THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14th February, 1961.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, *(Speaker);* Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, *(Leader of the Opposition);* Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., *(Premier);* Hon. M. E. COX, *(Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour);* His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., *(Deputy Speaker);* Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. F. E. MILLER, *(Minister of Social Services);* Mr. C. B. SEARLES; and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on the 7th February, 1961, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. *(A pause)*

There being no objection, these Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

Hon. D. D. GARNER entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Barbados Statistical Service - Selected Monthly Indicators - November, 1960;

Barbados Statistical Service Quarterly Digest of Statistics - No. 16 - December, 1960;

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for ten months ended 31st January, 1961;

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados, and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended on the 30th September, 1960 in respect of Schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg give notice of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to place the sum of $16,807 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61, No. 37, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Mr. TUDOR entered the House and took his seat.

QUESTIONS

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

How many, if any, miles of Tenantry Roads have been reconstructed or repaired in this Island by the Department of Highways and Transport since the present Director of Highways and Transport assumed Office?

2. Will the Minister state:-

(a) The name of each such road, and the Parish in which it is situate

(b) The length of each such road, and

(c) Costs of reconstruction or repairs of each such road?

3. Will the Minister state whether it is true that the said Director holds no Degree or other recognised academic qualification whatsoever in Civil Engineering nor Membership of any recognised Professional Institute pertaining to Road Engineering?

4. If the answer to (3) (above) is in the negative, will the Minister state fully the name and nature of such qualification or Membership?

Mr. BRANCKER: Also,

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

Has the Transport Board submitted to the Governor-in-Executive Committee its Report for the immediate past financial year, in accordance with Section 10 (4) of the Transport Board Act, 1955 (1955-37)?

2. If the answer is "Yes", will Government without delay, cause a copy of such report to be laid in accordance with the provisions of the said section?

3. If the answer is "No", will the Government take all necessary steps to ensure due compliance with the Act by this Board?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:-

Whether he is aware of the urgent necessity of installing electric fans in each of the free Wards of the General Hospital as are in need of adequate cooling or otherwise lowering the temperature in such Wards?

Mr. SEARLES TO ACT AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. James be Chairman of Committees during the absence of the Chairman of Committees.

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

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

12.25 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SEARLES being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1960-61 No. 36

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of $11,917 under various Heads of the Estimates and, as usual, each Head will be taken separately.

HEAD II — SECRETARIAT

Head II - Secretariat - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, some extensive repairs had to be done to the lift at Government Headquarters; and, as set out in the Note, the amount of these repairs cannot be met from the normal provision in the Current Estimates. The sum of $4,000 was originally voted in the Estimates under the Head "Incidentals" a further $600 was voted under Supplementary Estimates, and now an additional $202 is asked to be voted. I beg to move that Head II stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, in connection with these repairs, I am wondering if the provision for the repairs of this lift should be our responsibility, or the responsibility of the persons from whom this lift was purchased, if it was then in a proper condition. I do not know if whoever installed it did not make a proper job of it, so that so soon after its installation we are being called upon to meet the cost of these major repairs. As far as I know, there has not been any fire occurring at Government Headquarters or any stirring thing happening up there. I would like to enquire what has necessitated these major repairs; and whether these repairs should not be at the door either of the local agents for this particular lift, or at the door of the persons who installed it, although they may be the same persons. I am wondering if the Premier could assist us with any information as to the reasons for the necessity of these major repairs, so soon after the installation of this lift.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, there is nothing in the file to indicate that there was any agreement made with the agents from whom this lift was purchased. I am not saying that there is no such agreement. That lift has been operating since 1956; and while it is true that the service given by this lift is not all that could be desired, yet at this stage I do not know if any - it all depends upon the guarantee - reference was made on that point raised; nor do I know if any reference has ever been made to the agents.

At this stage, the Chairman of Committees took the Chair.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I was going on to say Mr. Chairman, that normally a thing of this sort would have been done through the Secretariat. I would have to make enquiries on the point which has been raised.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I do not know who are the makers of this lift, but in connection with any lift, after it has been in use for five years, you would be fortunate if you did not have to effect repairs. I know that it is very technical to adjust lifts in any part of the world. It is not every electrician who can be put to do the job because the mechanism is very sensitive; and it needs very careful and skilled maintenance. Lifts are becoming more and more complicated as time goes on. There was a time when these lifts were operated by operators, but now they are operated by the passengers; and that calls for qualification in the maintenance of these lifts.

The Government have an electrical department at their disposal and that department should frequently see that all lifts are properly checked. These lifts are becoming more and more numerous; people are required to use lifts. I see many of these lifts around Bridgetown out of order. As soon as a lift begins to give trouble, it is the duty of the owners or whoever is responsible, to shut it down and let everybody use the stairway. No one would ever guarantee a lift beyond one year. If this lift has been used for five years, then you would be fortunate not to have to effect repairs to a lift which has been working as extensively as that; and I think it is a reasonable expectation to have that lift overhauled.

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

12.35 p.m.

HEAD VIII - LEGAL

Head VIII – Legal – was called

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Item 9 - Cost of Living Allowance - I think you will remember that recently there has been an increase in staff in the Attorney General's Office. Two additional Stenographers have been engaged. This amount of $90 is now sought as a cost of living allowance to the end of the financial year.

With respect to Item 12 -Stationery - this amount of $45 is required to supplement the provision for newspapers, due to the increased cost. I beg to move that Head VIII - Legal - stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, of course we are supporting the passing of this amount, but once again I will remind the Hon. Premier that, just as provision is being made for additional stenographers in the Attorney General's Chambers, there are other branches of the Public Service which also need provision made for similar employees. Time and again I have reminded the Hon. Premier of this; and he has promised to give the matter his consideration, and I have no doubt that he will, but let me say a word in respect of the places where typists are most needed. Districts "D", "E" and "F" need typists; District "D" is in the parish of St. Thomas represented by the Minister of Finance, and that Court needs a typist very badly; the work in the St. Thomas Court is held up due to lack of having a

typist to do the work. You have typists at Districts "A", "B" and "C" and not at Districts "D", "E" and "F", so the alphabet extends only to "C". District "D" is represented by two Ministers including the Minister of Finance; and that word to the Hon. Premier, I am sure, will suffice for me at the next meeting of the House to express the gratitude of the Legal profession that Districts "D", "E" and "F" are no longer handicapped by not having typists as the other Districts.

The question that Head VIII – Legal stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XV - POLICE

Head XV – Police – was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Item 64 – Newspapers, Mr. Chairman, seeks the provision of $45 due to the increase in subscription to the "Advocate".

Item 85 – Medical Expenses – refers to the prescribing of medicine for Policemen. As the note explains, up to the end of November, 1960, $1,132 representing an average monthly expenditure of $142 was spent. Based on this average, the sum of $525 is required to meet expenses up to the end of the current financial year.

I do not know, Sir, if it is generally known that the prescriptions for Policemen treated at Headquarters are sent to the Hospital and filled out there. It would be most inconvenient however to send the prescriptions from the other Stations to the General Hospital, and therefore in order that they can get their medicine, an allowance is made per month to Police doctors of the several Stations. The number of Policemen for medical attention during the calendar year, 1960, was 863, made up as follows:- Bridgetown Division – 369; Northern Division – 350 and Southern Division – 144. When medicine is prescribed for the Bridgetown Division, the prescriptions are made out at the General Hospital and paid from Item 85 – Medical Expenses, at a cost of $4.

I think that the allowance of $4 in those days was very small; and medicine nowadays cost a lot of money; and it could well be increased in the coming Estimates. That is the position as it stands today. I beg to move that Head XV – Police, stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, with regard to Item 64 – Newspapers – I wonder if with this additional amount to be voted, we can be assured that every country station and every Police office in Bridgetown will be supplied with the daily newspapers.

It was only last September when I heard a high-ranking policeman, an Inspector, say that he never get an opportunity to see a daily newspaper. He pointed out that he was an Inspector and could not afford to buy an Advocate Newspaper himself, and no newspaper otherwise was available to him. He is working in the metropolitan area, very much in your constituency, Mr. Chairman, and it is really your personal affair from a certain standpoint; and not merely because this is an election year that I say that. If, as he said on oath, an Inspector cannot afford to buy a daily newspaper, what do you think of the poor Privates? They would have to form a club in order to be able to have one among a number of them.

Relative to the more important matter of Medical Expenses, I feel the time has come, in respect of dentures and spectacles for members of the Force, when certainly the lowest paid ranks should be supplied these things free of charge. Only last year I was chatting with a Private and he obviously needed a set of dentures. I asked him whether he did not feel, as a Policeman in the Government Service, that he should have an occasional extraction within the limits of his purse. He said he could not afford to get a a set of false teeth. That is a statement of fact. I have not seen him this year, and I do not know if he has been able to persuade a dentist, in view of the back pay which he may get in this election year, to let him have a new set. 12.45 p.m.

He said to me: "Well, you know, Sir, if we had got our Christmas bonus we would be able to handle a matter like that with ease." I promised him that he would get it as from the Christmas of 1961.

Sir, you will remember that in February, last year, I addressed a series of questions in connection with resignations from the Police Force, and this House was told that in the years from 1955 to 1959 not less than forty-nine men had resigned. That number has nothing to do with those who retired because of age, or on the grounds of ill-health.

We have been asked to provide an extra amount of money to be expended on medical expenses for Policemen, and that amount represents an average monthly expenditure of $142. I feel that, in order to hold the very intelligent young men who go into the Police Force, we must do everything reasonable to encourage these men to remain in the Force; and, certainly, as we are looking after certain expenditure for them now, I feel that the public purse should also take care of certain matters for Policemen such as spectacles and dentures. We want Policemen to be happy, and contented and to be in a physical good condition to perform the duties of their office. Certainly, if one's eyesight is not up to the best, one is not physically able to do the arduous duties of what is required of men in that category of life. I trust that my proposals will not fall on deaf ears.

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

HEAD XXVIII - SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

Head XXVIII – Subsidies and Grants – was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Under this Head, Subsidies and Grants, there is this new item – Item 52 (New) Barbados National Trust. The amount of $10,000 is asked for to assist the Barbados National Trust on a dollar for dollar basis in purchasing, beautifying and planting different trees in Welchman Hall Gully.

It should be remembered that there has been some talk for some time now that something of this sort should be done in cases where it is desired to preserve certain local items of historic and general interest. A certain group has been formed within recent months, having for their purpose, the perpetuating of what might be called relics of antiquity in this island. (A VOICE: Like the Conservative Party?) I would not say that! I think some of the personnel of this body are wellknown; and they are doing active work. They have decided that Welchman Hall Gully should be their first attempt; and they have approached the Government with the proposal that the Government should give some assistance. It was agreed that, on a dollar for dollar basis the Government will give them $10,000 towards the purchasing and planting of trees in this gully. They have other projects in mind, but this is the first; and I am quite sure that this community in general will be pleased to know that Welchman Hall Gully will be perpetuated; and that funds for other similar schemes which have the approval of the Committee from time to time will be forthcoming. The National Trust Committee has made an appeal through the *Advocate* for funds, and this appeal was well responded to; and the Government is now prepared to honour its part.

I beg to move that Head XXVIII stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I support this Resolution with great pleasure. The National Trust Committee was formed about a little over four months and they have got off to a good start. They have been well supported throughout the island immediately after they launched this appeal for funds to preserve these places of interest. As the Hon. Premier has said, the Government promised to match a

dollar for dollar up to $10,000 as an initial grant. So far, private subscriptions have reached either $17,000 or $18,000 and the Government has now come down with a Resolution for their $10,000.

Sir, I do not wish this Hon. Committee to feel that it is just Welchman Hall Gully in which the Trust is interested; that is the first bit of land which they are acquiring; and it is for the purpose of a Botanical Garden. It is going to take a considerable sum of money to put that in shape and to plant trees of West Indian interest. Those who know the Gully, know that there are quite a few fruit trees which are well established there. It is a good beginning; but apart from that, there are many objects of interest on the island which require preservation.

One of the outstanding things the Trust wants to preserve is the old windmill. A Committee has been appointed to tabulate the number of the walls of old windmills remaining. I think it is something over 100 remaining; and it is the intention of the Trust to put one or two in order so that during the tourist season they could be put into operation, and seen grinding sugar cane for the attraction of tourists and for those of our youngsters who have never seen a windmill in operation.

There are also some old homes of great interest; and the idea is to preserve them in their present forms; or to ask the owners to try and keep the same architectural form as exist today. Let us preserve some of the old homes which will be of interest, not only to tourists, but to Barbadians.
12.55 p.m.

There are many such things which need to be preserved in Barbados and unless a body takes steps to do it, they will disappear. Today, there are many sales at old homes, the furniture of which is bought by wealthy Americans or Canadians and shipped out of the island; it would be the duty of the Trust to acquire at these sales, some of these old bits of furniture, keep them in the island, and preserve them either at the Museum or at these same homes. That is done in the United States of America; and people from all over the world go to see how people used to live one hundred or two hundred years ago. We want to achieve the same thing in Barbados. I commend this matter to the Committee; I know it will meet with ready response not only in Bridgetown, but in the country as well. As other things of value go on the market, I am sure that the Government will be just as generous with their offer as they are now in respect of Welchman Hall.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the passing of this Resolution. I regard it as a very laudable and commendable act on the part of this body of persons who will, in future, be known as the Barbados National Trust. I am hoping that this Barbados National Trust will be properly constituted, and will comply with the terms of the Trust in all of the various requirements. It is intended to set up this National Trust by way of statutory authority; in other words, there will be a Statutory Corporation. Speaking for myself, I do not know who the organisers of this Trust happens to be, but I presume, from the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down, that there are men of the right calibre who will see not only to the Welchman Hall area which will serve as botanical gardens but to the development of other areas as well. In all the other West Indian Islands there are botanical gardens of some standing; but in Barbados, little England, as it is liked to be known, has fallen short of any places of historical interest.

In England, as hon. members know, there are quite a number of museums, botanical gardens, parks, public places and Trusts, but this is the first time within living memory that a National Trust is being set up here. This is a very commendable act; and will be a very commendable achievement when it is finally established. Although there are numerous pressing problems and pressing needs for which this money could be earmarked and voted, yet this $10,000 cannot be regarded as a waste of money or as money being thrown down the drain. This will tend to improve the tourist trade, in that it will be offering to tourists mainly, and to Barbadians or West Indians generally, some new form of attraction. Apart from our sea-bathing, there is hardly much more which we have to offer; but with the establishment of this natural park in the gully, a long felt want will be supplied. It is to be hoped that this body of persons will go forward and establish other places in the near future.

