

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 24th May, 1961.

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

PRESENT

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

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

I have the honour also to inform the House that the Order Paper for today's meeting will be ready in about half an hour's time.

At yesterday's meeting of the House, the House was sitting in discussion on a Bill to make provision for the payment of allowances to displaced workers as a result of the Deep Water Harbour. On that occasion the hon. senior member for St. Peter had just concluded his address.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there were one or two points which I had left over and which I propose to deal with.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not entirely finished yet?

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir.

PAPERS LAID

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

Draft Agreement with Esso Standard Oil S.A. Ltd. for the provision of bunkering facilities and services at Barbados.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to Esso Standard Oil S. A. Limited of a parcel of land; part of the Deep Water Harbour; containing by admeasurement 10,000 square feet, for the operation of the bunkering facilities in the new Harbour.

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

A Bill to amend the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 44/1961, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph regarding the treatment meted out to school children of the Primary Schools in the parish of St. Peter on attendance at the Dental Clinic at the Speightstown Health Centre, is now ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Question No. 45/1961, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph regarding the lack of control of the sound volume of the speakers presently installed in the Primary Schools making it impossible for the pupils to appreciate this form of education, is now ready.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 54/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, regarding the Soil Conservation Scheme in the parish of St. Andrew, is now ready.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958, be now read a first time.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER No. 5

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the business for today, there are certain items which I should like exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5, but since the Order Paper is not yet ready and may be changed, I will have to read them out *seriatim* from yesterday's Order Paper. They are as follows:- "Bill to provide for the payment of displaced workers" and then "Orders Nos. 1 to 13" inclusive on yesterday's Order Paper, as well as a "Bill to amend the Trade Act, 1910" which was given notice of yesterday and also the "Amendments to the Local Government Act, 1958."

I beg to move that those Orders be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5 for today's Sitting.

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

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

DISPLACED WORKERS BILL

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there are three points which I do not think I have made clear on which I want to conclude my remarks. Apparently the Barbados Workers' Union has come in for some criticism on this matter with which the Bill is dealing; and as the Barbados Workers Union has had to deal with these matters and I happen to be the General Secretary and there is no other person who can speak for the Union as I speak, I will have to make the position crystal clear.

The first thing which I wish to deal with is the appointment of members to the Board. In this Bill it is stated that three members of the workers are to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Yesterday we heard from the Minister that the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Cabinet were to do the appointing and the policy of the Government was to accept a panel of names from the organisation from which they would do the appointing. I want to make it quite clear here and now that we of the Barbados Workers' Union will have nothing to do with this Bill if Government is asking us to submit four names from which they will appoint three. We are making this position quite clear to let the public know that when the Deep Water Harbour starts to operate, whether it be tomorrow, next week or next month, we will have nothing to do with the Port until every matter is settled to our satisfaction.

The second matter is to deal with Mr. Reid, the Port Manager. I have been a man who has always avoided the opportunity of attacking Civil Servants, but there is this gentleman by the name of Mr. Reid who, I believe, will have a lot to do with the Port. I want to say that we of the Union have no intention of co-operating with him or anybody who tries to slander officers of the Union and more so, its Executive Officer who is myself. If I speak for the workers, then we will let the Government know in no uncertain manner whom I speak for. I say this now because we do not want to take anybody unawares.

The other matter is that the Union never stated that the question of finding employment should be a substitute for *ex gratia* payment. We have said and I repeat, the question of severance pay has been agreed upon between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government and has nothing to do with the question of finding employment. We submit that the question of finding employment is a matter to be dealt with on a national basis and for that reason a national body should be set up incorporating all the important elements of the community to deal with the matter.

In this Bill they say three members are to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to represent the workers on this Board. If it is the policy of the Government to ask the Union for a panel of names, I want to make our position quite clear.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not like these statements to go unchallenged when they are made because they lose their effect. I am sure that I have it in writing that the Union had accepted all the proposals as set out in the Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sure that Your Honour can understand English and you are listening to the debate. I am sure that you have heard what I have said and what the hon. member said. You heard him say yesterday that the policy of the Government is to have a panel of names submitted from which they will do the appointing. That is nothing to do with what is being agreed to. What we are saying today is that the Union was not told that the appointments to this Board is what is now being enunciated. Three members to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee means so far as this Cabinet is concerned....

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know where the hon. member read it that three members are to be appointed. The Act provides for the Board to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and it says that the Board shall consist of three members to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to represent the workers concerned and the Labour Commissioner or his Deputy to be the Chairman. That is the provision under this Act. The whole Board will be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: Will Your Honour ask the hon. member not to interrupt me with these nonsensical, ignoramus interruptions which he is making? If he is not listening to what I am saying, let him go outside. I said that three members are to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to represent the workers. What has been said yesterday is that the policy of the Cabinet in asking organisations to submit names for appointment was that you submit a panel of names because it was regarded by them that when you select a member, it was tantamount to your saying that you are doing the appointment and because of that, they are not in favour of your selecting the person. I want to make it clear that since it has been interpreted that that is their policy, we of the Union will have nothing to do with that policy, and if this Bill is based on that policy, we will take no part in it.
12.35 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by quoting a paragraph from the Report of the Committee which was appointed to report on the action to be taken to establish this Deep Water Harbour. The paragraph which I want to quote is paragraph 29 which says this:-

"It is anticipated that the establishment of a Deep Water Harbour while providing a saving in general labour costs, will thereby deprive a number of port workers of their means of livelihood. Accordingly, we recommend that steps be taken to ensure that, towards the end of construction, priority of employment be given to such displaced workers. We also recommend that consideration be given to the entire problem of displaced workers and their rehabilitation."

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me almost inconceivable that in its approach to this entire matter the Government has completely ignored the most important recommendations of this Committee, that recommendation being that steps be taken to ensure that, towards the end of construction, priority of employment be given to such displaced workers. One can hardly believe that in this year 1961 with the resources available to the Government, they should have approached this entire question purely from the point of view of putting a gratuity in the hands of this number of displaced persons without any thought of their future employment. The introducer of this Bill claimed yesterday that since these people pursued a particular type of job, it would be impracticable to locate them in other types of work.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I have never said anything of that sort. As a matter of fact, I went so far as to tell this House that the Government had decided that priority of employment must be given to these people wherever suitable. What I did emphasise, and I believe that every intelligent person will agree with me, is that there could be no undertaking which the Government could embark upon at this stage in order to absorb these workers to this extent at one time. That was suggested in the newspaper.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We heard him say that the Government thought of a number of things, roads....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I will be in a lot of restraint today. I did not say that the Government thought of a number of things; what I did say was that you cannot take a man from working as a stevedore and put him to work on a road, laying a pipe track or anything like that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We are not concerned with what the hon. member intended to say; we are concerned with what the records will show that he said.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say that. I hope that the hon. member will quote me correctly. I repeat: I did not say that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot quote because the Hansard from which to quote is not yet ready.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member has just said what I am saying. In other words, according to him, since these people are accustomed to a specific type of work, it is not easy to replace them in other types of work to which they are not accustomed. He said that there were many enquiries made in Germany. Somebody came from Germany and said that there was a shortage of workers in Post Offices and what not, and they were exploring avenues in order to try to get these people to work in Germany. Are they going to be stevedores in Germany?

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I dealt with that point in two phases. One was the question of those who are now working on the Deep Water Harbour. I explained that we discussed that question with the Minister of Communications in Germany thoroughly and then I said that as far as I could gather, there were a lot of jobs in Post Offices for people working with packages and so on, which were vacant and we also discussed that matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Whom are we going to send to Germany? Displaced workers and other unemployed people?

