule to this Act. You, Sir, put the Schedule one time; that is how I understand it, and therefore in discussing it it may appear to be a second reading speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are dealing with the Schedule and I am asking you to confine your remarks to that.

Mr. BARROW: If you have read the Act, and I presume you have, you will see that the Schedule is the whole Act. All the principles and all the sanctions concerned about the employment of domestic servants are contained in the Schedule and Section 3 says so. There is no point in my discussing Section 3 which I have just read, Section 4 which says that every employer shall keep a record, Section 5 setting out the penalty, Section 6 dealing with the power to order payment on conviction or Section 7 when the Bill comes into operation; that would be a waste of time. The sting really is in the tail; and that is the Schedule to the Act; and in dealing with the Schedule I have to be comprehensive to explain why I am supporting the amendments moved by the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Now I know they do not like to hear anything educational; it is anathema to them. This is not some wild fabrication of my brain; this is not something I have thought up to embarrass them, it is something which was in the English Labour Code for 123 years, that there should be no night work and that there be free Saturdays for women. There was no six day week in that Act, and in 1847 in England they stipulated that the working week should be six days and that they should not work on Saturdays. The last bit of legislation which I want to deal with is in 1937. I said there were eight principles declared in Sections 90 to 100 codifying the multiplicity of Wages Councils Orders enacted in the previous 100 years. We are still struggling now one hundred and four years later to get into the 19th Century. This is for the benefit of the Minister of Agriculture who says it is nonsense to talk about something like this.

In the 1937 Factories Act, referring to the hours of work for women, the maximum should be a nine hour day; the second principle is a forty-eight hour week. We had the riots in Barbados in 1937. The third principle is the period of employment, that is, the hours between which women and young children should be employed. In other words, the spread-over was eleven hours. There was a nine hour day and spread-over from 7 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the afternoon, but the nine hour day must come in between that. The fourth principle is the exclusion of night work; the fifth principle is free Saturday afternoons; the sixth principle is free Sundays; the seventh principle is that the spell of uninterrupted work must not be more than 4 1/2 hours with at least a half-hour break; and the eighth principle is that there must be continuous employment. That means no staggering of hours, but that most people should start together; that would only apply in circumstances where you had a group of people working together.

Now under the same 1937 Act, Section 73, governing the conditions of employment of women and young persons - these are the things the Minister of Agriculture says cannot be legislated for - they went further and said that no overtime was permissible and is not permissible even today for people under sixteen years of age, even if they want to work overtime. The reason for that was because they were trying to protect people from themselves, because they would work eighteen or nineteen hours to get a little bit of change. In the Bill the Government is presenting to the House today, you can work twenty-four hours if you are sleeping in so long as they give you time and a half which may amount to 11 1/2 cents, because there is no basic wages fixed or no Wages Council Order relating to domestic employees. There was a total maximum number of overtime hours per year for those people over sixteen years of age of 100 hours. The third principle in Section 73 of the 1937 Act was that there should be not more than six hours overtime per week; that was because they were trying to prevent people from over-working themselves. All that was enacted in England hundred of years ago. It went further to state that you could not work more than 25 weeks overtime in each year. The Government could have got the relevant legislation from Halsbury's Statutes of England and applied it *mutatis mutandis* to the Bill they want to protect domestic servants in. Even with overtime the fifth principle was that the maximum hours including

overtime should not exceed ten hours. Do you see, Mr. Chairman, where all the loopholes are plugged up? There is no question of working people 17, 18 or 19 hours because you are paying them overtime.

In this Bill all you had to insist on was a six day week and everything would adjust itself, because some employers may want domestic servants to work on Sundays and give a day off; some may prefer to give Saturday off instead of Sunday. The next principle was that the spread-over must not exceed twelve hours, and finally no night work was permissible. The rest of the Act was then concerned actually with the shift system.

Mr. Chairman, I have been at great pains to look up the different Sections of the Act, because the Minister got in here and fulminated against the Opposition for making suggestions which he felt carried their intentions, which are altruistic, further than their wildest dreams.
1.15 a.m.

The hon. junior member for St. Philip has said that we are going to be stunned by legislation. I am not only stunned, but I am practically speechless that in this year of grace, 1961, a so-called Labour Government would come to the House with this kind of legislation, with none of the sociological policies, and with nothing to prevent abuses; they have made it possible for the workers to be victimised more than they are now.

The Hon. Minister of Labour got up and said that I said in the debates on the Estimates that we are second-class citizens. I have in my hand the Official Debates of what I said on that occasion. My remarks can be found on page 170 and I will ask the Hon. Minister to go and get the debates and read them out. I was addressing the Chair at the time and reflecting on the presentation of the Budget by the Hon. Premier. I was speaking with respect to the Minister's suggestion of our girls going to Germany. I said: "I am looking at the political difficulties and the racial difficulties in sending them to Canada. Of course, Canada is an English speaking country and we may be able to open their eyes to see with us. When we send our people there we send them as second class citizens. A Barbadian young man or woman is a citizen in his own right. The Hon. Leader of the House considers them to be a labour force. We should have wider horizons."