The Government is really granting $10,000 to an Organisation or Trust which does not exist; that is the only irregularity which I see in the whole matter. Probably the Government will withhold this money, and it is only asking for the money until the necessary legislation has been passed for the setting up of this Statutory Organisation. We are voting money for something which is not yet in existence, but which is laudable to all intents and purposes. With those remarks, I beg to support the passing of this Resolution although it is a little irregular.

Mr. WALCOTT: In agreeing with a number of things in principle, you have to examine them. I believe that Barbados, like all small communities, speak of people of calibre; but when you speak of such people, do you speak of their ability to do an outstanding job or make a contribution to science? Or is it that somebody, because he or she happens to be somebody's son or daughter, you regard them as people of calibre? I do not belong to that group which describes people of calibre in that way.

What is evident to me is that the Government is quite ready and willing to lend aid to people of the character of which the hon. senior member for Christ Church has spoken; but when it is a question of other people, to Government, they are not people of calibre. I am saying that if other people are doing a job which is worthwhile, even if they are barefoot people, or are considered as people of low degree, and they are doing a good job, the Government should say that these people are doing a good job.
1.05 p.m.

There is no point in the Government saying that they are so cultural today, and that they see the aesthetic and national value of these things, when they do not see the lawns in front of the Law Courts; it is as filthy as anything. They did not think of doing something to preserve the grass that was allowed to grow right there in the heart of the City; so that right in your eyes, you would make a beautiful spot in front of the Court, and keep the area by the Library in an excellent condition.

This country is developing, and we should be utilitarian in our approach. We may be making these preservations, but let us preserve people first; because, you cannot preserve a National Park for monkeys or animals; you have to preserve it for people; and if you are going to preserve a Park and allow human beings to die, you would have Parks looked over by graveyards. We have reached the stage where more sumpathy should be given to projects which aim at the social development of this country. When people have to stand in the bus-stand, they should not have to do so in the rain. In the country areas, nobody has dreamed of putting up proper shelters for people waiting on buses, though there are a few in Bridgetown. This expenditure of $10,000 would have made Bathsheba into a boulevard and something really worthwhile. If you drive over the country and go to Bathsheba, you will see people throwing stuff on the beach.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to steal anybody's thunder, but there is Rockley which you bought for a lot of money. It is now covered with wild bush. You have three Councils, the Northern Council, the Southern Council and the City Council, and you should give them more authority and power to do some of the things which you are now doing; because, normally, many of these things are not done by the Central Government at all. You have Queen's Park itself with a dry lake. What could be more beautiful than having something done to the lake and replacing water in it - like when I was a boy? One of my happiest experiences in going into the Park and seeing the turtles and so on, was that you must fall into the lake as a boy. I am sure the Hon. Minister of Health remember that in those days going into the Park was one of the

grandest things to which we looked forward; and a fall in the lake at times! *(Laughter)*. There were also swingers, and you were restricted from going on them by the girls; those were the days we knew. To us, as boys, when we knew that we were not going home at half-day, going into the Park was one of the biggest events in our lives. Why is the Park not preserved?

In agreeing to this National Trust, I want to say that we have reached the stage in Barbados where we should not allow people to come here and do these things for us; people should not have to come here to tell us what is necessary for our own homeland; I would say that it is about an indigenous matter; and it seems to me lacking in some of the basic qualities of self-government when you are not even capable of thinking for yourselves what is the best for your own country.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that what I say is not taken as a criticism of this measure; but there are so many other things that are lacking, we should point the way especially since the Government is agreeable to spending $10,000 on this project. But what about the other places which I have just mentioned which you can beautify at a small cost? Nobody worries about them; and that is why I said there are many places in this island which can be beautiful apart from the Botanical Gardens. Barbados could be one of the most beautiful places if we were prepared to make it beautiful; and if we are going to allow somebody from outside to tell us how to preserve our beauty spots, and have no sense of our own values, then we will be always in this position.

In the City Council, you have the Mayor, and there is a Chairman to each of the Northern and Southern Councils, and through them we should be able to find clean streets and cities where there is no throwing of stuff on the streets where it can blow about. The Mayor who in the old days was referred to as the Churchwarden, thought it a good thing to put proper stuff receptacles and have trucks for making the cleaning of streets more modern; but I feel that the Government should see to it, Mr. Chairman, that some of these public places are kept clean. The only public place which is a credit to the Government for the way it is kept is the Government Headquarters on Bay Street, and it is time that all these things, just like in front of the Education Department, which are ugly, should be dealt with. In any country where the young see that tidiness is a matter of public behaviour, they themselves would grow up to engender that feeling.

I support the idea of assisting such persons who see the need for this sort of work; but, in addition to that, I also see the need for a greater part being played by those whose responsibility it is in the other aspects of our cultural and aesthetic life.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think, Sir, that I should lend my support to this Resolution. I think it is a worthwhile and admirable beginning. In spite of the observations and criticism which we may make, we can very well say that we commend those persons who thought out this idea; and we also commend the Government for so willingly coming to their assistance.

We hope that this body known as the National Trust will not merely stop at establishing at botanical garden. There are other places of interest in this island, Mr. Chairman; those of us who travel will appreciate Barbados more when we go abroad. Like the hon. member who has just sat down, I can only say that while we support very warmly today this Resolution - although the hon. member for Christ Church said that we are supporting something in the Resolution which does not exist; we have confidence that it can be done in a correct and proper manner - five years ago I pointed out that in the area by the Public Library where you have buses coming in from the northern part of the island, and where you find hundreds of people waiting for buses on evenings, there was no place to shelter if there was rain; and I suggested then that there should be shelter of some sort at that point.

1.15 p.m.

I suppose that, as long as I suggested it, you will not get the Minister building a shelter. These things will haunt him, I suppose; and I also suppose that my own name will haunt him.

The hon. member on my immediate right said that what can be more disgraceful than to keep the Rockley Beach Land in that condition. It has been suggested to approach the Government to see what could be done about it. It is such a lovely spot in my opinion, I feel it should be promptly cleaned up, some bathing sheds put there, and it could be also illuminated so that people can go there, bathe, have their picnics and the like.

I heartily support the passing of the Resolution. I do hope that what the hon. senior member for St. Peter and myself have said about the lawn by the Public Library, and also that land which you paid a lot of money for at Rockley, will be paid attention to. I do hope that the Committee would draw these things to your attention; and that you will not say that they were only drawn to your attention by that Committee.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I think it was Sir Winston Churchill who said that people who find that they have no history to look back on and to preserve, might also find that they have no future to look forward to. I am not saying that those are the precise words, and I do not even venture to say that those remarks are entirely incontestable, but they are food for thought.

Really, as far as this National Trust is concerned, it is one of the things which we can give our support because of our need for social development. I noticed that a similar phrase was used by the hon. senior member for St. Peter; therefore, it means that it is the general feeling of hon. members of this House that there is need for social development in this island. In giving our support to a venture like this, we must consider it not as the be-all and the end-all of our social development, but as part of our pattern which we have on general development. I am particularly interested in the social development of our community, and I say, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter suggested, that we of the Northern District Council would be making it one of the highlights of our policy; and even although we might not have all the finances by which we can carry out all these matters entirely at one time, I wonder whether at times we do not consider finance to be our master rather than our servant. By giving support to this matter under consideration, we would also be putting our energy into such schemes of development. This matter will also have our sympathy and support.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I certainly cannot disagree with this Resolution. I have listened to various hon. members who have spoken on this matter, and one of the chief things which worries me is the national duty towards animal and plant life. I have been into Queen's Park and I must confess that I have not seen many animals there. I have seen two or three monkeys there, and I saw a man with a few banana skins giving them to the monkeys; I do not know if a few banana skins are enough to keep monkeys alive. A monkey in an island is one of the greatest animals which you can think about; because, if at any time there is an outbreak of yellow fever, it attacks the monkeys first. Therefore, when we see monkeys dying out quickly after each other, we know that fever is here.

We come back to the different things, like gardens which we should upkeep so as to attract tourists. This Government should try to establish a properly kept garden at Queen's Park as well as at the other community centres in each parish. I hope that they have that object in view. Welchman Hall Gully is a gully which I have known for many years; and it is to be noted that only four months after the National Trust was formed, the Government is willing to grant that Committee money for the upkeep of this gully. There are some fruit trees such as spice, guava, pear and other perennial trees. We also have there monkeys, bats and different kinds of animals.

However, I would like to know why the Government has responded so soon to this project when there are other

projects to which they should have given prior attention. There are other attractive places in this island which need more development than Welchman Hall; therefore, I would be glad if this Government would pay attention to other parts of this island and have them put in order so that they can be of more attraction to tourists. You do not want better places as beauty spots of this island than Mount Hillaby and Chalky Mount; they are the best places which tourists would like to visit. Make proper roads leading to them so that tourists would be able to go there and view the island. Have a couple of roads built to these places, and after that we can think of other projects. That is the only possible means of encouraging tourists in Barbados. If this Government exists, or if another Government comes into power, I will always ask that something be done with roads leading to these places as soon as possible.

Lt. Col. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the whole of Barbados will soon be a National Trust. 1.25 p.m.

We started with Welchman Hall Gully, and we went to Rockley Beach; we came back to the Law Courts, and then we went to the monkeys in the Park. It is fantastic to me to believe that these relics of antiquity could ever be upkept, if we are going to undertake the whole island, as it seems to me is the feeling of a number of hon. members of this Hon. House. I rise merely to say that the overwhelming accord with which this Resolution has been met, motivates me to sound a note of warning. I am not interested in whether the persons who started this matter happen to be barefoot or up in the trees; whether they are up in the trees or barefoot I commend them, because I think this is a very worthy start, and it is something which could gain the support of a number of people locally. On the other hand, the Government have now become partners in this Trust, or they are about to become partners in it, to the tune of $10,000.

I should like to say that Welchman Hall Gully will not take two cents to keep it in order, neither is the erection of any windmill going to take two cents. I know that the National Trusts in England now are causing great concern on account of the large amount of money which is required to keep them up. It is all well and good to start off these things, but what really counts is the maintenance of them. I sincerely hope that this Government will not be called upon constantly for the maintenance of these ambitious escapades, such as monkeys in the Park, Chalky Mount and a few other things like that. I hope that the Government and the persons concerned will be well advised to watch their maintenance costs, in order for this community to maintain a few, not necessarily large numbers, of things as seem to be proposed here today.

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

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX – Miscellaneous Services – was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, under this Head there is a new Item "V.H.F. Equipment". This amount of $980, which is being asked for, is required to purchase Very High Frequency equipment. As a matter of fact, this is a re-vote from last year because the equipment did not arrive during the financial year. I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am not at all contesting either this Resolution or the amount which has been asked for. I should just like to ask one question. I notice that the appropriate Minister, the Minister of Communications, is not in his place, I want to ask whether similar equipment will be used on the new tug which, I understand, is on dock at the moment due to an accident.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I cannot give the hon. member the information. I will pass the matter on to the proper quarter.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of $11,917 do now pass.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

STATEMENT BY PREMIER re SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before you call the next Order of the Day, I am asking leave to make a Statement in connection with some questions asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition a few Tuesdays ago.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Premier to make a Statement.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the Statement is as follows:-

The following information is supplied in connection with questions asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition during the debate on Tuesday, 24th January, 1961, on Supplementary Estimates 1960-61 No. 31:

HEAD XV - POLICE

Item 43 – Bicycles

There are 63 bicycles in use by the Police Department.

Item 60 – Radio Telephony

The following is a sample of the correct and incorrect readings:-

	Correct	*Incorrect*
August - September, 1959	1760	176
October - November, 1959	2030	203
December, 1959 - January, 1960	1900	190
February - March, 1960	1850	185

After additional equipment was provided a new meter was also installed by the Light & Power Company and the incorrect reading was then discovered.

The consumption of electricity rose by about 500 units for a two month period, i.e. from 1500 to 2000, which would mean a 33 1/3 per cent increase.

It appears that the meter was incorrectly read by a member of the Company's staff.
1.35 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, may I thank the Hon. Premier for supplying the information about which I hope, on another appropriate occasion, to have an opportunity of making further comment?

THE WAGES COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) 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 amend the Wages Council Act, 1955.

Hon. M. E. COX: This Bill as hon. members will see, is to amend the Wages Council Act, 1955. The amendments are minor, but very important at this stage. In the first place there is an amendment to subsection 4 of Section 11. This Section is repealed, and the subsection substituted therefor is to delete the word "shall" where it appears; and that "shall" refers as you know, Sir, to the position of the Governor-in-Executive Committee when the Wages Council recommends to the Government the wages that should be paid to workers in that particular industry. The word "shall" will be replaced by the word "may".

Further on, the other amendment is to reduce the period within which the recommendations are made or published in the Press from twenty-one days to fourteen days when the recommendations are resubmitted to the Wages Council. Now, Mr. Speaker, that arose out of a very unfortunate situation, which is existing at present, among the workers in the shirt industry. Some time in 1958 — I think as far back as February — after a survey was made and a thorough investigation carried out into the wages paid and conditions of work of these workers, the Government was satisfied that in many respects and in certain categories or grades of employees in this industry, the wages paid were ridiculously low; and as a result, Mr. Speaker, Government set up under the Act a Wages Council to go into these wages. This is one of the cases where the workers are not members of the Union; and, as a result of having nobody else to represent them, the Government had to set up this Board to fix these wages. A recommendation was made by the Wages Council after approximately two years to provide for a minimum of $5 for women and $7 for men.

The Government regarded those recommendations as ridiculously low, and referred the recommendations back to the Wages Council for further consideration. The Wages Council sat on it again, but referred the same recommendation back to the Government.

I want to say quite frankly that I would never associate myself in these times to anything like a minimum wage of $5 a week; but the peculiar wording of the Act apparently made it incumbent upon the Governor-in-Executive Committee to agree to the wages recommended by the Wages Council. I discussed the matter with the Attorney General; and I said in no uncertain manner that I was not prepared to accept the recommendations as proposed by the Wages Council. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it was necessary to amend the Act — that was the legal advice — so as to remove that operative word "shall" and replace it by the word "may", which means that any recommendations made by a Wages Council need not be accepted by the Government, but can be referred 100 times. That is the position of this amendment in a nutshell.

I did read a letter in the Press this morning referring to shop attendants; and cases have been reported to me from time to time where certain employers are honouring the law more in the breach than in the observance; because, since these wages for shop assistants have been published and have become law, a few employers have done everything possible to get around these wages as recommended by law. I have heard of a very bad case, and I have names which I may have to call at a later stage. The law lays it down that anyone who works in or around a shop is a shop assistant; but there are people who put up barriers between one section of their business and another in order to get around the Act, and have not been paying, up to the last time I had information on this particular case, the wages as recommended. Mr. Speaker, I have drawn this to the attention of the Department; and I have advised one or two people to put employers in Court; but, apparently they are still hesitant, because they know that it is difficult after taking such steps to get a job again.