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say anything about Brazil.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We all know him; he knows nothing about ethics or the fine points of debate. He is responsible for reducing this debate to this low stage.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I object to that. That could not be true. You read the speeches I have made in here, those made by the hon. member and those by other hon. members.

Mr. CRAWFORD: His idea is that you cannot reply to him. He has to reduce the whole thing to abuse. If the Government admittedly is going to consider the possibility of sending people to work in Germany, in this context where they are not going to be engaged in similar work, the whole thing is nothing but absurdity. You really cannot conceive of the average Barbadian going to work in Germany.

12.45 p.m.
Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, are we going to find people with the calibre to work in German Post Offices and what not when we cannot get them with the calibre to work at the London Transport Board? It is the height of absurdity. The whole fact of the matter is that the Government is utterly incapable of approaching this matter in the manner in which it should be approached. Do not merely think of giving some hand-outs to people like the displaced coopers, and then when the money is gone the last stage of the men is worse than the first. This question, as the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has emphasised, needed to be approached in an entirely different manner; but the entire approach by the Government of Barbados on matters of this sort is singularised by their approach to the question of Federation. In so far as they are concerned, the only important thing we can get out of Federation is freedom of movement, because every country in the world, Trinidad and the West Indies, Germany and Europe are becoming almshouses for unemployed Barbadians.

We go to Federation because they tell people here that they have no plans or capacities to find work for the people; therefore some other country must find work for them - and he is even going further afield and telling Germany and Europe they must become almshouses to take in our unemployed people, when here in Barbados the capacity both economic and otherwise exists for finding remunerative employment for the people. What is needed is for the Government to approach this matter in a con-

structive manner and not giving out \$1 million as *ex-gratia* payments to thousands of people and then having them walk around and, as the hon. senior member for the City has said, throwing their financial cares and burden on the Public Assistance Bodies of the island, when, as has been pointed out, remunerative work could be found in this island for the people to do.

The hon. member yesterday quoted some figures of present unemployment which he said were census figures. I do not know which census he means; he could not have meant the last census because if somebody pushed those figures at him and told him they were figures from the last census, they were making an absolute fool of him, because the figures from the last census are not yet available. He said yesterday that the present Labour force had risen from 92,000 to 100,900, and unemployment had decreased by 18,000 to 16,000.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say that at all, Mr. Speaker. What can I do with a member like that? I outlined the position as far as unemployment is concerned, and I gave the percentage. I did not say 18,000; I said that the number of unemployed had decreased from 18% to 16%.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I got those figures from the hon. senior member for St. Peter who heard them.

Hon. M. E. COX: The two of you are strange bed-fellows.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In order to check my figures, I asked the hon. senior member for St. Peter and he called them back for me.

Mr. WALCOTT: When you talk about strange bed-fellows, how about you and Garner? You said that Garner carried away things from Fogarty's.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am quoting word for word what the hon. member said, and when I wanted to be sure of the figures I checked with the hon. member for St. Peter who was present and he called them back for me; but now the Minister is saying.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, the hon. member said he got the figures from the hon. senior member for St. Peter and now he is saying he had his figures and he checked them with the hon. member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I had the figures and checked them back with him.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, since my name was mentioned, I did not use those figures because I figured the hon. member might have objected. I must say that I took down the figures when he was reading, and he said that the unemployment figure had been reduced from 18,000 to 16,000; so I do not know what he is now saying. If he did not know what he said then, I was taking down the figures as he went on, because we was speaking on terms of unemployment and referred to the thousands of labour force and thousands of unemployed, and no question of percentage arose.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Somebody pushed these figures at him and he came in here to quote them and does not know what he is saying. He said that according to the census figures, the labour force has increased from 92,000 to 100,900 and unemployment has decreased from 18,000 to 16,000. If he meant to say percentages, he did not have time in the heat of debate to quote what he was given correctly, and said what came to his mind. If somebody says they are census figures, they are making a fool of him, because the census figures of last year are not available; they are still being processed in Trinidad.

Hon. M. E. COX: I never mentioned anything about last year. I told this House that the figures were from 1955 to 1960 and that 10,000 odd more people were employed in this island.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the figures are 1955, they are even more hopelessly wrong, and whoever is his informant does not know what he is talking about, because between November, 1954 and November, 1955, we had the Report from George Cumper on unemployment in Barbados. Mr. Cumper published the Report just before the election in 1956, and the Government was so dumbfounded at the figures that it refused to lay the Report on the Table of the House, and it was not laid for some time after. George Cumper said that the unemployment figures in the crop were 19,200 and they rose to 23,000 in the hard time. Those figures are to be found in the Cumper Report. As a matter of fact, one copy was laid on the Table of this House which disappeared the day after, and nobody knows anything at all about it after that. When we got ours some years after, those were the figures in it; so Mr. Speaker, if George Cumper discovered and reported that the unemployment figures were 19,200 in crop and 23,000 out of crop, one does not know where on earth he could have quoted those figures from. Naturally, they start off with the wrong information and cannot end up right.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to tell them at this stage what should have been done to find work for these people. I am too tired of telling them what to do, and then when I tell them what to do, they do it and get the credit for it; so I am no longer telling them.
12.55 p.m.

What he and the others signed and agreed to do was to finance the cost of the Harbour by pushing up the cost of goods in the island. It is not my duty to tell them what to do and could be done to find work for the people.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is the hon. member saying that this Harbour would lead to increasing the cost of goods coming to this island?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have often felt that if there were two people who could appreciate what you were saying, the hon. member was one. I said that their intention at the time when this Report was completed was to pay for the financing of the Harbour by increasing the cost of living. (A VOICE: Who?) The people who signed the report.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That is what I wanted him to make clear. When he says: "they" and then says "the people who signed the report", that is a different matter. We are not the people who signed the report. The people who signed the report was a National Committee appointed from all sections of the community. Do not say members of this Government only.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Minister signed the Report. He made no reservations at all when the Committee recommended that it was to be financed by increasing the cost of living. All I am saying here is that, left to him, that would have been done. If the Hon. Minister wants to disassociate himself now, well, then.....

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I draw to the hon. member's attention that this was the reservation made by him. This is what he said:-

"With reference to paragraph 23, I am in absolute agreement that the Deep Water Harbour could be financed by the levy of a part charge not exceeding 2% on all imports and exports."

What does that mean?

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is absolutely impossible, Mr. Speaker, to argue with him.

Hon. M. E. COX: Explain it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Explain what? Why have you stopped there? Read the other paragraph. I will read the whole thing. Of course, he is a man who divorced two wives.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member withdraw that remark?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I withdraw it.

Hon. M. E. COX: There is no harm in that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, for the construction of the Deep Water Harbour, they were of the opinion that a levy of 2% of the value of imports and exports could finance it. That is what the Committee said and what the Hon. Minister signed to. I said in the second paragraph that I agreed that you could finance it in this way but I did not say that you should to it. That is all I said. In my minority report, I said that I am in absolute agreement to this levy but then I went on to say:

"Since, however, this levy cannot be operative until the harbour has been actually constructed - that is to say, within at least five years - should there be developments in the economy of the country from which the scheme could be financed without placing this additional burden on the community, especially bearing in mind the recent increases in Customs duty, it is to be hoped that alternative methods of financing would receive consideration."