Hon. M. E. COX: I still maintain what I said. You said that domestic servants will always be second class citizens. If the hon. member went and changed up his speech, that is a matter for him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. John will recall that you have made reference to the point raised by the Hon. Leader of the House about being second-class citizens, and I am asking you now not to develop it.

Mr. BARROW: But the Hon. Minister then suggested that I went and changed the debates about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would ask you to refrain from that.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, they are the only people who are ashamed of their background and that is what I do not understand. Socialists are proud to say where they have risen from. Sir, if they are sincere in their desire to protect workers, I invite hon. members on the other side to support the amendment made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church and seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. I do not think that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would have the temerity after what I have read out from Section 73 to 100 of the legislation in England, to say that it is Utopian or that freedom is something to be left to the employers and employees. The very essence of labour legislation is that you should make encroachments on this *laissez faire* freedom to contract.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are three amendments which have been made. The first amendment stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, it would be so nice if we can hear from the other side what their attitude is.

Mr. WALCOTT: Let the Chairman put the question.
1.25 a.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The first amendment stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, namely, that the following words be added to the end of paragraph (1) of the Schedule:-

"and the same shall commence not earlier than 7 a.m. and shall terminate not later than 7 p.m." The question is that these words be added at the end of paragraph 1 of the Schedule. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. WALCOTT, TUDOR, TALMA, BARROW and BRANCKER - 5.

NOES: Hon'bles. M. E. COX, D. D. GARNER, R. G. MAPP, L. St.A. THORNE, Messrs. SEARLES, STRAUGHN and SMITH - 7.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question has been resolved in the negative, five hon. members voting "Aye" and seven hon. members voting "No".

I now declare that the "Noes" have it.

The question that the Schedule be further amended by deleting the word "fifty-two" appearing in the second line of paragraph two of the Schedule and substituting therefor the word "forty-eight" was put and resolved in the negative the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. WALCOTT, TUDOR, TALMA, BARROW and BRANCKER - 5.

NOES: Hon'bles. M. E. COX, D. D. GARNER, R. G. MAPP, L. St.A. THORNE, Messrs. SEARLES, STRAUGHN and SMITH - 7.

The question that the word "forty-four" appearing in line six of paragraph two of the Schedule be deleted and the word "forty" be substituted therefor was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. WALCOTT, TUDOR, TALMA, BARROW and BRANCKER - 5.

NOES: Hon'bles. M. E. COX, D. D. GARNER, R. G. MAPP, L. St.A. THORNE, Messrs. SEARLES, STRAUGHN and SMITH - 7.

The question that the word "half" appearing in the penultimate line of the proviso to paragraph two be deleted was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. WALCOTT, TUDOR, TALMA, BARROW and BRANCKER - 5.

NOES: Hon'bles. M. E. COX, D. D. GARNER, R. G. MAPP, L. St.A. THORNE, Messrs. SEARLES, STRAUGHN and SMITH - 7.

The question that the Schedule be further amended by deleting the word "two" appearing in the third line of paragraph four and substituting therefor the word "one" was put and resolved in the negative on the following division.

AYES: Messrs. WALCOTT, TUDOR, TALMA, BARROW and BRANCKER - 5.

NOES: Hon'bles. M. E. COX, D. D. GARNER, R. G. MAPP, L. St.A. THORNE, Messrs. SEARLES, STRAUGHN and SMITH - 7.

The question that the word "periods" appearing in the third line of paragraph four be deleted and the word "period" be substituted therefor was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. WALCOTT; TUDOR; TALMA; BARROW and BRANCKER - 5.

NOES: Hon'bles M. E. COX; D. D. GARNER; R. G. MAPP; L. St.A. THORNE; Messrs. SEARLES; STRAUGHN and SMITH - 7.

The question that the Schedule be further amended by deleting the words "each of" appearing in the third line of paragraph four was put and resolved in the negative on the following division.

AYES: Messrs. WALCOTT; TUDOR; TALMA; BARROW and BRANCKER - 5.

NOES: Hon'bles M. E. COX; D. D. GARNER; R. G. MAPP; L. St.A. THORNE; Messrs. SEARLES; STRAUGHN and SMITH - 7.

The question that the word "month" appearing in the last line of paragraph four of the Schedule be deleted and the word "week" be substituted therefor was put and resolved in the negative the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. WALCOTT; TUDOR; TALMA; BARROW and BRANCKER - 5.

NOES: Hon'bles M. E. COX; D. D. GARNER; R. G. MAPP; L. St.A. THORNE; Messrs. SEARLES; STRAUGHN and SMITH - 7.

The question that the Schedule stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon'bles M. E. COX; D. D. GARNER; R. G. MAPP; L. St.A. THORNE; Messrs. SEARLES; STRAUGHN and SMITH - 7.

NOES: Messrs. WALCOTT; TUDOR; TALMA; BARROW and BRANCKER - 5.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

1.35 a.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 7th February, 1961, at 12 noon.

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

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

1.35 a.m.