1.45 p.m.

In some of these cases, people who claim to be doing better than that, and who ought to know better, and are the first to criticise the Government on its wages policy, are indulging in that sort of thing. I say no more than that.

It will surprise hon. members to know that at least 50% of the people in these industries are getting wages between $5.00 and $7.00 per week. Our reports have revealed that. What is regrettable is the fact that after this was drawn to the attention of the Wages Council, the Council sat on this matter; and, of course, it was within their right to send back the recommendations as was first submitted to the Government. In some cases, the minimum was $1.00 per day. I do not care two hoots who accuses me of politics when I make speeches in this House; I do not care who says that it is a political speech, or that my speech is such and such because of the coming election and all that sort of nonsense. The Government has a programme to put through, and whenever the time comes it is prepared to put it through. If you repair a road in this village at this time, people will say that is was done because it is election year; if you put in a standpipe, they are going to accuse you of doing it because it is election year. They are so conscious of the fact that they did nothing when they were in power that, whenever we do anything, they say it is political. I can assure you that the people like that political way; and not only like it, but appreciate it also, because it is doing for them something which is sadly lacking and which should have been done for them many, many years ago.

I once heard the stupid nonsense in here that the Government had resigned, and therefore, the Government could not go on. I never yet heard such a silly argument in my life. The people who said so on that side of the House did not realise that the Queen's work must be done and must be carried on. (A VOICE: Who did not know that?)

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister refers to the fact that those people when they were in power did not do anything, and then referred to the fact that members on this side did not know in 1958 that when the Legislature comes to an end that the Queen's work must go on. I do not know whom he means when he says members on that side, but members of our Party knew that. These are the things which we knew long ago.

Hon. M. E. COX: The debates of this House will show whom I mean. However, Sir, as I was saying, as far as this item is concerned, it is better that we have an order to assist these workers in the shirt and garment industry. We have had to bring in this Bill to amend the principal Act to the extent that we would be able in the future to have this matter again referred to the Wages Council. As I have said earlier, we are not accepting any $5.00 a week as any minimum; that might be good enough for 1888 but not today; but as the law stands at present we will have to accept it.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to say much more on this question at this stage; I can well imagine that some hon. members will be ready and willing to say "let us go into it a little further at a later stage." With those remarks, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, with a Bill like this you would have expected that the Government would have asked the Trade Union for its views. I do not know who is advising the Hon. Minister, but he knows more of the Trade Union than I know!

Sir, you can very well remember your own past experience not too long ago in negotiating for these people. The Hon. Minister says that these people are not in the Trade Union. Let me say that the Trade Union represents all workers, but all workers may not be members of the Trade Union. In this House of Assembly, the Hon. Minister has a fancy of saying that everybody did not vote for them but they are representing everybody. He makes the mistake in thinking that they represent the whole island.

The Hon. Minister talks this nonsense about election year. Of course, this is election year; but I am saying that you have brought this down without asking the Union anything about it or what were its views on it. Why bring down this bit of nonsense? It is not as important as the Workmen's Compensation Bill.
1.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I should like to ask the hon. member to rise sometimes to manhood. The hon. member knows that the Workmen's Compensation Bill is a very comprehensive Bill; I have said that time and time again. Further, I have to have a discussion with him and the employers on that Bill before I bring it down here. And since I have had information from the Assistant Labour Adviser to the Secretary of State for the Colonies which makes me change my mind, I have to have a discussion with the hon. member. What did the hon. member do when he was in charge?

Mr. WALCOTT: When I was in charge of what? I was never a Minister. At anytime when legislation of this nature comes here I will say what I have to say. The Workmen's Compensation Bill is before the House, but it is nothing; you have to withdraw that Bill because it has no right being introduced. The Assistant Labour Adviser to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, my mate! I do not need anybody like that to advise me. Do you think that she is more important than we are? If she is, then let her come here and run this country.

When it comes to the question of Wages Councils, the hon. member has the view of the Trade Union already. The Wages Councils Act, 1955, Section 11 (3) states this:-

"Before submitting any wages regulations proposals to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, a wages council shall make such investigations as it thinks fit, and shall publish in such manner as shall be prescribed by regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee hereunder notice of the proposals stating the place where copies of the proposals may be obtained and the period, which shall be not less than twenty-one days from the date of the first publication of the notice."

The Wages Councils must decide that they will put up five dollars or two dollars a week; they have to publish these things in the newspaper saying what they propose to put up to the Executive Committee and see if anybody has any objection to it. They published these rates and the Workers' Union objected to them. When the hon. member says that the Workers' Union does not represent the workers.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to quote what was mentioned?

Mr. SPEAKER: After the suspension of the sitting. It now being 2 p.m. of the clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention that there is no quorum present. I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. I understand that there are no answers to Oral Questions ready. The House will proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re SINGLE MEMBER CONSTITUENCIES

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution *re* Single Member Constituencies and the appointment of a Commission with respect thereto.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution which stands in my name, and of which I now formally beg to move the passing, reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the necessity for establishment of Single Member Constituencies in this Island has become increasingly apparent, particularly in view of the imminence of the next General Election;

AND WHEREAS the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain has appointed a Boundaries Commission consisting of a Judge of the High Court of Justice as a single Commissioner to fix British Guiana's Poll Boundaries;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Government seek to avail itself of the services of this Commissioner or any other qualified person for the purpose of delimiting constituency boundaries in time for the next General Election here.

Mr. Speaker, it was only towards the end of last Session that I discussed this matter of single member constituencies quite exhaustively; as well as other hon. members of this Chamber, of course, who participated in the debate. There could be no doubt that, up to now, there has not been advanced any valid argument against this Resolution; no intelligible argument has yet been raised against the question of instituting single member constituencies. It is well known that we are one of the very, very few places, and the only allegedly politically awake part of the British Commonwealth, which is still functioning without the institution of such constituencies.

Let me say this at once so as to disabuse the minds of certain persons who do not seem to follow or understand the implications: in so far as this Resolution is concerned, it speaks only of and therefore refers only to single member constituencies; this is nothing to do with the increase of seats in the General Assembly. It may well be, and few will disagree, that the most appropriate time to consider whether there should be more seats in the General Assembly, whether the number should be increased from twenty-four members to thirty or thirty-six, whether that matter should not also be considered and decided upon, is the same time when we are considering a division of the constituencies.
2.35 p.m.

This Resolution is an invitation to the Government to avail itself of the services of some qualified person for the purpose of delimiting single member constituency; in other words, to make it lucidly clear that the parish of St. Lucy, like every parish or constituency in this Island, provides for representation by two persons.

Mr. Speaker, as you will well remember, - it is unfortunate that other members of this Chamber, particularly the Ministers, do not possess memories photographic like yourself - the Resolution we discussed last Session was no different from this Resolution so far as that is concerned. This will do nothing to interfere with the present number of members of each constituency. All this will do is to divide each constituency into two, whether St. Lucy West and St. Lucy East, or St. James North and St. James South; and that which, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, might not find disfavour in your own eyes - the parish of St. Peter being on the one hand the town of Speightstown and on the other hand the rural area of that parish. One could not imagine anybody invading that parish of St. Peter if it was so divided, knowing how well the hon. junior member for St. Peter stays in Speightstown, and how Gibraltar-like is the hon. senior member outside of that urban area. That is all that would result from the passing of this particular Resolution and the putting into operation of it. There would

be the same number for each constituency, and the same total number of seats. That would have nothing to do with the retrograde move which one hears mentioned every now and again, of having a nominated Speaker.

We respect you, Mr. Speaker, not only because you are Speaker, but because you have to fight for a seat like all of us; and then when the twenty-four of us have fought and gained seats, we then elect one of our own whom we think most suited, best-qualified, and who is willing to assume the Chair of this Chamber. A nominated Speaker would be a most retrograde move; a word to the wise is enough. I would not like to think that the members of the Cabinet are so unaware of the desires and aspirations of some of their less highly placed Party members, even in this Chamber, that a nominated Speaker is desired in certain quarters, thereby providing an extra seat. Now we know, Mr. Speaker, and the people of St. Peter know, and I am surprised if other members particularly of the Party opposite are unaware, and all of them are not unaware.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member mentions the people of St. Peter of whom I am one, I can assure him that I am completely unaware.

Mr. BRANCKER: That is the advantage, Mr. Speaker, in your position similar to that of a judicial officer not listening to rumour, of hearing anything, or of learning anything which is not brought officially to your notice. "A wise old owl lived in an oak, the more he heard the less he spoke; the less he spoke the more he heard; would that there be more of us like that wise old bird!"

You, Mr. Speaker, are Mr. Speaker twenty-four hours of every day; and if you have not heard (Mr. SPEAKER: I have read, not heard.) And you have been advised, Mr. Speaker, that what one reads in the *Advocate* is never true; and of course in respect of certain other papers, they are not read at all!

If it is true that between now and the next General Election there will be proposed additional seats for certain constituencies, to bring the number up to thirty-six – St. Michael, Christ Church, the City, St. Philip and St. George – let the members of the Government understand that our attitude towards it will be that of uncompromising, relentless hostility and opposition, unless.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Surely, the hon. member could enlighten us because that again is totally unknown, I am sure, to any of us. I do not know if that is hatched from his fertile brain.

Mr. BRANCKER: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, our attitude towards it will be that of uncompromising, relentless hostility unless either before, or simultaneously, there is instituted a system of single member constituencies. In as much as there was no point of order made, but merely a request for information, I certainly am not at this stage disposed to supplying that information of which the hon. member should be so well aware; because, I heard it from a very leading member of their Party.

Our attitude in this matter, Mr. Speaker, is, if you propose increasing on a population basis, that you should maintain as your minimum for a constituency the two members which exist today. It would be unfair, and I would say unwholesome and unhealthy politically, to take away from any of the six or seven more thinly peopled areas, 50% of the numerical political representation which they today possess. You will maintain your two seats in St. Lucy, St. Andrew, St. Joseph, St. Thomas, St. James, St. Peter; but divide, as I said, St. James into North of Holetown and St. James South to the St. Michael border, depending on what the Commissioner or Commissioners recommended and you accepted.
2.45 p.m.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, single member constituencies met with the approval of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies who was over here last year; and met with his approval because it was so long established in democratic countries, that he was obviously surprised that there was an apparent reluctance to putting it into effect in this island. He regarded it as a matter not worthy of argument since it was clear and fundamental that, in these days in every democratic community, single member constituencies must obtain. We, of the Democratic Labour Party, when we had our interview with him, found out, in advocating this measure, that we were speaking to the converted. It has been so in England from time immemorial; and there is no constitution which claims political advancement, other than ours, in which single member constituencies do not obtain.

I trust that Your Honour has been able to hear me because there has been a certain amount of cross talk from across the other side of the Table; so much so, I was not able to hear myself at times; but I know how worried some of my friends on the opposite side are about single member constituencies. Some of them feel that they may possibly be able to slip themselves back in, but will not be able to take with them their colleagues whom they want to take. It is not for me to say whether A carries B or B carries C; I am not in a position to say that; but I know that there is a strong feeling among hon. members on the opposite side, especially in those cases where there are two members of the Government Party representing the same constituency, that if both do not go as a result of the implementation of single member constituencies, then one must go. I know how they feel, and I sympathise with them.

This is a matter which requires quick action in order that these boundaries may be delimited in time for the next General Elections which, as present indications are, will be taking place in the summer of this year. Of course, I would be glad if they take place before. Action should be taken on this without further procrastination.

It was stated in this House before the 1951 General Elections by the now Federal Prime Minister, that he regarded this as a matter which should be put before the electorate as part of his party programme. That stage, as Your Honour knows, was followed by the 1956 General Elections; and you were aware, Sir, as hon. members were reminded, of the reference in the Speech from the Throne to single member constituencies. I was able to refer as far back as 1956, and reference was made by the Hon. Mr. McLeod to such a reference in the speech from the Throne in 1958. One of the significant omissions, one of the many and extraordinary omissions from the latest speech from the Throne, is the complete absence of such a reference. It is for them to say that the Government is in favour or not in favour with single member constituencies; but it seems that the Government seems not to express their point of view on such matters of public importance, and that they are looking at single member constituencies from a matter of political expediency.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sure that when I spoke on behalf of the Government on the last occasion, I made it clear that this Government was not in favour of any nonsense of single member constituencies.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, I am glad to hear him say that this Government is not in favour of any nonsense of single member constituencies. Will he say whether there is any intention of increasing the membership of the House? However, let us have our nonsense of single member constituencies; let us have a Boundary Commission here to recommend delimiting of the boundaries for the purpose of single member constituencies. (Hon. M. E. COX: I say we are not doing it.) I wonder whether the hon. member knows when he says: "We are not doing it" that there are hon. members of that Party who have talked in an entirely different manner from him.

It may well be that the proper course may be not to seek assistance of any outsider, that is to say, any person without the Caribbean at all. I do not even think it necessary that we should have a Judge of the High Courts of Justice in England, distinguished and capable as such a man would be; because, as I have said last year, we have in this island at the moment some eminent and thoroughly able

retired Chief Judges anyone of whom would be quite capable; and it would not be a surprise if they were prepared to assist the Government of this island, or would give as good assistance to the Government as the Judge of High Courts of Justice in England in dividing the island on a proper basis into single member constituencies. I only need to remind this Chamber of the retired Chief Justice of British Honduras, the Hon. C. W. W. Greenidge, M.L.C. B.Sc, LL.B, and Sir Frank Wilfred Holder, B.A., former Chief Justice of British Guiana, a man who has had considerable, intimate and practical experience of constituencies in this island. Both of them are so remote from local party warfare, but so fully apprised of local conditions, geographical as well as historical, as to be eminently suitably qualified for the post of Joint Commissioners in respect of such delimiting of constituency boundaries as this Resolution envisages.
2.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, if on the other hand, like the Jamaica Government, our present Cabinet supports the idea of a referendum, we would be only too willing to give our support to the idea of the institution of such referendum whereby the people would, before the next General Election, express their point of view in respect of and *apropos* to, the establishment of single member constituencies and the abolition of the present dual member constituencies. If the Government is not prepared at one sweep to take steps for the establishment of single member constituencies, we suggest to them as an alternative, rather than carry on as we are doing now, that they submit the matter immediately to referendum to be decided by the vote of a majority of those who participate in the taking of this referendum.

At this stage, I do not think I need add anything more to what I have said. There is no argument, no valid, sensible, logical, intelligent or cogent argument against the institution of single member constituencies. I beg to move the passing of that Resolution which I read at the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need detain the House too long in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution. Not only have most of our views been put forward during the last session but I myself, who seconded the motion moved by the same hon. member on that occasion, gave my views *in extenso* on the matter. If I rise now to second the motion it is because, of course, I am still supporting the motion in its terms and its context; and also because since we last discussed this Resolution, we have had the opportunity of examining in some detail and at great length the objections of the Government as expressed through the mouth of the Minister of Trade who was the spokesman for the Government on that occasion.