Hon. M. E. COX: Like what?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am not here to tell them that, either. I am tired doing that. They are the Government; let them find out what should be done and then when I do not agree with it, let them say so. I am not going to tell them. I remember telling them about manufacturing cassava flour to feed the people when the war was going on and you should have heard what they said then. Twelve months after they were doing it. You could have heard their laughter down Broad Street when I made the suggestion; but twelve months after they were doing it.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the entire approach of the Government to this matter is so reactionary and so inconceivable that you cannot really believe that a section of people running a country in the year 1961 with all the available sources of information, knowledge and everything else, can sit down and solemnly decide that they are going to put 18,000 people out of work and put them to sit down and find no other alternative employment for them. I am saying this. Can you imagine that happening either in Trinidad, Jamaica or one of the small islands? The Committee itself had recommended in its report that prior to the completion of the construction of the Harbour - that is to say, do not wait until it was finished - priority of unemployment should be given to such displaced workers. Either they do not understand or it is complete indifference to them; but they have sat supinely by and just push people in a corner and tell them to go and sit down until you call them and give them a little bit of money. We all know that the amount which they will get will be such that they will go and throw it away in two or three weeks and then you would have them walking around the country and probably stealing.
1.05 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: This is what the paragraph says:

"It is anticipated that the establishment of a Deep Water Harbour, while providing a saving in general labour costs, will thereby deprive a number of port workers of their means of livelihood. Accordingly, we recommend that steps be taken to ensure that, towards the end of construction, priority of employment be given to such displaced workers. We also recommend that consideration be given to the entire problem of displaced workers and their rehabilitation."

You could not be displaced until the thing has been finished.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, such simpleness is beyond my conception. What do you mean by the words "towards the end of construction?" Ask any fourth standard boy what "towards the end" means. What the Committee felt is that you were not supposed to wait until the Deep Water Harbour was actually finished to talk about finding work for these people; before the Harbour was finished you should put the men in work. That is what the

Committee meant. The Committee meant that you could give them some money.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. If he says that you should find work for these people, I am asking him whom would he put into the work which they were doing so as to carry on until the Harbour is finished?

Mr. CRAWFORD: In other words, you would find work for the people before the Harbour is finished. That does not mean that these people must go into the work before the Harbour is finished. Do you mean to say that you have people running the Government who are so abstruse? That is the spectacle which they make of themselves in this debate. The Committee meant that before the Harbour was finished you should make plans for the employment of these people. Another fifteen hundred people will be unemployed and you should make plans for putting these people in new employment when the Harbour is finished. The Minister of Labour has no conception of what has to be done, and therefore let him stew in his own juice; let him pay out this money, and when it is all gone, let the people be unemployed and have a riot as we had in 1937. That will bring them to their senses.

What I am saying is that regardless of what section to which you belong, you have got to view with a certain amount of gravity, the position in which we find ourselves at the moment. I regard it as a national tragedy that at a time like this, the Government should be in the hands of pigmies. In Jamaica, they are making the most rapid strides towards finding employment for the people there, and the development of the country is something at which to marvel. A few days ago in the pages of the Advocate, Mr. Hewitt, who covered the Inter-governmental Conference in Trinidad, had some remarks to make about the extraordinary pace of development in Trinidad. Even to Mr. Hewitt, who knows the West Indies fairly well, what they are doing there is a surprise. And in the current debates on Federation, both the leaders of Jamaica and of Trinidad regard freedom of movement as something basic; they are not thinking of it as the only solution to their ills. The Jamaicans do not want to go to Trinidad and the Trinidadians do not want to go to Jamaica. Even Grenada is not emphasizing so much at this stage the question of freedom of movement as Barbados is doing. Barbados is clinging to freedom of movement like a drowning man who is catching at a feather because they have nothing else. The number of the unemployed is still about 26,000, regardless of the misinformation which was given to this House yesterday. If there is less unemployment in this country, it is not because avenues of labour have been found. As a matter of fact, if there are any avenues of employment in Barbados itself, that is because of less mechanisation; it is not because there is any more work provided here.

Look at the thousands of people who are leaving this country in order to find work in England; as a matter of fact, any merchant in Bridgetown will tell you that this situation has placed a very serious financial drain on the overall economy of the country. That is so more especially since the pronouncement made by the Federal Prime Minister that emigration to Great Britain is likely to be curtailed, and every single man in the country who can put his hand on a dollar is trying to stock it away in order to accumulate his passage money for the purpose of going to England.
1.15 p.m.

There are today on the estates in this island in the urban parishes large numbers of workers hoarding every cent they can get to make up the \$600 or \$700 required to go to England. Go to the Police Station and find out the number of applications for Passports. If you were to estimate, Mr. Speaker, the serious strain on the economy of this country by the cost of passages and other costs of people going to England, you would see how much money is going out of circulation. While I stand second to no one in my desire to see as many people as possible find work outside of the country, I also feel that the time has more than come when every effort should be made to try and find work for people who are bound to come back here sooner or later and people

who will be bottled up here with nowhere to go, because whether or not the British Government intends to curtail West Indian migration, the fact remains that after Independence, there will not be the open door to Britain that exists today; and if with this large scale exodus of Barbadians to Great Britain and elsewhere to ease the present situation and to cause any reduction that exists in the unemployment labour force there is no attempt to find additional avenues of employment in Barbados, you will know what the position will be when the exodus to Great Britain ceases. What the hon. senior member for St. Peter said yesterday is bound to pass, Mr. Speaker, and that is why all I am doing on this matter today is pointing out the incapacity of the Government and their indifference towards the basic issues involved in this question of displacing all these people from the Port.

Mr. Speaker, the time will come when we will do more, but I want to tell them that their approach is completely out of date and wrong, and their source of information of the unemployment figures is completely wrong, because the D.L.P. tried from Trinidad for another reason to get the information available and it is not available yet. Trinidad says it is doing theirs first and ours would take about three months, I believe. You could not send to Trinidad today to get one single complete return for the last census to disclose the number of unemployed in this country at all; it is not processed yet; so if he says that those are the unemployment figures, they are completely wrong.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, although my colleague has stated our position in this matter, I would like to attempt to fill in any gaps he might have left. Now speaking generally on this Bill, Sir, I agree with the general principle of it and with the Objects and Reasons as set out, because it serves a useful purpose in providing some means of temporary assistance to the displaced workers. What I am mainly concerned with is that having had personal dealings with the displaced coopers, and having known at first hand the attitude of certain members of the Government and more especially of the former Prime Minister in a matter of this nature, I would like some sort of assurance or some sort of *bona fides* exhibited here today that those Port workers who are being displaced will not be let down as the coopers were eventually. It is all well and good to put legislation on the Statute Book like the Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1953 and then after a few years have it repealed. This will be repealed probably after a few years. I want some assurance that this Act which we are passing here with all the hopes and the aspirations for these displaced workers will not after another four or five years be repealed like the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export (Amendment) Act, 1953. Under that Act, Sir, the displaced coopers were left to the mercy of the Government or to the particular Board which was set up, because under that Act, legislation was introduced and put on the Statute Book whereby provision was made for displaced coopers by way of a levy. I will read the appropriate section of the Act to which I refer.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but will you remember that during the last Session this House unanimously agreed to a Bill to amend that Act. That Act took away any power whatsoever from Government or from anybody to make a levy to provide for displaced coopers after it was agreed upon by the Union representative and some of the displaced people; therefore any criticism on that part of it is a reflection upon the decision of this House, and I call Your Honour to rule.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am not criticising the Government; I merely want an assurance from them on a point of that particular nature which in my opinion was a sort of let-down to displaced coopers. I have not got the Government in hand; we can talk here as long as we want and they can outvote us. I did not get up to talk like that, but if he wants me to do it, I can. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that in this particular case legislation was put on the Statute Book whereby a levy would be imposed on the molasses produced in this country. That Bill said that a levy shall be made; it was not a question of "may", because every-

thing I see in this Bill is "may"; I am thinking of something mandatory, but this Bill is only discretionary. That is one of the first points I want to deal with in this Bill. Whereas in the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export (Amendment) Act, 1953, it is specifically set out that there shall be a levy which shall always be imposed....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, this is a Bill which, if agreed to, the House will be asked after that to pass a Resolution for the sum involved in this exercise. This is different from what he is saying. There is no levy on sugar or anything like that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am merely pointing out something to the hon. member and I do not intend to go back to school to him or anybody else around here. I am pointing out that the phraseology of this Bill is entirely different. Whereas the word "may" is used throughout the new Bill before us, in the case of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export (Amendment) Act, 1953, the word "shall" is used, and anybody trained in law would know that "shall" is mandatory and has to be done, whereas in this Bill it may or may not be done.