So far as my memory serves me, the burden of the Minister's speech on that occasion was that this proposal, coming as it did from this side of the House, was an attempt to stab the electorate in the back. The implication was that it was not a proposal which could be discussed on its merits and argued about in good faith; but that it was some underhand, disdainful measure designed in some way (Hon. M. E. COX: Sinister!) sinister, the hon. member now says, to rob people of what is theirs by right. Not much time had elapsed since we heard his speech, when the head of the Party gave his opinion at the Party in terms which must have staggered even his warmest supporters. We were made to understand that it was not so much the merits or the demerits of the proposed electoral reform, but it was a question as to whether it would help the Labour Party. If it was to the advantage of the Labour Party then it could be done, but if it was not to their advantage, then it should not be done.

Much as I deplore that attitude, it is one which I can understand; coming from the mouth of the head of that Party, it gave us the clearest indication of the Party's attitude. One assumes that the head of the Party was speaking authoritatively, that the attitude of the Party towards this matter of single member constituencies was not a question of merits or demerits, but it was a question of their private political advantage or disadvantage. I am entitled to draw that conclusion because I have not heard that the statement by the head of the Party has yet been repudiated by any member of the Party, whether by those who run the Government or those who do not; so that we have it from Sir Grantley Adams, the Spokesman for the Labour Party on this matter.

It must be known to everybody in this House that, if it were ever a fact that political parties or politicians could consult only their own immediate selfish advantage before pronouncing judgment on a measure, very few political schemes would succeed; because, by implication, other people would do the same thing and there would be no room for a decision on the merits of an issue. Their selfish political advantage may well have its attractions against anything where community issues are concerned.

When the hon. Mover of this motion was making his speech, in the course of his remarks he said that all the arguments for the institution of single member constituencies had been put forward and could not be overturned; the Minister of Trade, who is the Leader of the House, shouted across *sotto voce* and said that he would like to hear some arguments against the present system. Well, I can give him my argument against the present system. Parliamentary democracy rests on the system that in a Parliament it is the people who are represented and not communities. That is the fundamental principle of Parliamentary democracy.

Of course, there is another principle on which we need not labour here; that is that no Government could really be sillier than the people who elected it. However, we are not now dealing with that aspect of the matter; we are dealing with the aspect that it is the people in Parliament who are represented and not communities. If you disagree with that, nobody can quarrel with the Government for not changing the system; if you hold, as we do, that it is the individual and people who are represented in Parliament, well then, the principle of one vote, one man and one value is the logical result. If in St. Michael you have 35,000 people who are entitled to vote, and in St. Lucy you will have 5,000..... The figure is really under five thousand, but let us use five thousand so as to keep it to the round figure.
3.05 p.m.

Now suppose every single person in any election in St. Michael turned out to vote and recorded his or her vote; and suppose similarly every single person in St. Lucy turned out to vote and recorded his or her vote; don't you see, Mr. Speaker, that it takes seven times the effort to elect a member or members for St, Michael as it does for St. Lucy or any such parish? In other words, without even any question of taking away representation from those who already have it, we now have a situation in which some who have it have it seven times more than others who have it. In other words, a vote in St. Lucy for no logical reason is worth seven times a vote in St. Michael. (Hon. M. E. COX: What is wrong with that?) It cuts across the principle of one man, one vote, one value. It is true, of course, that is some parishes like St. Lucy it is cast a little bit more intelligently, but that is not the issue under dispute. The issue is, and I am always drawing this to the attention of the hon. member, that his very presence in this House is a case in our favour; because, there are members sitting around this Table who have been elected with far less votes than he has.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he may argue that it takes 10,000 votes to put him in here for St. Michael because there are more voters in St. Micheal; but why should it be so? Is anybody in this island a voter different from anybody else? We have abolished the property qualification on the ground, and rightly so, that wealth, power and position should not prevent a person from exercising his vote or should not give him undue political influence. All of the developments in the direction of equalising the vote have been developments which have been given more and more explicit demonstration of the democratic ideal that it is individuals who are to be represented; but if a vote somewhere is worth seven times the value of a vote elsewhere,

you are not giving the fullest possible expression of the democratic ideal in the case of the people among whom it takes more of them to do the same thing than it takes in another part. Even if it is true - I am not yet convinced - that somewhere else in the world this same practice continues, that is no reason why it should continue here; in Barbados, with out long tradition of representative Government, we should be the easiest and the first people to grasp these principles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will again be the Government's spokesman because he was on the first occasion; and he is fond of quoting authority to support his arguments; so I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to the view of Sir Ivor Jennings as expressed in a little book which he has written on this and other matters called "The Queen's Government", a book which I may say is a book prescribed for study for Fifth Form pupils who are doing British Constitution at the Ordinary Level of the General Certificate of Education. On page 80 there is a chapter on "The Queen in Parliament", and this is what it says:

"If the Colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady were sisters under the skin each ought to have one vote: but until 1948 some people had two votes, though in different constituencies.

Moreover, the idea of political equality necessarily implied that each vote should have the same value. If Bath and Bristol, Lancashire and Rutlandshire, each had two seats, the votes were obviously of unequal value. If there were four times as many electors in Bristol as there were in Bath, each vote in Bath was worth four times as much as a vote in Bristol. The idea of the representation of communities had therefore to disappear. The largest counties and boroughs had to be divided into single-member constituencies. This process was begun in 1885 but it was not completed until 1948. Since then the principle of 'one man - or woman - one vote, one value' has been carried out almost - though not completely - logically."

I could not have stated it as concisely or as succinctly as that. Here the argument is plain. There is no merit in any scheme for electoral reform which takes away representation from people who already have it; and that has never been advocated or could never be; but there is merit in the argument which strives to equalise the value of votes in several constituencies; and it is no longer a matter of who will benefit or what the possible results in any election might be. It may well be as has happened time and again in history, that the political party in Government which is bold enough to carry out a reform sometimes profits by it. It sometimes happens that they do not. In 1867 it was Mr. Disraeli's Conservative Government which enfranchised the county householder; there was a general election a year or so after and Mr. Disraeli thought that in view of the fact that he had given the people the vote, he would cash in on it, but he didn't. And it worked the other way around when, a few years from then, Mr. Gladstone lowered the franchise thinking he would benefit; but the Opposition Party benefited. Those are two examples to show that you cannot really assess these problems from the narrow range and gauge of political advantage. When young women got the vote from Mr. Baldwin, they promptly went and turned him out. I do not know what will happen in this case; but I do know it will make for greater political equality if the change comes about.

When the Government is addressing itself to this problem, I would really like to hear whether they do not agree with the principle of one man, one vote, one value. I would like to understand from them if they feel it is all right that seven times as many votes in one constituency as another should return a member. I drew attention to the matter on the last occasion of my own case where 1,500 votes served to make me a member of this House as against 10,000 for the Hon. Minister. Are you going to argue therefore that the 1,500 people in St. Lucy are so much better in quality and so different that it only takes a few of them to return one member, while by naturally prescriptive right many thousands more - seven or eight and in some cases ten times as many - should return a member in St. Michael? The whole system is manifestly wrong and should be changed.

Once you admit, Mr. Speaker, that people as individuals are to be represented in Parliament and not as communities, you cannot escape the logical conclusion that some sort of electoral reform is necessary in the direction of equalising the value of votes. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is inevitable that any such question of electoral reform should somehow run into and dovetail other questions which are not properly part of the subject matter; and as to whether and in what circumstances should the Speakership be or be not contested, I would advise that this question is left on one side, because it is not really germain to this particular issue; but this idea was that, without some sort of electoral reform in the direction which we have advocated, it would be unrealistic for Political Parties to reach any agreement not to contest the seat of the Speaker.

3.15 p.m.

I, myself, speaking personally - I do not involve my party in this - I believe in the British tradition where the Speaker is without party influence. I believe major political parties under the circumstances of parliamentary democracy can, and should take upon themselves not to contest the Speaker's seat; but that can only be done if you have an electoral arrangement where the Speaker is in a separate constituency. It would be impracticable to come to such arrangement in this island. Here again, we may not even have considered bringing this aspect of our policy into line with what obtains in other countries, because the basis of such agreement to any existing arrangement can only come if we have electoral reform in this direction.

I would like to hear whether Government accepts these principles. No one can say in the course of this debate in this House how the details may be worked out, but if you trust people on these matters they will work them out for you, and give you the benefits of their knowledge.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this is just a dress rehearsal or a repeat performance; and I am glad that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had the courage to bring this Resolution back to the Chamber. I am glad that he has brought it back at a time when the Hon. Leader of the House is present.

I am not going to incite the Hon. Leader of the House to say anything, but I am going to state that the Hon. Leader of the House, when we were in England, in a report that came back to Barbados with respect to this same single member constituencies, had the effrontery to go to England and say that the request for single member constituencies....

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I object to his telling me that I had the effrontery to go to England. Does the hon. member think that I am a puppet? I speak as I want to speak. I am not a puppet for anyone.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is really when people assume offices which they are not equipped for that you get them saying those things. You are not mentally equipped for the task which you are performing.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. If the hon. member does that at all, I am going to say what I have to say this evening.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is out of order. You must not speak to the Hon. Minister, you must speak to me.

Mr. WALCOTT: When the Hon. Minister rose on a point of order, he rose to say what? I said that if the hon. member was equipped mentally for the position which he is holding, and instantly he rose on a point of order and objected to the words used. How could he object to the words used when the

context was not completed? He did not allow the sentence to be finished, therefore, he did not know in what context I was going to say that he had the effrontery.

I say that he had the brass to go to England and make a statement in relation to this proposed measure of single-member constituencies to the effect that the reason for the Opposition urging this, was a plot by the Conservatives to get back into power; and that this was what the Conservatives were doing in their attempt to get back into power. It would take a man a lot of brass and a lot of effrontery to say that, knowing that it was a measure which emanated from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who did not have any association with the Conservatives. Only a man with brass and effrontery would say that, and then rise on a point of order and say that he is not a puppet. Where does the question of effrontery and puppetry have anything to do with it? Puppets really do not have effrontery, but you can be a marionette; therefore, when your master says "do not have this electoral reform," you also say "I am not going to have this electoral reform."

Some members forget their background, and forget that they came through the hornpipe of the Conservatives. When members begin to say that this is something conservative, what is there conservative about the idea of electoral reform? I said on the floor of the House already, and I am going to repeat now, that in 1945 and 1946 when we were thinking of electoral reform in so far as Adult Suffrage was concerned, the then Leader of the House who is now the Prime Minister of the West Indies, did not want legislation to be introduced for Adult Suffrage because he said that would bring another party into power. It is a good thing that the old Conservatives were not as stupid as members of the present Government; because, with the present attitude of members of the Government, if they were in the position of the Conservatives in 1930, they would not have given way to Adult Suffrage.

Mr. Speaker, you and I were elected on a vote which was not yet Adult Suffrage. A Bill was passed which was not on Adult Suffrage but one on liberalisation of the franchise; and that Bill was passed in the Other Place by the casting vote of the President. Members of the House in those days knew that if they passed such a Bill giving the vote to every man, this change which has come about, would bound to have have come about; but you cannot keep back the hands of the clock. Barbados was the last place to liberalise the franchise. British Guiana, Trinidad, Jamaica - all of them Crown Colonies - had Adult Suffrage before Barbados. I repeat, it was because the Congress Party was felt to be so strong that the now Prime Minister of the West Indies was not in favour of introducing Adult Suffrage. Members of the Labour Party felt that if they introduced Adult franchise, it would bring the Congress Party into power. The Congress Party was so strong then, that the present hon. junior member for St. James, when we went to St. James (I mean the Barbados Labour Party) could not make up his mind, but eventually he made up his mind to run as a member of the Congress Party. That is history. (Mr. SEARLES: That is not true). He says that it is not true. He forgets that he ran in St. James as a member of the Congress Party.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. SEARLES: On a point of order. It is true that I ran in the first instance as a member of the Congress Party, but I was a full-blooded Labourite. *(Laughter)* What the hon. member is saying now is absolutely not true; I was not a member of the Executive Committee as he wanted me to say. (Hon. M. E. COX: You were never a Tory.) I was never a Tory.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the last word?

Mr. SEARLES: I said I was never a Tory.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh, a Tory.

Mr. WALCOTT: I did not accuse the hon. member of being a Tory; I am only giving some of the reasons why they are against this matter. The same reasons which were given against this Resolution were given against the institution of Adult Suffrage. The hon. junior member for St. James first ran for the other Party and in a *sotto voce* remark, he was advised to say that he was not a member of the Electors' Association. The hon. senior member for St. Michael has said that I was a member of the Electors' Association, but I do not want to deal with that now. When the hon. member is lying, he has the effrontery to laugh; he is laughing to make somebody believe that he is so virtuous that he can laugh at the lies which he is telling. Here you have a man who was never a member of the Electors' Association, but he knows the members of that Association so well, as to know that I was a member of it! Mr. Speaker, you were associated with me for all of these years; I have been in that Party for all of these years, and they did not know for all of this time that I was a member of the Electors' Association! I pass that because I do not have to justify it; I believe that I am one of the people who helped to kill the Electors' Association.

The Prime Minister of the West Indies can say that we do not want any single member constituencies. Years ago when we had an income qualification, in order to get a man elected to a seat here, he had to earn $80 a month; he would have to be a lawyer, a professional man or somebody paying taxes of so much. The House of Assembly met at midday because a horse and buggy could not get from St. Lucy to Bridgetown, unless it left at an early hour; then the members left here at four o'clock in order to get back down to St. Lucy for dinner. That is why the House of Assembly met at midday; but we are now meeting in order to accommodate the people over there.

When you look over the island and at the records, you will find that the population growth in St. Michael was not the sort as it is today; and even then it would not matter. Today you will find that in St. Michael you have more votes collectively than some of the other parishes put together. In so far as the law was concerned, the porters were disenfranchised. The Civil Servant was disenfranchised because some Civl Servants could not work for any £50 per annum. One half of the teaching profession, even some of the Headteachers, were disenfranchised if they did not have any land, because some of them did not work for any $20 a month. In our time we have adult suffrage, which means that every man and woman is eligible for the vote. In days gone by a woman could not vote; a man who could not even spell Ada backwards backwards could vote, but the Headmistress of Queen's College could not vote. That was a situation where even the intelligent section of the community could not vote because they did not have any land; it would appear as if they did not have any sense or eyes or brain.

I think we would have to admit that there are those who belong to the democratic forces of progress. Some people think that because you are democratic you are progressive, but that is not necessarily so. Those of us who are members of the progressive democratic force feel that the question of the vote should not be restricted; therefore we give everybody the right to vote. We gave people the right to vote but not on the basis of an illiteracy test as obtains in Africa today; if you keep a man ignorant it is just like telling him that he cannot vote because he is poor.
3.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing on our Statute Book that a man must be able to read and write - though at one stage they wanted to put that as a qualification; a man who cannot read and write but does his part in cutting canes, putting up buildings, hewing down wood and working hard in this community is also making his contribution. Those of us who represent the rural areas especially, know that there are some men who cannot read and write, but you cannot tell inasmuch as they talk to you like a man who can read and write. Some of these men are so sound and have made such a contribution in their own homes and lives, that you are amazed; some of them have produced scholars. It would be surprising to some people to know that some people have brilliant children though they themselves do not know "A" from "B", but they have enough intelligence to know that their children should be educated. Are you going to tell me

that a person who can make that contribution to society should be denied the right to vote? We say "no", because they have made their contribution. There were certain circumstances which prevented people from being educated and we know them.

Now that I see the Minister of Agriculture coming in, I will say that when we were passing the Maude Bill to give everybody the right to vote — though he is a democrat, he is not a Local Government progressive democrat, he felt that a man who did not pay taxes should not have the right to vote in Local Government.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member gets on with that sort of mimicry and foolishness because he thinks he is a king-pin in Barbados and can attack everybody. He is ignorant, totally ignorant. The *Advocate* just wrote an editorial on that Party the other day, and he thinks he is the Lord-God of Barbados, and intends to curse everybody. He is a real ignorant man. Nobody knows or cares anything about him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Philip...

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am sorry, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member remembers that in Parliament he cannot refer to another member as "that man", but as "the hon. member". That is what I rose to point out to the hon. member.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That hon. member must be told to respect the Chair and other people in this Chamber. He thinks he has the right, because he comes here, to attack everybody and say anything he likes; but that sort of thing cannot work in here. We are trying to be decent human beings, but nobody is going to sit down and kow-tow under him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is not replying to the hon. member now; he is really chastising the hon. member in a manner that would be my duty if the occasion arose.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I appreciate that, Sir. But he goes out of his way and tries to be funny and nasty. I want him to know that he alone cannot be nasty. I am no play toy in here for anybody. If he is making a speech let him make it, but I am not responsible for him, nor do I hold on here for a job; so let him get that in his head once and for all. When I am not here, I am on my farm.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, a little introspection is a good thing. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: You only make me hot). You cannot get hot; I would run you back in St. Philip this very evening, man!

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get back to the point.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I made reference to the hon. member which I had the right to do in this House, and I think I did it without any hate or rancour; but all the epithets that have been used by the hon. member to the effect that I am nasty, and his remarks about dirty behaviour, could more be put to the hon. member for the way in which he acted in his pentecostal style which was so unbecoming.

What I did say was that there were those of us who fought for these democratic progressive rights in so far as giving the right to everybody to vote was concerned; and then the presence of the hon. member in the Chamber caused me to cast a little reflection on a similar matter with which we dealt. I made reference prior to the hon. member's presence in the House to the fact that there are some people who are democratic, but they may not be democratic progressive. I said that the hon. member is not a progressive democrat in Local Government affairs; and that when we were passing a Bill to give people the right to vote in Local Government, he felt that such persons should not have the right to vote; and that voting should be done on the old basis of property qualification. That is the same veiw which the Conservatives held; but we are not saying that the hon. member is not a democrat because he held the view that .....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. Nowhere in the debates of this House will you find anything on this subject to confrom to what the hon. member is saying, but the hon. member persists in saying it. As a matter of fact, some time ago he said that he would come to St. Philip and say these things; and I want to know what he is trying to do. He is trying to get that in the debates so that people can read it. He cannot say these things because they will boomerang.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member denying it?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Emphatically.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, all of the views which a member holds are not always expressed here. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that one can say that the only place we express our views is in this House of Assembly, because, Your Honour would have to speak outside of this House. There are functions which you have to attend and places where you have to express political views, and I do not think.....

Hon. D. D. GANRER: On a point of order. I would like the hon. member to say where and when I propounded such theories.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member is pressing that, because the hon. member's name is one of the signatories to a petition that was passed by some of the Vestries against the idea of introducing this. All I am saying is that the hon. member as a member of the Government voting against this, was a member who voted against the other measure too; and if there were all the people in Barbados with his views in this House of Assembly and in the Other Place, a man who today can vote in Local Government would never have had the opportunity of voting, because he would only have been able to vote on property qualification; and that is where I say the hon. member in not a democrat progressive.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. Again the hon. member must not get up here and mislead people. There is nowhere that that can be found; and there is nobody who was associated with that meeting which took place at the Parochial Building who can verify what he is saying. If the hon. member has not got his facts correctly, he should not persist in doing things like that. When he was not a member of this House I was fighting in Vestry politics. What is the hon. member trying to convey? I was fighting for adult suffrage all my life. Why persist in that sort of thing?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's point of order is clear.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: He should not persist because it gets under your skin. It is spiritual wickedness in high places.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: What is spiritual wickedness is for a man to know that he has said something and deny it. Not only have you done it, but there are people whom you have spoken to. Let us go to the records. If the hon. member says he wants me to challenge him, I accept his challenge; and at the next meeting of the House of Assembly, I would prove it.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I rise on a point of order. I would like the hon. member to name the persons here. Do not hide behind anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to intervene at this moment, and to say that the path which the hon. members are now pursuing is not serving the purpose of this debate. Do not expand on this.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, it was not my intention even to expand on that aspect; but I only drew that to the notice of

the House because of the earlier statements which were made in connection with the statement made by the Hon. Leader of the House in England when he said that this idea of single member constituencies is associated with the Conservatives. (Hon. M. E. COX: Of course it is.) The hon. member said "of course it is" and I know that that was not how the Conservative Party felt.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member believes he has sense, but he is short of it. I did not say that the Conservatives propounded that doctrine; I said it arose from the Conservatives. I know that I am correct in saying that the late Mr. T. B. Pierce, among other Conservatives, had been for years talking of single member constituencies. He was unalterably opposed to double-member constituencies.

Mr. WALCOTT: All that is illogical. If the late Mr. Pierce was opposed to single-member constituencies on the basis that it gave the voter the right to plump a man, you can only plump for a man when you have double-member constituencies.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order. There again, the hon. member is only playing to the ignorant. In single-member constituencies there is only one person for whom you can vote if 40 persons are running for the seat. But under double-member constituencies, you can vote for two or plump for one. The conservatives were opposed to that when the late Mr. A. E. S. Lewis beat the late Mr. T. B. Pierce in the City of Bridgetown.

Mr. WALCOTT: If there were single member constituencies in Mr. Lewis' time when he ran against Mr. Pierce the people would have voted the same way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, that is only a side matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am speaking, and if a point of order is raised I have to give way; however, in truth and in fact, what the hon. member said was not a point of order; it has no bearing on the statement which I have made. It does not convey what was said because the point which was raised was not as regards Mr. Pierce in the House. The Conservatives in the House of Assembly today are down to the lowest number.

Hon. M. E. COX: With your support, they are stronger now.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, did you hear that remark?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to appeal to the hon. senior member for St. Michael. Such asides can only produce just more heat.

Hon. M. E. COX: I apologise.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I can give you the complete assurance that those asides will not produce more heat, but more nails in his coffin. In the House today the only new Conservative who was not in here at the last elections is the hon. member on my immediate right — Lt. Col. Dowding — and he is here through the attitude of the Hon. Minister who in trying to remove the then senior member for St. George — Mr. Barrow — did succeed; and they felt more pleased to see the present hon. senior member for St. George elected than to see the other member elected; therefore, they cannot say that the Conservatives are in here but not by them. You have brought them.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member says that we felt more pleased to see the hon. senior member for St. George elected than the hon. junior member for St. John. I would like to assure him that we are pleased with neither.

Lt. Col. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal explanation. I would like to put straight the records. Neither the members of Government nor anybody else brought me here. The votes as recorded have done that. I could not care less whether the Minister likes me or anybody else likes me. The votes like me.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I never intended to convey the idea that I do not like him; what I meant to convey is that it does not matter to me whether the present hon. senior member for St. George is a member or the hon. junior member for St. John is a member. I do not care less.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would just at this stage like to intervene. I do not think hon. members will relish reading the debates on this matter when they get them, and more particularly when they get old; I am sure that they would not feel very proud of themselves. What they are arguing about does not centre around the Resolution at all. I think that it would be better for the hon. members to confine themselves to those things which deal with the Resolution. Let the people who in time to come will read these debates, say that they were serious representatives in this House. For the good name of this House of Assembly I shall ask hon. members to think twice before they say things which happen to be irrelevant.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am endeavouring as much as I can to keep on the straight and narrow path. As a member of this House, I have to give way when the member rises on a point of order, though he has nothing to say as regards what I was saying. The Hon. Minister in an interview in England gave it out to the people that what we were now trying to do is nothing genuine, but was something to bring Conservatives back into power. The reason why I mentioned that was to show that we have not brought the Conservatives back into power; if anybody has brought the Conservatives back into power, it would be members of the Government.

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

3.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, how is it that we are accused of bringing somebody into power when there are three people who are members of the Labour Party but who were members of the Conservative Party? But there is no point in painting the lily. There are twenty-one members of this Chamber who have been elected to this House because of their profession and belief on the Labour side. Would any ordinary idiot, not a village idiot, begin to tell you that in the context of Barbadian political life and development, anybody looking like any of us could be wasting our time when we are getting near to a grave, in resuscitating old boots? *(Laughter)*. The Government has given the Conservatives so much economic strength and power that they are making more money than they have ever made; and my worry is to get some of that money out of their hands.

The Hon. Leader of the House is famous for making what can be regarded as politically slanderous statements. It is nothing short of that to tell a man that he is doing something to bring back in the Conservatives. He says in a *sotto voce* remark that I am helping the Conservatives to get back in. When the hon. member says in England that this and that thing is done so as to bring the Conservatives back into power, let us analyse that. If we have single member constituencies or any kind of constituencies that you can think about in Barbados, no Conservative could come back into power; it is just like asking a snow-ball to survive near the sun. There is no point in talking in that way in this House of Assembly. That is not anything which one would take seriously.

Two or three hundred years ago Barbados had representative Government, but because Barbados had that Government two or three hundred years ago, are you saying that we are not in favour of more self-government because the Ministers will get more power? You do not decide or resolve issues on that petty, bogus argument; only a fool does that. When you get that statement made, that this is an issue to bring back the Conservatives into power, I should like to ask where could you carry Conservative and get him back in? There is a little pocket in Christ Church where the hon. junior member for Christ Church could bring in a Conservative, and there is also a little pocket in the City where only a man like the hon. senior member for the City could bring in Conservatives. If the true family of Barbados were allowed to be created, and not the petty narrowness, you would not have to talk about bringing back the

Conservatives; the whole thing is that some of them are in a position where they thought they could behead us; but we are not in that position to be beheaded.

I should like to ask if there is anything criminal about working for people? What do you mean when you say that you are not working for anybody? Is working for somebody something degrading? It is a part of the Conservative philosophy, that you are a gentleman when you do not work for people; and that you are a slave when you have to work for somebody. The hon. member says that he is not working for anybody but I thought he was working on behalf of the State. Is there anything wrong about working? Our Master worked, and therefore that is the example which we should follow.

The whole of Barbados was a big borough three hundred years ago. There were six thousand votes for the whole of Barbados in 1937. That was before we had Adult Suffrage, and taking an arithmetical division you did not have anything to worry about. When you divided the whole island into twelve constituencies, what did you get? You got less than five hundred people voting in these constituencies. A man would lose his deposit at that rate; therefore, a complete metamorphosis has taken place. When you talk about the Electoral Roll, you have to discuss it in the context of the whole change. There was a time when there were no Ministers in Barbados. I was never a Minister although reference was made to my being in charge. A Minister had his own department; nobody had that power before. The Hon. Leader of the House did have a little bit of power but everything was still something glorified. It was the Governor who used to inform the Colonial Secretary that this is the sort of legislation they wanted, and papers came to you; before the papers were agreed upon they came to you.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I cannot allow that remark to go unchallenged. A former Governor, Sir Hilary Blood, said in his Speech at the opening of the Legislature a few years ago that he would accept the advice of the members of the House of Assembly who are the members of the Executive Committee so long as they were unanimous in respect of any matter.
4.05 p.m.

I repeat that the hon. member was the authority on labour matters, or matters of this sort; and the Leader of the House at the time accepted almost *carte blanche* everything he said.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you see that the hon. member is a convulsed idiot? He does not understand the meaning of the word "advice". "Advice" does not mean that you initiate; it means that before you do something you have to hear what we say on it. Under the Governor-in-Executive Committee Act — I would say for the benefit of this House — no member of the Executive Committee had the authority to initiate legislation; but the Governor gave authority to the members of the House collectively where there was unanimous agreement. Why do you have to talk about where there is collective unanimous agreement? Unanimous agreement by whom? You would not have to talk about unanimous agreement if you had the power to do something.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. It was also agreed that if there was a difference between members, the matter would be postponed; and then, when it was considered on a second occasion, the views of the Leader would then prevail.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that has absolutely nothing to do with it; this is a question of showing that you did not have the power to initiate. It was the Governor who sent down legislation to us, but the words "Leader of the House" were used; and, therefore, as Leader of the Party, you sent down legislation. The hon. senior member for Christ Church was a member of the Executive Committee before Ministerial status, and he knows, as a member of the Executive Committee, that there was a difference. Nowadays a Minister initiates; and can send something to Cabinet; but in the old days when there was no Cabinet your papers were sent around to you, and you had to go to Government House to a meeting. The Hon. Minister is such a political slanderer, he does not have enough sense to understand that you could not have this change, if you are saying that this is something which you had all along; because, if you had it all along, what are you changing now? The name?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, just as you make changes in constitutional development, changes can be made in electoral reform. In the parish of St. Thomas the Hon. Premier was kept out from this House because of double member constituencies. What the hon. member does not understand, is that they are holding on to the same power that the Conservatives held on to, when we were coming to the break. It was so fast and swift, and we brought so many people into the pool of voting, that even though there were double member constituencies, they found that they could not get a seat on that basis.