1.25 p.m.

If you want me to explain it further, you will see in Clause 3 of the Schedule that what I am saying is clearly pointed out. It says: "No displaced worker shall have an absolute right to any allowance payable under the provisions of these regulations." In other words, what is done for him is *ex gratia*, or out of compassion. You are doing something just to keep him quiet. Jump up and answer that.

Hon. M. E. COX: What else can it mean? Those persons were not the Government employees for whom we have to provide pensions and/or gratuities. That was the only means of doing it. I can quote the occasion when people were displaced through B.U.O.C. They were given thirty or forty weeks. All over the world that is so; therefore, that is nothing new.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am pointing out that Clause 3 of the Schedule shows on the face of it very clearly and explicitly that what is being given to the workers is something out of compassion. It is not anything which shall always be done. It is not a levy which shall be imposed every year; it is just what the Government may want to do. In other words, as is contained in this Bill, the funds of the Board shall consist of such sums as may be provided from time to time for the purpose of this Act by the Legislature. Everything depends on the whims and caprices of the Government. Then the Bill goes on to say that the funds of the Board shall consist of (b) such sums as may from time to time be paid out of the Price Stabilization Reserve Fund in accordance with regulations made under the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, for the purpose of this Act; and (c) such other sums as may from time to time be paid to the Board.

All that I am saying is that you can also put in "and a levy of so much, whether it is 50 cents or one dollar in each crop year on every ton of sugar produced." If you had put that in, we would have seen some measure of security. It would mean that you would be providing a Revolving Fund to assist these 14,000 or 20,000 workers and their families. As matter of fact, you have to multiply 16,000 by five or six in order to get the number of souls who are going to suffer as a result of this Harbour.

Sir, I speak with an intimate knowledge of this matter because I was the one who when the Prime Minister — the ex-Premier — could not be found was the person to whom they sent all the displaced coopers at that time, and after they had made all those wild promises, I was the one who had to stand up and see after assisting those displaced coopers. I have a heart and a conscience; so I stood up and helped the displaced coopers. I saw to it that money which should be put in the fund was got from the Labour Welfare Fund and so on. Each and every displaced cooper would tell you that. I never dodged through any door and went through the other; I helped them. I fear that unless special provision is made for these 8,000 or 9,000 people, they are going to rely on promises. Unless a levy is imposed on the sugar manu-

factured in Barbados for another ten or fifteen years to allow enough time to lapse whereby the old ones would have gone off the scene and the younger ones would have got rehabilitation or unless you have something to provide a revolving fund for some sort of permanency on a reasonable basis for fifteen or twenty years, we will not be helping these displaced workers as they deserve. What is being done here today is merely providing compensation for loss of employment; in other words, what a Union Leader would call Severance Pay. We are providing Severance Pay and what would be called in the case of Directors, Golden Handshakes.

Mr. Speaker, even from the Objects and Reasons, you will see that there is a glaring omission which is being made, because as regards the financing of the funds of the Board, in my opinion, there is nothing there which would give you the impression that these people are being provided with compensation for a reasonable time on a permanent basis. Unless you include a levy on the sugar produced in the island which would be tantamount to some of the profits gained by bulk shipment of sugar, you are doing nothing. The factory people are effecting a big saving as a result of bulk shipment of sugar. I am not quarrelling with that; they have to do that to compete with the world market; but if they are effecting a big savings on account of that, why should not a levy be made on each ton of sugar produced as was done in the case of the bulk shipment of fancy molasses? A levy should be made on all the sugar manufactured in this island for at least the next twenty years.

1.35 p.m.

You should make it specific so that in another two or three years we will not be seen coming back here in order to repeal this Act which we will have passed here today. That Act was not repealed in my time; as a matter of fact, that could not have happened. That is my first observation. Whereas the Government is trying in a way to help the people, there is no measure of permanence in anything which they are doing; and with the experience of displaced coopers at the back of my mind, I know what they are up to. You will provide this benefit for a year or two and then the whole thing will go to bottom. If the Minister who is in charge of this Bill wants to do anything of a permanent nature, he should give some assurance that he will consider the imposition of a levy on the sugar produced in this island. The hon. member will have to amend the regulations and the Act in time; I know that he cannot do it all today.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that he should prevent the displaced workers from getting their money as expeditiously as possible. However, I should like to say that this Bill should be amended by inserting a sub-clause in Clause 6. I would like the Hon. Minister to reply to this point and not by-pass it. Unless that is done, unless this Clause is amended there is no question of setting up a revolving fund by which income would be provided for the purpose of boosting the fund in order that pensions can be provided for the old people who cannot now work, but who have spent some forty years in some capacity or the other on the waterfront. That is an appeal on behalf of these people. Unless that provision is put in, the whole thing will fall to the ground. I dare anybody to say otherwise.

The Government will not be able to come down here for any \$1 million every year to give these displaced workers. You will find that the planters and the factory owners will fight the Government over the Price Stabilization Fund which used to be to the tune of about \$15 million, but which has been depleted since the building of the Bulk Sugar Installation. In any case, the Government will meet opposition from the factory owners. The Bill says that the Funds of the Board shall consist of (a) such sums as may be provided from time to time for the purposes of this Act by the Legislature. I am saying that the Government will not always be able to provide one million dollars for displaced workers; they will do it for this year but another Resolution will not be coming down for any million dollars. This Resolution has to come down because this year is election year and it would be suicidal not to do otherwise. I am surprised that this amount is not even more; this amount should be \$3 million. When this first Resolution comes down to provide funds for the purpose of financing this Board, the

merchants and planters who are really one and the same people - I should say that these merchants and/or planters will put up a fight against the Government in relation to the Price Stabilization Fund and the Government will not be able to touch much of that money. If you are going to touch a substantial portion of the money accruing to this Fund then let us know where we stand now. Do not let us just mention that some sort of this money is coming from the Price Stabilization Fund and pass on. This Fund has always been regarded as the private interest of the plantation and factory owners; this money is controlled by the Colonial Office and unless the Colonial Office agrees to this matter, then there is no business doing.

Mr. Speaker, I have inside knowledge of these matters. There is a promise held up in paragraph (b) of Clause 6. That paragraph reads as follows; Clause six begins; "the funds of the Board shall consist of" - and then we have paragraph (b) which says: "such sums as may from time to time be paid out of the Price Stabilization Reserve Fund in accordance with Regulations made under the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, for the purposes of this Act." As I have already said, these are reserve funds which are controlled by the Colonial Office and to write in this Bill that these funds will be supported is not good enough for me. It says in paragraph (c) "such other sums as may from time to time be paid to the Board." But from what source?

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The hon. member is not adding anything to the debate. He is only filibustering. I said that the sum of \$750,000 will come from the Price Stabilization Fund and \$1 million will come from the Treasury. If you are going to finance this Fund and the money is to be paid out in instalments, you lose interest. This money is to be paid out as demands necessitate, and as the money is required. As to these two sources and any other source, I said that if there is anybody who wants to make a contribution towards the assistance of these displaced persons, there is nothing to prevent him from doing so. The hon. member or anybody else who wants to contribute to these funds can do so.
1.45 p.m.