Why do we want single member constituencies, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Our natural development requires it. It is just like a man who starts to live in a small house when he had no children, but when he started to get children and got more money, as a consequence he extended his house. Single member constituencies must become a normal electoral development in any progressive community. Look at the population growth today; you have rural and urban communities; but in these rural areas you get large communities growing up. If you have double member constituencies which do not relate to present day circumstances, you have to think in terms of what can meet present day circumstances — an electoral reform that is scientific. Why send a man to the poll on the basis that we are so unique in Barbados in the changes that have taken place, that he has two votes to cast, and that if you take away one, it would mean you are taking away his right? You do not take away the right from a man when you have given him that right. As things stand today, a man who has a vote in St. Michael does not vote in St. Philip, neither does a man who votes in St. Philip vote in St. John.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, so far as regularising the votes in sending people back to the House of Assembly is concerned, I say quite frankly, whether or not somebody likes it, that if you have any sense of political science, you will realise that Barbados in 1961 has reached a stage in its own political growth that the only logical thing is to have electoral reform on the basis of single member constituencies. It is the only workable solution you can have, because the population is bulging. Barbados has one of the most unweildly electoral systems in the whole Caribbean, inasmuch as all the votes cannot be counted the same day. A place as big as the United States of America can count millions of votes in one day; but Barbados, 166 square miles, has to wait another twenty-four hours. You should not get on with this ignorance as though Barbados is different; that the water we drink is different and the air we breathe is different; or that we are living on a different planet from the people in the United States of America or Russia.

The Prime Minister of the West Indies was right when he said not to vote for this, if it was going to keep him out of power; he was always like that, and that is why he will not be voted for in his present position. That is the same kind of remark that was used in connection with Adult Suffrage. There is no point in saying that you do not want electoral reform because you want to keep in power. The Prime Minister said that he did not want Federation because the Chamber of Commerce would run it. It is just like in the old days when the Conservatives did not want Adult Suffrage because they said the flood gates would be opened; they were afraid of us. There were people who did not want Adult Suffrage because we were coming here; there were people who did not want Federation because it meant conservatism.

Mr. Speaker, what difference does it make if a Conservative, a Labourite or a Liberal is given a vote? Are you going to say that a man should not have the right to vote because he does not vote for you? Some day he may change. Many of us have been in politics and know that today a man may not vote for you, but on another occasion he may vote for you and *vice versa*. That is part of the political life we have undertaken.

I do not know how true it is, but the members of the Government cannot be thinking in terms of the Speakership, as the hon. member spoke.
4.15 p.m.

If they want to bring down legislation that the Speaker is not to be an elected member of this Chamber, on what basis are they saying so? Is it on the basis that Trinidad does it, or because British Guiana does it, or because Jamaica does not do it? In Jamaica they have single member constituencies, as well as in Trinidad and British Guiana.

If it is that the Government is really concerned about its own political future as against the logical step which should be taken for electoral reform and constitutional development, then they are two different things. If you want to be returned at all costs, then you do a lot of things towards that end. That is why all the dictators have taken the democratic processes and abused them towards that end. For the hon. member to say that he is not agreeing to this electoral reform on the basis that the Conservatives want it, well then, that is dead as a door nail. Which Conservative can get into power unless some of the members of the Labour Party help him? Of course they would support a member of the Conservative Party in order to prevent any one of us on this side from getting in here.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hate to interrupt the hon. member, and I hope that I will have the opportunity to nail the lies.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am not going to sit down. That is not a point of order. I am not sitting down.

Hon. M. E. COX: Will you allow me?

Mr. WALCOTT: Call the Speaker; I am not going to sit down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not giving way to him when he says that he is going to nail the lies.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must take his seat. I must hear the point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not giving way today no matter what happens. He has to withdraw that statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not mind what the hon. member says.

Mr. WALCOTT: You must.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to hear what the Hon. Minister has to say. If he says that he is going to nail the lies, well then, I will have to nail him.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member says, on his point of order, that he has risen to nail the lies.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is breaking the Rules of this House. I am drawing to the hon. member's attention that if you are not prepared to allow me to hear the point of order that you will be breaking the Rules of this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot permit him to say that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you suggesting that he is going to nail lies?

Mr. WALCOTT: He said that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: He did not say that to me.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, he said that. I am not prepared to sit and let the hon. member rise on a point of order to say that he has to nail the lies.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am appealing to the hon. member. You are breaking the Rules of this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: What are the lies he has to nail? He cannot say that. You cannot permit him to say that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member would not let me speak. The hon. senior member for St. Michael has not been given the opportunity to state his point of order. I must hear his point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: He rose on a point of order and said that he hoped he would have the opportunity to nail the lies. That is vulgarity.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is provided the Chair gives him the opportunity to do that. I am ruling now that you are breaking the Rules of this House. Will the hon. member sit now.

Mr. WALCOTT: You have allowed him to break the Rules of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Michael has not told me anything yet.

Mr. WALCOTT: He has.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen on a point of order. Let me hear the point of order. Will the hon. member state his point of order?

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I have no more desire to do that. I have another opportunity.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, the point which I have accepted to take objection to I have stated repeatedly. So far as electoral reforms are concerned, you either agree to them or you do not agree to them. As the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has said, this question of single-member constituencies means that you are giving a man the right to vote for one person; it is not a matter of giving a man the right to vote for a conservative or a labourite. Single-member constituencies are not based on "I am going to get in" and "you are not going to get in." You still will have the Barbados House of Assembly comprised of 24 members. You will not have it comprised of 20 members.

I agree that if you took away representation from the people of Barbados by reducing the number of seats from 24 to 20, then one could say that you are not having electoral reform which is progressive but retrogressive. We are only saying that, with the changes which have taken place, we feel it is a logical step that you should have single-member constituencies because many things are in their favour. One is that when you go to vote, you have your clear cut issues on how to vote.

Even in political parties, by your having double-member constituencies, it has caused a lot of political enemies within the constituencies. I well remember the first election in which Your Honour ran; the now Federal Prime Minister who was the Leader of the Party and your colleague, felt that you got Mr. Fields Lowe to get the people to plump for you. I am outside of that Party now, therefore no man can discipline me. Coming to the constituency of St. Michael, I can say that one of the biggest rows which took place in that party was between the hon. senior member for St. Michael and the hon. junior member for St. Michael. It was due to one saying that one was asking people to vote for one and not the other. (Hon. M. E. COX: Who?) You did it. Ask the Hon. Premier. One of the biggest warfares in that party was on account of that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member is capable of quoting that, he is a cold-blooded murderer.

Mr. WALCOTT: What adjective can you find to quote him? Sir, you were associated with that party for very long. If there is a cold-blooded murderer in this island, he is the one.
4.25 p.m.

There are very few people in his Party whom he has not tried to murder; and you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, came

under the axe on one occasion; you can well remember when you returned from the United Kingdom. If there is one man who should be on the gallows, the Hon. Minister should be the one.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am appealing to the hon. member not to travel along that road.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member who is sitting next to him knows the vulgar phrases which he used against the hon. junior member for St. Philip; but now they are comrades in arms! There are things which the hon. member has done to people, some of those people are having pains to their heart. The Marshal of this House has also suffered at the hands of the hon. senior member for St. Michael; the Marshal was a friend of both of them, and he did not know on which side to come down. I was in the Party and I know what I am saying is true. You ask a man to open a tender in order that you can get that tender; if you treat the closest person to you in that way you treat them, then you are capable of doing anything. *(ASIDES).*

At this stage Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Did the hon. member make the statement to the effect that I am a lying bastard? I would say that there was an enquiry conducted once and he should have been behind Prison bars. If the hon. member can get in the position in which he was, then you will know in what position Pilate or Judas was. Instead of being Minister of Trade, the hon. member would have been a Minister in Prison.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. of the clock, the House reverts to the consideration of Government Business.

WAGES COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion when Government Business was being considered, a Bill to amend the Wages Council Act, 1955, was being discussed. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to speak on this Bill. The Hon. Minister of Trade introduced it and in his introductory remarks, he said that the Wages Council Bill is not concerned with people in the shirt industry only; that it concerns anybody with whom you have to deal. The Minister also said that these people are not members of the Union. What is to be corrected is that you will have workers who are members of the Union but the trade in which the workers are engaged is of such a nature that one organisation could not speak for the whole trade. In such circumstances, therefore, you have a Wages Council.

For example, you have shop assistants and there is a Wages Council for these workers. There are shop assistants in the Union. It was only yesterday that we were dealing with a disputed matter in the Union. The workers are organised and therefore you can negotiate. Although there is a Wages Council, the Barbados Workers' Union negotiates for the workers at Bata on the basis of what we put forward. The Wages Council does not preclude negotiations; it does not mean that because there is a Wages Council there is no Trade Union existing.

We feel that we have views to express even more than the workers whom we have to represent. We like to express our mind on these matters before they come down to Parliament. We were not accorded this privilege in connection with this Bill. I should like to make it quite clear that the Amendment for which approval is sought here, gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee discretionary powers, according to the hon. member who introduced this Bill, but the Amendment does not say what the Executive Committee can do if they do not agree with the Wages Council.

When the hon. member raised the question about the Wages Council's recommendation for payment of $5 a week, we also objected to the Shop Assistants Order. The Shop Assistants had an Order in respect of $12 a week and when that was published, the Union objected to the proposal. The matter was sent back to the Wages Council and the Wages Council amended its decision; therefore the Order came in as it is now. The Act says this: "Before submitting any wages regulation proposals a Wages Council shall make such investigations as it thinks fit, and shall publish in such manner as shall be prescribed by regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee hereunder notice of the proposals stating the place where copies of the proposals may be obtained and the period, which shall be not less than twenty-one days from the date of the first publication of the notice within which written representations with respect to the proposal may be sent to the Council; and the council shall consider any written representations made to it within that period and shall make such further enquiries as it considers necessary, and may then submit the proposals of the Governor-in-Executive Committee either without amendment or with such amendment as it thinks fit having regard to the representations."
4.35 p.m.

That means, Mr. Speaker, that a Wages Council cannot submit the proposals to the Governor-in-Executive Committee before it allows the public to know what the proposals are; and if anybody wants to make any objection to those proposals, he may do so. Well, the Barbados Workers' Union did that on two occasions: on the occasion with the Shop Assistants when $12 was recommended, and on the occasion with the Shirt Industry when we said we were opposed to the idea of $5 a week. We objected to that, and we have not heard anything more about it.

The hon. member became warm when I said that he had introduced legislation dealing with Workmen's Compensation; and he said that he has a comprehensive Bill. I have a Bill in my hand which was introduced by the Minister to Trade, Industry and Labour to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. This was introduced on 10th January, 1961. I want to say that this Wages Council Bill is not as important as the Workmen's Compensation Bill which was introduced on 10th January, but the hon. member has not got to it yet. He is pegging along with these things and not doing first things first. Why did you introduce this Workmen's Compensation Bill if you were going to introduce comprehensive legislation? Who slipped this into your hand? Did I put it? What I am saying is that you brought this legislation down for Workmen's Compensation which proved inadequate; and if the hon. member had comprehensive legislation he would have brought that, and not this. There is absolutely no excuse for bringing this.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I think there is a Rule somewhere that we can amend something which is on the Order Paper. I am sure that I told the House already that, as a measure of relief, perhaps to some people who may be involved any time, this was introduced. In other words, as the legislation now stands, the maximum is $1,800 if a person loses his life. Under this one which we have introduced, it is $3,600 if he loses his life; $2,500 for permanent disability under the old one, and under this new one it is $4,800; therefore I was pushing this small amendment to meet any emergency which may take place within the period in which the Bill was before the House. The hon. member knows these things. We discussed them with him, and he has commented on certain aspects. I have the Union's views signed by him on the comprehensive proposals for the Workmen's Compensation Act; and though I have made that position crystal clear on several occasions, the hon. member still persists as though he is scoring something.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not playing cricket; we have to score in Australia tonight. The hon. member makes a different statement each time. I made reference to the Bill which was introduced, have said that it should have been dealt with before the one we are doing now, but I did not go into the merits of the Bill. The hon. member wanted to explain something and I think, Mr. Speaker, that you were quite charitable. As a matter of fact, I think all Speakers should be charitable to members of the Government, if they

feel they have the right to explain their point. The Hon. Minister should know that if he says that I know they are having discussions, he should be fair enough to say they have not been carried out; if the hon. member has given instructions, he must know if they are carried out.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I have said that we have already had discussions on this Bill; or, at least, that the Union's views on the present proposals have been sought, accorded and recorded on the files. I pointed out earlier that I brought in this interim Bill because the Comprehensive Bill takes some time. Since I have seen the Report by the Assistant Labour Advisor to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, there will be further discussions because I am prepared to modify some of the proposals which were already agreed to.

Mr. WALCOTT: Not by what we tell you, but by what she tells you! All I want the hon. member to say, Mr. Speaker, is what he should have said. He must say the correct thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter not to bother with the propriety which the hon. member might have exercised. (Hon. M. E. COX: You cannot teach me anything.)

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is a Biblical injunction which says that you can learn from a child. I believe if I went to Fourth Standard, I went further than the hon. member. He says these things, Mr. Speaker, not for you to hear; and he does not believe I can hear; but you must be able to reply sometimes with dirt to dirt, otherwise he would not understand, because the level of his mind is there.

He brought a Bill in here in which the Union should have been consulted; because, the last discussion with the Union was that we should have been consulted before anything was done. I have here with me a file with their letters; I bring all their things to the House of Assembly. (Hon. M. E. COX: Quote the letter.) I will quote it when we are dealing with the Workmen's Compensation Act, but right now we are dealing with the Wages Council Bill, and I am showing you the nonsense you talked on it. (Hon. M. E. COX: You are making sport.) You stopped learning too early, but I am still learning; if you were still learning you would do better. (Hon. M. E. COX: Success!) I do not need it from you.

In this Bill which he is introducing, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing affecting the Wages Council; all he says is that if they send proposals to the Government, the Government does not have to make an order, but can send the proposals back to the Wages Council, and this process can go on indefinitely.
4.45 p.m.

In such circumstances, what will you do? Sometimes the legal people are busy with more heavyweight things and they cannot pay strict attention to the lightweight things. What do you say? You say:-

Subsection (4) of section eleven of the principal Act is hereby repealed and the following sub-section substituted therefor -

"(4) Where the Governor-in-Executive Committee receives any wages regulation proposals, he may make an order (hereinafter in this Act referred to as a "wages regulation order") giving effect to the proposals as from such date as may be specified in the order.

Provided that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may, if he thinks fit, refer the proposals back to the Wages Council and the Wages Council shall thereupon reconsider them having regard to any observation made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and may, if he thinks fit, resubmit the proposals to the Governor-in-Executive Committee either without amendments or with such amendments as it thinks fit having regard to those observations:

Provided further that before any such amended proposals are re-submitted to the Governor-in-Executive Committee the procedure laid down in subsection (3) of this section shall apply except that the period within which written representations on the amended proposals may be sent to the Wages Council may be reduced to fourteen days; and that where proposals are so re-submitted, the like proceedings shall be had thereon as in the case of the original proposals.