Mr. TALMA: That did not carry us any further. What I wanted the Minister to say is that not only will \$1 3/4 million be voted this year, but that each year provision will be made for this Fund in order that a certain measure of permanence and security may be granted to these displaced workers. That is what I wanted to hear him say, but he wants to hand this out now and then everything else will be all right after. The Objects and Reasons said "such other sums as may from time to time be paid to the Board."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I dealt with the sources of income of this Board and again I want to make it clear that there is nothing mandatory about it; everything is discretionary and may or may not be done. I am trying to be as brief as possible and what I am saying now has never been said before. I am repeating it because some of them across there are dull to understand. When I leave here, I know I have given a good elementary lesson and at least the Minister of Education will understand, though not the other Ministers.

In going through the Regulations, I see that there are no schemes set out. I remember quite well that when we were dealing with the displaced coopers, we had the Regulations drawn up and in the Regulations schemes were set out in order to provide some measure of permanent employment and assistance to those workers then; but no permanent scheme is set out in these Regulations. Some of my colleagues who have spoken already have criticised the Government on that score and the Government's attitude is to leave it to them to devise the various schemes and things of that sort. I feel that unless we insert some practical schemes which could be utilised for the benefit of these workers, and which could be carefully considered by the Cabinet, we would be failing in our duties. I do not care who gets the credit. I would feel happy to know that a few thousand souls get something to eat every day if proper schemes are put into force now; so I am going further than my colleagues. I am astonished to see that nothing

concrete has been set out in the Regulations. The Minister said that he could not think of anything or words to that effect; I would not attempt to quote the Minister because he would say I am misquoting him to anything I say he said. The gist of what he said.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I know the Minister because we worked together as Ministers. I am asking him to state any time I have ever made any misleading statement, lie or anything he knows of.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, my idea is to say what I have to say and finish. In these Regulations, no mention is made of any permanent scheme to assist the workers. It is just that this hand-out will be given to them, and after that, nothing. There should be schemes for the younger men and other schemes for those over 50 and so on. Those under 50 years could be assisted in a greater measure by way of emigration in the first instance; they can be assisted also in certain road works, say, the East Coast Road, so that the younger men who are able to work could be given remunerative employment. The road leading to the Airport could be widened, new roads could be built and others straightened so that the younger men could find work of a permanent nature apart from this hand-out which they are going to receive. They should have some assurance that money can be earned and employment secured by them.

Mr. Speaker, what harm could there be in Government negotiating the purchase of three or four plantations in the parishes abutting St. Michael which would be nearer to their homes for the older men to work? I am not telling the Government to misappropriate anybody's plantation, but they could acquire any plantation which was set up for sale and work it on a co-operative basis so that the older men could find employment in their little plots of land in order to end their days happily, and not have to be on street corners after his money has left their hands. You say you have no means of finding employment for these people, but this is an agricultural community, and though these workers have been engaged on the waterfront for all their years, some of them still have a knowledge of agriculture and some of them are desirous of having a spot of land to work rather than to be left knocking about the streets.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order, would you displace those agricultural workers who are already working on these plantations?

Mr. TALMA: This is a scheme whereby the profits of the plantation would swell the funds and proper wages would be paid. These are just suggestions I am throwing out because in the eyes of the Government nothing can be done. For them the only thing that could be done is to vote \$1 3/4 million and pay it out in three months' time, and in six months' time the same displaced worker would be starving and their little children and wives penniless and in want. I am suggesting something by way of alternative schemes to help them, but you say it is too big a problem. If you gave the assurance that each year you would vote \$1 million to pay these people.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, the hon. member just said that he was responsible for the displaced coopers.
1.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Why did not that bright idea spring to his mind when he was Minister of Agriculture? He had that bright idea for four years, but only today when he is not in charge, you hear of it. An individual who has nothing to offer can always offer something when he is not called upon; but as soon as he can do something, it is a different thing. He never recommended anything for them. He only recommended a handout; but today, he is going on saying to buy estates for them and to do this and that. Why did he not have that idea when he was Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. TALMA: In the first place, I was not Minister of Agriculture even for three years. He would see when I sat on these things and what I said in the files; but I was not allowed to remain in that office to put them through.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I have seen every file in that Department but at no time have I seen any such scheme.

Mr. TALMA: The big plan is right there in the Department still and he can see that it is divided into 26 lots. The land at Six Cross Roads forms part of the scheme and it was divided into 26 lots to assist the first 26 of the first 44 who wanted land. I was not allowed to remain in office to implement the scheme. The Hon. Minister knows that too.

Hon. M. E. COX: There were 44 old men who wanted land.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 p.m. by the clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m.

The Sitting was accordingly suspended.

2.00 p.m.

On resumption;

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I notice that there is no quorum and I ask that you instruct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can appeal to hon. members to allow the Government to continue at this time with Government Business. I think hon. members will appreciate that we do want to pass these Bills before members of this House on both sides leave for England.

Mr. BRANCKER: Subject to the approval of the hon. senior member for St. Peter who has a matter before this House we will agree, provided that we do not come back tomorrow.

Hon. M. E. COX: The appeal which I made, I made to the other side including the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am sure that the hon. member would not mind giving up on this occasion.
2.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Joseph allow his questions to remain over until some other date?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Lucy is not in his place.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member I will ask that his questions be allowed to stand over. And if the replies to the questions asked by the hon. junior member for St. John are ready, I will also ask on his behalf that the questions be allowed to stand over as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will some other hon. member ask that the questions standing in the names of other hon. members be also allowed to remain over?

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of other hon. members I am asking that the questions be allowed to remain over.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Private Members' Business.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the Peo-

ple Act, 1957. On the last occasion, the Hon. Leader of the House was speaking.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that the hon. senior member for St. Peter in whose name this Order stands, was giving way.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think that I have to address you and the hon. member will have to take the ruling from you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is desirous of proceeding with this Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I think that I made the position quite clear that in the circumstances there could be no valid reason for reducing the voting age from 21 to 18 years. I know that it is the consensus of opinion of the people of Barbados that since Adult Suffrage came into being and even before that, from 1944, the electors of this island have more or less discharged their duties and responsibilities in a very admirable and satisfactory manner. That is because they realised that under the old regime they could not have hoped to improve the lot of themselves and that of their families and their friends as long as that regime remained in power. No doubt they were anxiously awaiting the opportunity to relieve themselves of the burden which was forced upon them by these representatives or misrepresentatives of the time. Therefore from the time that the change came about—while it is not so in every case, yet it is so in the majority of cases—the electors have lived up to what was expected of them by the Socialist people. That being so, I do not see any reason and none was given to us by the hon. mover of the second reading of this Bill as to why out of the blue it should be suggested that this voting age should be lowered. If the voting age is to be lowered, I should like to know whether it is also intended that those who would be qualified to vote at the age of 18 years would also be qualified to become members of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to waste the time of this House because I know that this Bill will not see the light of day. Hon. members cannot, in the face of arguments which have been adduced and in the face of what obtains throughout the world with the exemption of one or two places, without some reasonable argument having been adduced, vote for the reduction of the voting age to eighteen years. When an individual reaches the age of 21 years that individual is regarded as a man or woman. It also follows that that individual has the right to vote. To reduce the age to 18 years would be to accept the principle that an individual has matured at the age of 18 years. That would change the whole structure of the social and political set-up of the community generally.