That only means that they have cut down the time from 21 days. The principal Act states -

"The date to be so specified shall be a date subsequent to the date of the order, and where, as respects any worker who is paid wages at intervals not exceeding seven days, the date so specified does not correspond with the beginning of the period for which the wages are paid, the order shall, as respects that worker, become effective as from the beginning of the next such period following the date specified in the order."

This amendment substantially is the same as the one here in the principal Act. The Act says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall make the order. All that is done by this amendment is that it says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may make the order and then refer the matter back to the Wages Council.

There is no point in putting Governor-in-Executive Committee when dealing with legislation of this nature, because it is not for the Governor-in-Executive Committee under the new constitution to make an order; it is for the Minister to do so. This is not giving the Minister power to make an order; the Governor-in-Executive Committee can only make an order when he receives proposals. I am no lawyer, but application to duty is a first-class schoolmaster. If you apply your mind to anything, your commonsense can help you a lot. It is my duty to read these things and I read them because I have to explain them to workers.

When it came to the Hotel Industry, they wanted to set up a Wages Council; and we wrote the Minister and said that we did not agree to setting up a Wages Council for these people because they were people for whom you should negotiate. In addition to the letter which we wrote the Minister on that matter, we informed him that there should be a minimum wage for workers. The Minister replied saying that they did not agree to a minimum wage; they look upon the Wages Council to do these things.

There is a law which says that holidays with pay shall not be what it is, but prior to that Act, we had people who used to get vacation with pay by agreement. When the Act was passed it was on the basis that all of those people who were not represented should get holidays with pay and what was going to be the minimum. It did not stop the Union from having the right to negotiate in such matters. We have workers who get more than two weeks' holiday with pay.

Let us put one side domestics servants and people like that if you say that we are dealing with people in industrial employment. For a man or woman working in a shirt factory or a store, we say that so and so shall be the minimum; if you say that you cannot employ people at that figure, then you cannot employ people. In the old time days, the biggest minimum which you paid people was 1/6 a day. In the U.S.A., there are eighteen million workers organised in the U.S.A. Workers Union and other unions, but you have a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour as what you can pay a person. What happens is because the Trade Unions are so powerful, they say what the minimum wage should be in a particular industry.

Let us examine these people who are in the Shirt and Garment Industry. The Shirt and Garment Industry has grown up in this Island out of income tax free concessions, the pioneer status and duty free reductions which have been granted them; therefore, we say in an industry like that, why is it you cannot lay down a minimum wage? Do you know what has circumvented these things?
4.55 p. m.

A shirt maker in the old days when I was a clerk was some person to whom you gave out shirts to make, so that

the person would not come within legislation at all. You regard such a person or persons as an out worker or out workers, and you have no provision for holiday with pay or anything like that. This is how the workman's shirt was made in the 1930's; you put an agate in the back and you put an the shirt to be buttoned behind. Nowadays you button the shirt to the front and you feel smart. *(Laughter)*

Our attitude is that we do not believe in any Wages Council; we realise that when you have a Wages Council you will never get back to the worker. We have many cases with which to deal; we were going to prosecute a man when he dismissed a worker;he had to pay that worker a lot of money. If that worker had taken the matter to the Court and the services of a barrister had been retained he would have had much difficulty in proving his case, because he had to sign for wages which he did not receive. When we say that for cutting canes workers must be paid $1.36, for instance, and you did not pay that wage, well then, you would have to cut the canes yourself. We did not want any Labour Inspector to carry out these terms.

I want to say that some people are exploited; and it is said that it is better for a person to get $5 a week than to get nothing. The Wages Council do not negotiate for the level of wages at the various points and therefore we do not believe in them. Where we cannot negotiate with all of the employers, we agree to cooperate and we submit persons to the Wages Councils. What you want to take the place of a Wages Council in Barbados is a minimum wage reflecting a decent standard of wages for anybody to be paid, whether it is a porter, a worker in a shirt factory or anybody else. We have stated that an employer should not pay anybody less than $3 a day, no matter what the category of the worker may be.

When the hon. member talks about the political scene, I may say that he is a polititian. I am different from the hon. member. I was a boy, I played cricket, I swam, I got in fights and I got out of fights! *(Laughter)*. (A MEMBER: The hon. member too!) I speak for myself. I jump up at Carnival too - and I would prefer to be out there right now! The hon. member thinks of politics all day long but I say: let us go and have some sport.

Anyhow, Sir, wherever you have a Wages Council, sometimes we try to get some of our officials on the Wages Council, people who could be of help to the other workers on the Council. Wherever you have an exploited industry, if you have to set up a Wages Council, the employers are invariably in a better position to present their case and fight some of the very workers who are part of the industry. I am the Secretary of the Trade Union but I cannot serve on any Wages Council; the law does not permit me to serve on such Councils as long as I am a member of this Assembly. I do not think that I should resign from this House of Assembly, because, I believe the workers want me here. Our law is that an hon. member loses his seat in this House if he serves on a public board or committee for financial reward.

One of the difficulties in any community is where people are not organised; but they should be organised if they want protection. It will be realised and seen that they get better protection in their own organisation than when they have these legislative Acts; because when you pass legislation it has to be watched. There are employers who want us to put up tariff walls and give them all the protection; we are prepared to give them that protection and we give it to them; but that is where we say, on the other hand, that employers must be prepared to pay the workers no less than so much.

5.05 p. m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would boldly ask any member of the Government today to tell me why Barbados cannot have a minimum wage. I would go further than the Minister and put on the Statute Book of Barbados that the normal working period of any man shall not exceed so many hours. I would give forty-eight hours for this year, or for two years, but let everybody know that within the next two years the normal working period shall be forty-four hours until you get to such industries in which you can have a forty-hour week. The very progress of life is going to create that with the introduction of machinery; and there would be nothing wrong in making legislation which makes a person pay overtime for certain things outside the maximum hours.

When we ask the Minister about a minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, we are not asking for the wages we had in 1937. When you give a minimum wage, it is for the people who do manual and menial jobs. In the United States of America it was 90 cents as hour, and it went to $1.00, and now Mr. Kennedy wants to raise it to $1.25. The danger I see in all these Bills which deal with labour legislation is that if you have a Trade Union in Barbados, what is the use of not making use of it? All I can say is that the hon. member wants to see to other matters and leave us out as in the case of the Tourist Board; but we are not "scruffing" about to go and serve the Tourist Board. We can show people that we run our own affairs; we run the Union to compare with any other in the Caribbean. We get money for workers, and the Government is not associated with us; so when it comes to legislation dealing with these matters, it is not a question that we are begging for anything, we have a direct interest in it; the Wages Council is to deal with such workers who may not be in the Union; and we cannot meet all the employers with whom you can deal.

Mr. Speaker, there are workers in this Island for whom we cannot meet all the employers - for instance the porters in Roebuck Street - but we still agree to wages because some of the employers are not tied to the Organisation. When we approach an employer and he tells us he is not in the Organisation, that does not prevent us from going into the store where his workers are organised and saying that we do not agree with certain things. A man was dismissed from the firm of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and we went and said that we did not agree with the reasons for his dismissal. There are men at the Rum Refinery and in other businesses, who come within the provisions of the Shops Act, but we still put a different wage for the man who comes under the Shops Act because we say it should be more. As an example, we asked a business place which is employing a porter under the Shops Act for $20 a week for the employee, but the employer offered the Union $18, which means that it was $2 more than what the minimum was; but it does not mean that where the Union was not negotiating that there should be minimum of less than $16, nor does it mean that when the workers become organised that that should be the minimum. We would not begin to negotiate at $16; we would take into consideration that a man was working for so many years, the profits of the business and so on.

Where nothing exists for a group of workers, a Wage Council can be a means of making workers become more conscious of their own organisation. With regard to what the hon. senior member said he read in the newspapers this morning, I will say that I know it is true; but it is a good thing when these things happen. There is a Biblical injunction, Mr. Speaker, which says that without the shedding of blood there is no redemption. That has a very strong meaning for workers; because if workers are not prepared to make some sacrifice, they are not going to make any progress. That is what they get because the workers in the store do not want to have an organisation of their own, together with the representation to which they are entitled. They want to be free riders, and politicians must come to the House of Assembly and pass things for them; but we cannot police them.

What Order is this amendment going to allow the Minister to make? That is the point I would like explained; and that is why I say that discussion with the Minister on this would reveal that, in amending the Act, you should see what the Wages Council Act in England says; and, if it does not give enough flexibility, let us provide it. As it stands, there can be a hiatus just as there was a hiatus in the Shops proposals to the Government in which nothing has been done by the Government.

Those are my views on this matter; and I am quite prepared for all that the Minister has to say about me apart from the vulgarities. My back is quite thick and I will tell him that I am ready for him at any time.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief in my reply. I hope not to make the same mistake as the hon. member, rambling all over, vilifying and abusive as usual. The position, as I stated earlier, is that we found difficulty in implementing this Act.

As a result of our having to return to the Wages Council which sat and considered wages for people working in the garment industry, and as a result of their returning to the Governor-in-Executive Committee with the same recommendations, it became necessary for us to amend the Act. I pointed out that the amendments are simple; especially the one which reduces the period within which the recommendations must be made in the Press and in the Official Gazette. The other amendment is very important in that the legal adviser has made it clear to us that when a recommendation is made by the Wages Council, it is the duty of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make an Order since the Act says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall make the Order.
5.15 p. m.

I said that these workers were not represented by any Union; and I am going to make my position clear again, if the hon. member does not understand what I said on several occasions. This Ministry is not dictated to by any whims or fancies of his; and I am not prepared to be controlled by him as he controls all the others over there. As a matter of fact, I am controlled in this capacity as a member of this House by the electors of this island; and the electors in St. Michael in particular. I see no other boss.

We have always made it clear that whoever workers were not represented by any organisation, we would set up Wages Councils.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I rise on a point of order. This is a Wages Council Bill; and you have set up a Wages Council dealing with somebody in the garment industry. If the Hon. Minister does not know, when the Wages Council Act was introduced, it was sent to the Barbados Workers Union first.

Hon. M. E. COX: The intent and purpose of this Act is to provide some measure of representation for workers who are not represented by any organisation whatsoever.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes. We agreed to the Act as it was. Therefore, if the Act is going to be amended, are we asking too much to let us know what the amendments are all about? That is why you sent it to us in the first instance.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am saying that the intent and purpose of the Act is to provide a measure of representation for persons who are not organised in any organisation in the island. The hon. member knows that. That has been the principle and policy of the Government long ago.

The position as pointed out in this particular case, is that there is no representation for these people; therefore, the Government set up a Board of Enquiry into this garment industry to investigate the wages and conditions of work of the workers; and after the Board investigated, the findings of the Board were that it was necessary to set up a Wages Council for it because the wages paid in many respects were ridiculously low. As a result of that, a Wages Council was set up.

Before I point out to this House that, speaking for myself, I would have no objection to submitting something to the Union because, as far as we are concerned, much as the hon. member has tried to sever the connections between the Labour Party and the Barbados Workers' Union, we still have a high regard for the Union and still appreciate it and we still give it 100% support. I want that to be clearly understood..... (Mr. WALCOTT: We are not running any candidates.)

We still know that in the case of labour legislation to benefit those people, if a majority of members of this House do not pass that legislation, it will never be the law of the land. I suppose, as the hon. member is an independent, that he can get a lot of things passed!

In the setting up of a Wages Council for this industry, it was comprised of representatives of employers, representatives of the workers and also independent representatives. This is how it was comprised: three members from the Barbados Workers' Union.....

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. There is no point in wasting time. The point which we are talking about is not the constitution of the Council with respect to the garment industry; we are talking about the Wages Council Act. We are saying that the amendment is one in which we of the Union feel that we should be consulted. This is an amendment which you are now introducing, and you did not treat us in the same way as we were treated when the original Act was introduced.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am still going to say what I was prepared to say. The Wages Council for people in the garment industry was comprised of three members of the Barbados Workers' Union.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Those are people to consider and furnish proposals. That has nothing to do with the amendment to the Act as such. Am I right?

Hon. M. E. COX: I am dealing with the Wages Council Act and the amendment. It is around that which this debate is centred.

Mr. SPEAKER: That Council dealt with the proposals. That is nothing to do with the amendment to the Act as such.

Hon. M. E. COX: The amendment arose out of that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member is calling names.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not calling names.

Mr. WALCOTT: He has called a number of people.

Hon. M. E. COX: The composition of the Board was as follows:-

Mr. SPEAKER: Was that Board considering a provision of the proposed amendment to the Act?

Hon. M. E. COX: That Board dealt with the shirt and garment industry and made recommendations.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I know, just as well as other people in Barbados, that the composition of that Board can only deal with the preparation of certain proposals in a specific industry on a specific thing, but this House is now considering an amendment to the Wages Council Act; therefore the composition of that particular Board has absolutely nothing to do with this amendment. I am positively certain about that.

Hon. M. E. COX: If Your Honour rules that way, I am always willing to obey the Chair. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said just now in a portion of his speech - and I hope Your Honour will allow me to deal with that - that the Union protested against the recommendations made by the Wages Council which was set up for the garment and shirt industry. I must confess that I am ignorant of any protest which was made.

Mr. WALCOTT: Does the hon. member mean that I write a protest?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member knows that it is within my province to know; it is something which comes under my Ministry. He does not really understand thoroughly what the constitutional position is. Under the new proposals which we will try to implement in a short time from now, reference is going to be made to the Governor-in-Executive Committee because we have agreed not to change that. We have agreed to allow Governor-in-Executive Committee to remain, but Governor-in-Executive Committee will not be quite the same as under the old set up. More authority will be delegated to the Ministers in that, at present, there is no delegation of subsidiary legislation under

the present constitution; whereas, under the new set up, delegation so far as this is concerned will be the case.
5.25 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this letter is dated the 13th November, 1958. It is signed by the Secretary of the Wages Council and it deals with the Wages Regulations Proposals. This is what it says:-

"The Shirt and Garment Wages Council established by virtue of the Wages Council (Shirt and Garment Manufacture) Order, 1958, made under Section 3 (2) of the Wages Council Act, 1955, having investigated the industrial conditions prevailing as respects the workers and employers in the garment industry and being unanimously agreed now hereby give notice of its intention to submit wages regulations proposals to the Governor-in-Executive Committee in accordance with the provisions of the Wages Councils (Notices) Regulations, 1956, made under Section 11 (3) of the Wages Council Act, 1955.

2. Copies of the Wages Regulation Proposals may be obtained from the Secretary, Shirt and Garment Wages Council C/o Labour Department, Wharf, Bridgetown.

The Shirt and Garment Wages Council shall consider any written representations with respect to the Wages Regulations Proposals within a period of thirty days from the 17th November, 1958. Any such representation should be sent to the Secretary of the Wages Council at the address stated above."

Mr. Speaker, this is the Report of the findings of the Secretary of the Council. This took place on the 8th May, 1959 and this is what it says:-

"Dear Sir, ..."

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member has no right, during the course of his reply, to raise something which is a new matter. The hon. member is now reading something which he is reading for the first time. Why should he deal with that now? Any hon. member who introduces a Bill can only reply to things which have been raised; and nobody raised any new matters. If the hon. member is dealing with a report in connection with the garment industry he should have said that at the beginning. If he wanted to do that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I will have to check on that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am quoting this report so as to point out that the hon. member was misleading. This is what was written on the 8th May, 1959.

"Dear Sir,

I am directed by the Chairman of the Shirt and Garment Manufacture Wages Council to inform you that in accordance with Section 11 (3) of the Wages Council Act, 1955-41, a notice of Wages Regulations Proposals was published in the Official Gazette and the various Sections of the local Press on the 12th March, 1959. No written representations were made with regard to the Wages Regulations Proposals within the period of thirty days stipulated by the notice and at a meeting on the 30th April, 1959, the Council unanimously agreed to submit the Wages Regulations Proposals in accordance with Section 11 (1) of the abovenamed Act to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for further action as required by the said Wages Council Act.

I shall be grateful therefore if you would forward to the Governor-in-Executive Committee the Wages Regulations Proposals as follows:-

(i) that there should be a minimum wage of $5 per week not exceeding forty-two hours or one dollar per day applicable to all workers including those employed on a weekly as well as a piece-rate basis of hire.

(ii) that persons holding a certificate of efficiency or who have completed twelve months' service within a period of eighteen months in an accredited shirt factory should be paid a minimum wage of $7 per week not exceeding forty-two hours or $1.44 per day applicable to all workers including those employed on a weekly as well as a piece-rate basis of hire. Any period shall be taken into account in computing the aggregate twelve months but the onus of proof of such service to rest with the worker with assistance from the Labour Commissioner should circumstances demand.

(iii) that minimum wages should be rigidly applied to any organisation engaged in the manufacture of shirts and garments irrespective of size."

That is the Report, Mr. Speaker, and this is the first time I have heard of any protest. What I am saying now is this: The Cabinet decided that these minima were too low and referred the matter back to the Wages Council with a view to having a revision. One of the arguments we thought that could have been used by the same Wages Council was the fact that, in-as-much as the cost of living has risen over the last few years after the last salary revision and the Government gave a cost of living for government employees of $2.08 per week, that would have been the point by which the Council would have been guided in increasing the wages.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter of detail; that is nothing to do with this stage. I think that that is a matter which could be very easily ferreted out when the House is in Committee.
5.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I can assure you that I would not have referred to it, but since it was referred to and since a lot of play was made of this whole thing, and also of the Shops Act, I should make the Government's position clear. It is all well and good for a member to come here and try to make the public believe that he has done this and that and the Government has done nothing.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. If that was the hon. member's intention in introducing the Shops Order, I am sensible enough to know, if he does not know, that when the Government sets up a Wages Council it has nothing to do with the Government. We protested what the Wages Council did; and if the hon. member says that we protested, the Act says that anybody can protest. If the hon. member wants to come here and say that he is responsible for negotiating wages for the people in the shirt industry, let him say it. All I am saying is that we protested and he heard the protests. He knows this is not the first time he heard me say on the floor of this House that we protested against the $5 a week.

Hon. M. E. COX: All that has been made clear to the House, so I am not arguing about that. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill hinges upon the Wages Council in this particular industry, and that is why it is here. If when we sent back the recommendations for Shop Assistants of $10 for females and $13.50 for males the same thing had applied as applies in this case, we would have had to come to this House of Assembly to get the Act amended. We refused to make an Order on the recommendations made in the case of Shop Assistants; and they reconsidered the matter and went to $12 and $16 respectively; therefore it was unnecessary to come here with the amendment at that time, because there must be some flexibility.

I must say before I sit down that we are not competing against the Union. The hon. member referred to the Hotel Workers and what we did after we had finished the Shops Order. Some of these workers come to us from time to time and tell us of their unhappy plight, because, after all, we are their representatives. My Ministry wrote the Union saying that it had under consideration setting up a Wages Council for these workers and asked their opinion. The Union wrote back saying that the Government need not do anything because the Union and the Hotel and Catering Associating were getting together; so we said "O.K." We do not want to interfere where the Trade Union is representing the people; because; I repeat, the Trade Union is

serving a useful purpose in this island. We have had to build it; long before the Trade Union we were a political party; so we consider the Trade Union as part and parcel of the whole exercise; and that has been stated from platform to platform for years. It is only recently that the break-away Katanga Province..... (Mr. WALCOTT: Do me like they did Lumumba; and Katanga is the richest part of the Congo). That is the position, Sir, and we do not want to interfere where the Trade Union.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. No question of interference ever entered my speech. He does not listen, so he cannot reply. What I said in relation to the hotel industry was that when the Government asked us to set up a Wages Council, he informed them that this group of workers was organised, but in addition to that we took the opportunity of informing the Minister that we were of the opinion that instead of setting up a Wages Council in Barbados, the stage had been reached when the Government should set up a Committee to recommend a minimum wage for Barbados, and that is where the point was raised.

Hon. M. E. COX: I should like to tell the hon. member that we do not agree with that. We had a Minimum Wage Bill on the Statute Book for years in the 'Forties' and everybody knows that.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not the occasion to argue for the merits or demerits of it.

Hon. M. E. COX: That has been repealed and the Wages Council has been substituted in its place. Are you going to fix a minimum wage for everybody in the island?(Mr. WALCOTT: What is wrong with that?) However, Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered the points raised by the hon. member. All I have to say is that as far as I am concerned, as long as I am able.....

Mr. WALCOTT: You have not yet answered my question. I asked you what is going to happen when you take out the word "shall" and use the word "may". How are you going to reach finality?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member knows that this is only to give a little more latitude to the Governor-in-Executive Committee so that it can refer the matter again. If, for instance, a matter is referred a second or third time as the case may be and nothing is done, then it is left to the Government to take such steps as it considers necessary in the interest of the people concerned.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:

2. Subsection (4) of section eleven of the principal Act is hereby repealed and the following subsection substituted therefor -

"(4) Where the Governor-in-Executive Committee receives any wages regulations proposals, he may make an order (hereinafter in this Act referred to as a "wages regulation order") giving effect to the proposals as from such date as may be specified in the order:

Provided that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may, if he thinks fit, refer the proposals back to the Wages Council and the Wages Council shall thereupon reconsider them having regard to any observations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and may, if he thinks fit, re-submit the proposals to the Governor-in-Executive Committee either without amendment or with such amendments as it thinks fit having regard to those observations:

Provided further that before any such amended proposals are re-submitted to the Governor-in-Executive Committee the procedure laid done in subsection (3) of this section shall apply except that the period within representations on the amended proposals may be sent to the Wages Council may be reduced to fourteen days; and that where proposals are so re-submitted, the like proceedings shall be had thereon as in the case of the original proposals.

The date to be so specified shall be a date subsequent to the date of the order, and where, as respects any worker who is paid wages at intervals not exceeding seven days, the date so specified does not correspond with the beginning of the period for which the wages are paid, the order shall, as respects that worker, become effective as from the beginning of the next such period following the date specified in the order."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, what I was endeavouring to explain to the hon. member is that a Wages Council is not anything that the Trade Union or anybody would want to disagree with. You are deleting the word "shall" and substituting the word "may", but what I am pointing out to the hon. member is that if we had been consulted on this, we would have shown him where, under this amendment, the Governor-in-Executive Committee did not have power to make an Order. What I am pointing out is that you have power further to amend this if they played the fool. If it had reached the stage where it required the Govenor-in-Executive Committee to act and you met the Union, we would tell you that you should have power to make an Order if you sent it back to the Wages Council so many times and they refused.
5.45 p.m.

We objected. I do not know what happened at the Labour Department, but the hon. member heard from me on that matter when it was proposed and published that these people were to get $5.00 a week; and it was drawn to my attention when we made submissions that this wage proposal was not going through. I was not aware that the Labour Department wrote me back. I do not want the Hon. Minister to say that we are making all this fuss and have not made any objection. We spoke against it on platforms; kept meeting and told the people that we did not agree to it.

I may also say that work by a Wages Council is very secretive. A member of a Wages Council cannot come back to tell you anything that has been done. The representatives of the Union on Wages Councils are not representatives like representatives who go to negotiate with someone; therefore, we of the Union do not get any reports as regards what a Wages Council is doing. The information which a member of a Wages Council gets is something which he cannot divulge.

Now, as regards this amendment, the word "shall" only gives you the right; the word "may" does not give you the right to make an order. If they send it back to you again in the same way as at the first, you can do nothing. (Hon. M. E. COX: We are aware of that.) For me, the important thing to do is to be able, if you send it back to them the second time just as you did at first, to make them agree to it. It should be just as how you have some legislation on the Statute Book. If you refer something to a Body and that Body refuses to act as you have said, you should be able to make an order.

When the Hon. Minister talks of "Governor-in-Executive Committee", that is only the Cabinet Ministers, the Attorney General, the Chief Secretary or some other official in that capacity; therefore, the Governor-in-Executive Committee now, is the Cabinet. As far as legislation is concerned, a Wages Council Order is not a thing in which the Governor-in-Executive Committee has a say. Therefore, if you are going to send down an order or if you do not agree to send down an order, the whole Executive Committee has to agree to what you say. The Governor

says that he is taking advice when it comes to legislation; that is why I say it is the Minister and not the whole Cabinet.

As I have said, this amendment does not give the Minister the power to make an order. If I am not mistaken, dealing with the nationalised industries in England, there are some clauses which say that the Minister can have the power to submit certain things, and he is also given the power to do certain things; and in the final analysis he has the right to say what those things should be. How are you going to stop the hiatus by this amendment? That is why I say that when it comes to matters like this, you should have had consultation with the Union. My contention all along, was that, as it was labour legislation we, of the Union, should have been consulted. What the Hon. Minister of Labour does not seem to understand is that these are workers whom you are talking about. You are talking about people in the garment industry and this amendment is going to apply to any worker for whom you are going to set up a Wages Council. I repeat, that in the same way that the Union was consulted at the beginning, when the principal Act was brought down, we of the Union should be consulted now.

Do not let the Hon. Minister worry about the separations of the Union from the Barbados Labour Party; you have separations with your wife and family sometimes. The Ministers of the Government cannot run their Ministries and the Union too. If the Hon. Minister is running his Ministry, I am running the Workers' Union. We are running our affairs; and we say that we should have been consulted on the basis that this a legislation dealing with workers. If you bring legislation down as regards the putting up of a sugar factory, we do not quarrel and say that you should tell us about it before you brought it down. All we say is that if you are bringing down labour legislation that you should treat us in the same way as you treat I.L.O. Send it to us. We feel that is as it should be.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

5.55 p.m.

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.

PUBLIC OFFICERS LOAN AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 4 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances Act, 1948.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to amend the Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances Act, 1948, in order that the facilities thereby created will be extended to people in the lower grades of the service such as Postmen, Deputy Marshals and people of that sort. The Bill seeks to amend the Act in two respects; in the first place, by deleting the word "motor" appearing in Section 3 and in the second place by extending the definition of the expression "vehicle" in Section 2. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the principle of this Bill; I feel that a very deserving class of workers like the Postmen have been in need of assistance for some time. However, I would be glad if the Premier would say how much loan is to be granted and what allowance there will be for maintenance purposes given to Postmen in so far as autocycles or bicycles are concerned. This is a very commendable act, but I want to be certain that the amount for the Postmen and those who are called upon to travel in the lower grades will derive real benefits and not artificial benefits.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, as far as motor cars are concerned - I presume that the rates will apply to motor cycles as well, all depending upon the mileage travelled. It is suggested that for the first two hundred miles the rate should be 28 cents per mile, for an additional 150 miles, 8 cents a mile, and over 350 miles, 7 cents per mile. With regard to autocycles, for the first two hundred miles, the rate is nine cents per mile, for an additional 150 miles, three cents per mile and any mileage over 350 miles, two cents a mile.

As regards the loans, the maximum loan in respect of motor cars is $3,000; in the case of motor cycles, $1,000; autocycles $450; and bicycles, $155. In no case should the loan exceed the cost of the vehicle. There is the usual Bill of Sale, Insurance and the maximum period of the loan.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

6.05 p.m.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M.E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st February, 1961 at 12 noon.

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

INTER-GOVERNMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in agreeing with the adjournment, although it would seem a bit unusual, I would like on this occasion to say that for once the Premier of Barbados said something on behalf of Barbadians that sounded very good, or looked very good to read, when in Trinidad he let it be known that if Barbados could not attend the Inter-Governmental meeting, it had a right to say so. I think it is time that those who speak on behalf of Barbados would give a little bit of resilience in their speech, so that people would have a little more respect for us. Our position in the Caribbean seems to have been slipping; and they believe all Barbadians have become subservient to the Federation; and because the Leader of the Labour Party was made Prime Minister of the West Indies, they feel that Barbadians must be subservient in every other matter. I was very pleased indeed to see that the Premier had the courage to say in Trinidad that Barbados is run by Barbadians and we will not be pushed around. I welcome that; and

I would like the Barbados Government to understand that Barbados is run by Barbadians; and that those of us on this side of the Table are Barbadians and will not be pushed around.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member may has lost sight of one or two aspects of the matter. It is quite true.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter just rose on the Adjournment to make a complimentary remark which was on the Adjournment proper, and which I permitted; but I will not allow any debate to lead to a criticism of what the Premier did in Trinidad. I just would not for one single moment allow any debate that would be derogatory to what the Premier did in Trinidad; that is not before the House. I allowed the congratulatory remarks by the hon. senior member for St. Peter to the Premier, but I will not allow anything else to smear its decorum and introduce a note of sourness; that is quite unnecessary and has nothing to do with this House at this present stage.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think you are anticipating what I did not intend to say. What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that all of us are most enthusiastic and anxious to commend any indication on the part of Barbados in demanding respect from our Federal colleagues; but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, in expressing our appreciation of any such stand, one has to bear in mind that you cannot be wrong and strong.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is?

Mr. CRAWFORD: You have to wait and hear. A decision which is founded on an indefensible position is to be commended.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now talking on a subject I do not know of.

Mr. CRAWFORD: So was the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh, no! The hon. senior member for St. Peter in forthright language spoke congratulating the Hon. Premier on his stand at the recent inter-Governmental talks in Trinidad. That was simple, plain, and I believe earnest.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Of course, I am sure he was earnest, but let us say this finally: the congratulatory remarks by the hon. member for St. Peter might not have been mentioned at all if he were fully aware of the facts involved.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st February, at 12noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.15 p.m.