The age of 18 years is considered to be the adolescent age. I know that this matter has been discussed on several occasions and it is the desire of some people who believe that the electors have not been doing a good job to have this change, because of the fact that the electors have from 1948 elected the Labour Party to this House as the majority party. They have given the Labour Party the majority of seats since that time and it has been felt and it is still felt that if the voting age is reduced, other persons may have the chance of capturing the majority of seats. Frankly speaking, I have absolutely no fear as to whether the voting age is reduced to 14 years, 10 years or whatever it may be; but I want to be practical, to be intelligent and to follow some prescribed standard. Some time ago I had the experience of meeting a youngster on Martindales Road; he really stopped me and told me that he wanted to become registered. I suggested to him how he could become registered and he said, that he did not want to have anything to do with those 'Democratic people'. He told me that he was 21 years of age and how anxious he was to vote. That is an indication of the fact that even if that youngster had a different outlook when he was at the age of 18 or 19 as the case may be, as soon as he reached the age of 21 years he had the understanding of what was taking place and perhaps of what used to take place when he decided to support the party which had done so much to improve the lot of the masses

of this island, some of whom do not and perhaps cannot, appreciate what has been done for them.
2.45 p.m.

We are grateful however, Sir, and thankful to God that quite a large number of people in this island still appreciate the sacrifices made from time to time and the inconvenience experienced by those hard-working members, especially the Prime Minister of the West Indies who has done his best to help those less fortunate persons. I repeat that whether the age be 9, 10, 13, 21 or 40, I am still convinced that the majority of those who have the right to exercise that vote will use it intelligently as well; so it would be immaterial to me as an individual whether the age was 18, 20, 21 or 40. What I do maintain is the fact that if you look over the West Indies at British Honduras, at Great Britain, the United States and Canada, those three territories which no doubt wield quite a lot of influence over the West Indian area, you will see that the voting age is 21 and upwards. As I said yesterday, as far as being a member of the House of Representatives in the United States is concerned, you cannot be a member unless and until you have reached the age of 25, and then you cannot be a Senator until you have reached the age of 30, so as to make sure that a person would appear to be matured before being saddled with the responsibility of running his country.

Frankly speaking, Sir, I feel that this is a puerile attempt to offset what has been done and what shall be done by the electorate before and in future elections.

I would like to clear up one misleading point which the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is responsible for this Bill made. I heard him say it yesterday and I read it again in the newspaper. I have never made any statement about this being an attempt to buy votes. That is the most stupid and silly statement that could ever be made by any individual. Commonsense would tell you that if you reduce the voting age to 18, you are bound to get many more persons on the Register than you have today, thus making it more impossible for people to buy votes. As a matter of fact, the smaller and more circumscribed the voting area is, the greater the opportunity is for buying votes; so when you say you are extending the franchise which will bring in another 30,000 people or whatever the number may be, you cannot associate that with buying votes; that is the height of nonsense. I could never have said that or intended to convey that impression in anything I said because it does not make sense. What I said was in a different sentence and was directed as Your Honour quite rightly attempted to put it yesterday to the *sotto voce* remarks made by the hon. senior member for the City.

If you read the debates of this House for 1929, 1930 and 1942, you will see that reference was made to the two-shillings and sixty cents election. In those days, Mr. Speaker, 80 votes in St. Andrew could give a man a seat, and 75 votes in St. Joseph could give a member a seat; therefore it was easy in those days to buy a seat. That is why I think it was the Prime Minister of the West Indies who referred to one of these wealthy planters as the pocket borough of the particular area, and indeed he was well aware of what he was saying. If I remember correctly, it was said that William Pitt's grandfather owned a borough and two persons of the Pitt family were elected to the House of Commons on seven votes. So the smaller the number of votes the greater the chances and opportunity of buying them if you can buy them, because sometimes you pay for them but you do not get them. That has been our experience on several occasions since we came on the scene, because if we had to buy votes we could not get a seat; only the members on the other side could get them.

That, Sir, is the position as it stands, and I want to repeat that what I said yesterday was completely taken out of the context and misrepresented not only by the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. senior member for St. Peter but also by the others. I do not think there is anything more I can add except to say as I said before that this is a futile and puerile attempt probably to get what members failed to achieve from the older people who cast their votes at election time.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957 by re-

ducing the voting age from 21 to 18. I do not think that if a Bill of this nature is passed it would hamper members on either side of this House. I have heard quite a lot concerning the people who have power to vote, and I want the House as a whole to understand that it does not take age to represent; it takes wisdom, knowledge and understanding to represent, and I do not think that the younger people of today can be so easily biased out of their good attitude. No one is going to ask them to sell their votes, and if any man goes to the young people especially from 18 years up with the idea of buying their votes, it would be an insult to their integrity and they would refuse to accept such bribes. People might try to force them to take a bribe, but the young people today have a better understanding.
2.55 p.m.

They are looking forward to someone who would represent them as a whole, someone who would take care of their welfare. Lots of people today are looking forward to them. I want the Government to realise that a child who is 18 years today is as experienced as his parent who is 36 years of age. You meet today young people who are 18 years old who have three and four children and there is no one when it comes to a man or woman who has better experience than a person who has children; therefore, with a Bill of this nature, when you take all the circumstances into consideration, neither side of the House should try to criticise it.

Mr. Speaker, boys of today who are 15 years of age have so much learning and understanding that they will shock your modesty, far less those of 18 years of age. The government has gained the majority by lowering the franchise and if it is lowered by reducing the age to 18 years, they should have a bigger majority. It seems as if members of the Government have some fear.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is right. We lowered the franchise to Adult Suffrage but we are not prepared to lower it to Teenage Suffrage.

Mr. CORBIN: Is that a point of order. It is not even a point of explanation; it is a point of confusion. The more they talk, the more they will make me talk. It seems to me that the present Government is in dread of the young people if they give them the power to exercise the vote at 18 years of age. Why are you afraid? Why were you not afraid when the franchise was lowered to Adult Suffrage? What has happened to you now? Do you not think that the young men are still in your favour?

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I suppose that he hon. member was not listening to me as he should have been. I said in no uncertain manner that there was no fear. If they vote at five, ten or at any age, it is nothing for us to be afraid of. I am no political butterfly.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, whether a Bill of this nature comes into operation today, next year or not, it does not matter to John Wesley Corbin. But one thing I know; and it is that I am not going to oppose it because I do not see any reason to oppose it. Why should there be so much criticism over this Bill, I would like to know the reason. If you are in favour of it, let it pass easily. If it does not affect you, let it pass without argument.

Mr. Speaker, I will not oppose this Bill because I think within myself that its objects are good, regardless of which side wins by it. If the present Government wins by it, it does not move me or if any other Party wins by it, it does not move me. I support this Bill and hope that it will come into operation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other member who wishes to speak on this Bill before the hon. senior member for St. Peter replies? (A Pause)

It seems to me as if no other hon. member wants to speak on it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I can anticipate the Government members talking nonsense whenever I introduce

anything. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture rose on a point of order and I said then that I will deal with him. I can deal with him; I do not have to run into any political party to play hide-and-seek. When people can talk of strange bedfellows, I wonder if I can live long enough to see the Hon. Minister of Trade and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture becoming bedfellows because if they can become bedfellows, then Ananias and any character in the Scriptures can be bedfellows.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know the Hon. Minister of Agriculture for many years. He and I are good friends. I went to St. Philip in 1940 and spoke on his platform and supported him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: When was that?

Hon. M. E. COX: That was in 1940 when the hon. member got in this House. I was not in the House yet.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Did you speak in 1940 in St. Philip on the hon. member's platform?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I have no recollection of that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think the point of order by the Hon. Minister was to tell me something. All I said was that the Hon. Minister spoke about strange bedfellows and I said that if the Hon. Leader of the House and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture can be strange bedfellows, Ananias and any of the other characters on the Scriptures can be strange bedfellows too.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have known the Hon. Minister of Agriculture for a long time, and we have had our misunderstandings but not to the extent of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the hon. senior member for St. Peter and I have had misunderstandings, it was purely on an issue before the Chamber, and being in opposing parties, we differed. The hon. member and I never abused each other as the hon. senior member for St. Michael used to abuse the Hon. Minister of Agriculture because I remembered several occasions when the Hon. Minister of Agriculture got up to speak, the hon. senior member for St. Michael heckled him. He is the first person I have ever heard accuse the Hon. Minister of Agriculture of criminal acts.

Hon. M. E. COX: You are a liar.
3.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member retract those words?

Hon. M. E. COX: I withdraw them. That hon. member and the hon. senior member for St. Peter never spoke two words to each other until he broke away from our Party. They were sworn enemies.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member knows more about me than I know about myself. The hon. member and I went to Jamaica in 1947 and in 1954 I went to Geneva with him too. Does the hon. member want me to change his heart? The heart which the hon. member has is that with which he was born. If you are a bedfellow to a man whom you originally called a thief.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. As soon as an hon. member rises on a point of order it is parliamentary for the member who is speaking to sit.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member has said lots of things about me, but still I do not hate him.

Mr. WALCOTT: When the hon. member talks about strange bedfellows, if those two members could be members of the same Ministry - well, you cannot do worse than

call an hon. member a thief. When he said during the War that if you could not get tyres you could go to Marchfield....

Hon. M. E. COX: That does not mean that the tyres were stolen.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you talk about bedfellows, you should go into your bed and take out the bugs first.

Hon. M. E. COX: Together for ever.

Mr. WALCOTT: You have to be together for ever. I know the motive. My public life has never been the subject of public investigation, neither have I been of any embarrassment to any political party in which I have been, owing to my conduct. I have never used my position in the Government to buy or sell anything; I have never used my wife's name in relation to anything so that the responsibility should not be placed on me. I have never been looked upon as a public rogue.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has made his position pretty clear; he should now be speaking in reply to what has been said on this Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: I shall deal with that, but whenever I speak, Your Honour knows what happens. The hon. member has insinuated that the motives behind this Bill are improper. Even when the hon. member said that they could never buy votes and that it was a question of buying votes, that was in respect of the other side. They do not buy votes on that side.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I meant the wealthy members on the other side.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member is now becoming clever. The hon. member has accused me of spending Conservative money. I am just getting these innuendos out of the way because it is said that when you are introducing this measure you are spending Conservative money.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Your Honour will forgive me for rising so regularly. I had hoped that when I was concluding my speech that I had cleared up any misunderstanding whatever. When I use the word "they", I mean anybody. Why does the hon. member think that I mean him?

Mr. WALCOTT: That is the innuendo. Unless your mind is corroded you could only advance a thing like that. He says that he does not mean an hon. member unless the cap fits him; by implication Your Honour's name was mentioned but it was not actually called. The hon. member is very anxious for me to deal with this matter, but he was not dealing with the matter; he was really dealing with persons. The Hon. Minister of Education spoke on this matter and so far as he is concerned, the young people in St. John would vote for him. I did not introduce this measure on the basis that young people would not vote for somebody; the Minister of Education said that I did not give any reasons for reducing this age from 21 years to 18 years and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph referred to Aristotle.
3.15 p.m.

We would be going in for very high literary exercises if we began to deal with Aristotle, Plato, Cicero and all those people and see on what they based their thinking. This Bill was introduced by me; and for those who did not listen to me, I made it clear that within our community today a boy or girl of 18 years must be looked upon within the context of 1961 and not 1261 or 1361, and not when they wrote Doomsday Book. The Minister of Education and the Minister of Trade talked about puerile. If you want anything more puerile than what they said, you would have to go to a Kindergarten. The hon. junior member for St. Philip in another debate said something, and that is where we are paying the penalty at this stage in our history for the puerile attitudes of members of the Government, because they are not prepared to think as adults in the context that they are not matured, but make excuses and accuse people of improper motives by saying that this is done for all these reasons

without wanting to face the issue. They are not prepared to face the fact that Barbados is living with a different community in 1961 than in 1930. You heard the Hon. Leader of the House say that the age was 21 all along and asked why we should change it. (Hon. M. E. COX: It would be different from the States, Canada, Jamaica, Trinidad, St. Lucia.....) He is making a second speech. If I stop addressing the Chair and deal with you, you will rise more than once. (Hon. M. E. COX: I can answer you.) You cannot answer me in the debate I put forward; you can answer by talking about people's mother and grandmother, and I am nothing to do with that. Whoever is your mother is your business or your father's. (Hon. M. E. COX: Some people have not got any.) Like you, because I do not believe you could have had a mother as that would be the worst thing she could ever have done.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the aside to be much better controlled so that the hon. member who is speaking would not be tempted to reply to them. Free us from temptation; let the tempter depart.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, people must be prepared to take what they want to give out; their skins must be hard. Some people are shameless, and that is a different thing.

The argument was that the Labour Party is in power and this is being done as an attempt to get them out of power. Now, Sir, that is such an ignorant remark to make. When he was 21 years of age he could not vote, and I challenge him to get up and say he could vote at that age. There is no righteousness in 21 being the age at which to vote. When the hon. junior member for St. James who is looking at me half asleep was 21, he could not vote either.

Mr. SEARLES: On a point of order, when I was 21 I was fully qualified.

Mr. WALCOTT: Where was he qualified to vote when he was 21? Do you mean you used to vote on colour? When he was 21 it must have been 50 years ago; so in 1901 what could he have been working for to vote in Barbados? The Colonial Secretary of Barbados must have been getting £100 a year in 1901, but today the Attorney General gets \$10,320 a year. The hon. member could not have been working for \$20 a month in 1901. If you look through the Estimates for 1901, you will see that Headteachers were still getting \$20 a month; so where would he get the money from? Does he want to fool somebody that because of his pigmentation he could vote in 1901? It is not a question that you could vote, because the qualification was not that of age. The qualification in Barbados was so restrictive that only a boy of twenty-one years to whom somebody had given property, like the plantation owners who gave their sons property, could vote on that basis. Let us examine the income qualification in Barbados. When I came to the House of Assembly there was no Labour Party which the hon. member is talking about. You would believe that the Labour Party had a majority in this House many years; you would not believe that, Mr. Speaker, that when I came here the Labour Party could not even get candidates to run. You will remember when I first ran in an election. I did not join the Party on the basis of running because I am a man who wanted to work, but I did not have candidates; you are now telling me that you were in the vanguard.

Mr. Speaker, the Labour Party came here in 1944 with seven or eight seats out of a House of 24 though there were 14 or 16 members representing the point of view of labour. The hon. member came here in 1944 and I came in 1945. If you look around for the members who were here before, you will see the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the Hon. Premier. When you say that we now want somebody else in power and all that nonsense, the people in Barbados voted for progressive people. You can call yourself by any Party. I am not a member of any Party. I heard the hon. member boasting, but let us look at Mr. Donaldson and what happened to him a couple of Sunday nights ago coming from San Fernando. Where is he now? He is rumbling in the dust and you can go in Port-of-Spain and throw a stone at him. You may be leaving in here and one of the beams drop from the roof on you and you cannot

even sue anybody. (Hon. M. E. COX: I am glad that you realise that at last.)
3.25 p.m.

Have you listened to what you said yesterday? You do not believe in dying because you believe the Barbados Labour Party is there forever. He was part of a team to get me out of here; therefore, do not let him come to me with that. We all will get ourselves out one of these days. The hon. member has been trying very hard to get me out of here but he has not been successful. I am still in here with him. Why do you think the people in St. Peter elected me? Do you think it is because you told them to elect me?

The hon. member said that I brought in this Bill because of the power I want. The same argument they used is the same argument which the Conservatives used when members of the Barbados Labour Party were in here fighting tooth and nail to lower the franchise. The Conservatives had a little fear because they were opposed to the idea of Adult Suffrage, but not as the Hon. Minister has talked about the young adult. If the hon. member were in a different community, he would use the argument about education. The Hon. Minister of Education in replying to me said that I was trying to say that only boys with school certificates had knowledge. The Hon. Minister of Trade talked about the labour force in Barbados. Do you know how many people between 18 and 21 years form the labour force of Barbados? (Hon. M. E. COX: I have the figures.) That labour force forms a comparatively large slice of our community. Why are you depriving them of their rights?

The Hon. Minister said that the bringing in of this Bill is tantamount to your saying that you are not in agreement with what the people of 21 years and upwards are doing. Let me say that voting in Barbados is not compulsory; therefore, do not use this argument about teenage. I did not bring the biological functions of human beings into this argument. I was just dealing with facts. A boy or girl of 18 years is regarded in our context as a man or woman. A boy of 18 years goes to jail. You do not talk of his being any teenager in a case like that. What members of the Government are talking about when it comes to the age of 18 years is that it is not the legal age for taking on certain things to yourself. That age is 21 years. You hear them arguing about 21 years of age as if it were some divine dispensation sent down to mankind and as if before you got to 21 years you can do nothing, but as soon as you get to 21 years, you can do everything.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Surely none of us said that. I said that some people at the age of 18 years and so on in many cases are more qualified and intelligent than some at 60 years and 90 years. I was not dealing with the matter purely from a point of view of age.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, you have to review these things. I say that the Government of Barbados is up against you when you have to prepare something, plan something and put something up. When you do that, our people seem to be always lacking. When you put forward this, you hear the argument that this is something which the D.L.P. wants. When you brought forward single-member constituencies, you heard the argument that that is something which the Conservatives want. Must I be so ignorant as to say "well, the D.L.P. wants it, therefore I must not agree with it?" The hon. junior member for St. James at one time in his life came forward for the D.L.P. The hon. member knows that I do not associate with Conservatives as he has associated with them. Let me give them a classic example. I went to Melverton in St. George during the last election campaign and a gentleman by the name of Mr. Hutson Williams was on the platform of the hon. senior member for St. George telling the people not to vote for the hon. junior member for St. George. Talking about Conservatives, in my own constituency the same hon. member is spreading the propaganda that the Conservatives are running me. Here it is; at the last election you had a man on the Conservatives' platform speaking against the Minister of Social Services, but before the next elections you find that the Government of Barbados has taken that same man

and made him Chairman of the Barbados Labour Party and he is the big man in the Barbados Labour Party.

Hon. M. E. COX: Some people move from good to bad and others from bad to good.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, you hear it now being said that you had them all liquored off. They did not have anybody liquored off but their election expenses were so great that they said that somebody had put on things to them. I do not want any Government money to spend on my election campaign. I will spend my own money. What I will say is that it is a pity you cannot run without spending money.

The hon. member talks about conservatism. Let me have a little introspection.

3.35 p.m.

I put it to this Chamber. I will bet you that if I went on a platform tomorrow or brought forward somebody, their sympathies would be with people who have no sympathies for labour. I am surprised to see the hon. junior member for St. George associate with somebody who could bring forward a man like that; you have a shameless man who could prate about Conservatives coming into power and the Conservatives came in at the Labour Party's backdoor like the Pope. If the hon. senior member for the City were to come with you, you would say that you should run the whole island. The hon. member tried methods in the Union and they have failed so that I will have to watch him. The Minister of Agriculture went out just now, thinking I am afraid of him. He has come back. If he is old and he is not afraid, do you think that I am afraid? The hon. member said that he was not in favour of lowering the franchise under Local Government. The hon. member was out of the House at that time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. There is no more truth in that statement than in the statement that I entered on the planet of the Moon. I went outside and got the debates which really count. If the hon. member wants to read what I said about Adult Suffrage, let him go to the debates. Do not let him get it from my arch-enemy. Let him get it from somebody who is capable of speaking the truth.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member was not in the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has said that the hon. junior member for St. Philip was opposed to lowering the franchise. What he is referring to is that the Vestries of this island sent a Petition to the Government asking them not to agree to extend the franchise lower than it was for election to the Vestries of this island. The hon. senior member for St. Philip was a signatory to that petition. You will see in the pages of the *Advocate* that he was a member of the Vestry of St. Philip when that Vestry signed the Petition and he was in agreement with it. Not only was it a question of the Vestry of St. Philip but it was a question of all the Vestries of the island. Anybody who denies that is flying in the face of what is there for anybody to see and to conclude.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member has answered the call. If anybody in here had any doubt as to who my arch-enemy in this Chamber is, it is clear to him now. It is true that I was Churchwarden of the parish of St. Philip and we were asked by the Government to do certain things. We met as a Vestry and sent something to the Government which we had deliberated. I signed it; do you want me to tell you how many things you have signed? Oh! you had better not trespass on that. I signed that document as a responsible member of the community.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying now is a matter of history. I want him to say that what I have signed is a matter of history. He cannot fool people that he knows something about me. This man lent me £300 to assist in buying a plantation and I paid him back. I sold him back the plantation so that he has it back. I wanted the qualification for membership of the Vestry of St. Philip and he lent me that £300 to assist in buying the plantation. He has no secret for me. I sold the plantation back to him and he is making a fortune out of it. It was the

most foolish thing for me to have done, to sell him back that plantation.

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is going to be suspended for ten minutes. I have already suspended a sitting of this House in similar circumstances. As soon as Mr. Speaker rises, especially when he rises to establish order, hon. members should sit and desist from speaking. The hon. senior member for St. Philip would not desist from speaking when I was on my feet. I beseeched him, I knocked the gavel and he would not desist from speaking. We therefore have a suspension of this sitting for ten minutes, there being disorder. This sitting stands suspended for ten minutes. 3.45 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that whenever I am speaking, Your Honour.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I would like to say that so far as I can recall, with reference to the Suspension of the House, throughout all my years in here it is the first time that a Sitting has had to be suspended because of any controversy in which I was involved. I completely regret the incident and can assure you that only the urgent necessity for making my own position superlatively clear prevented me perhaps from hearing Your Honour's injunction at an earlier time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I accept the hon. member's apology.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it seems as if whenever I am speaking it provokes the ire of others and Your Honour has to take disciplinary action. I am sorry about that, Sir, but you can very well understand that if I have to say certain things which the Other side does not like, they will have to stay for them, because we hear them say things that we do not like and we stay for them. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture did not like the statement made, but I was going to say something more if he did not get up then and say that the Petition was a petition asking the Government not to proceed with adult suffrage on the basis of giving people the right to vote.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order, Sir, it had nothing at all to do with adult suffrage; it was the change-over from the Vestry system to the Local Government system.

Mr. WALCOTT: He must be a crazy man. Only a simple fool would say that, because the change-over from the old Vestry system to the new Local Government system was something completely different. On the question of adult suffrage, we still had to fight for it; so when you hear the hon. member talking about votes, a person who could vote in the Local Government could not run. Our idea was that a man should be able to run for the House of Assembly, and we wanted the thing changed. Now as I said, if those two members who sit side by side can find compatibility in political quarters, Ananias and the Archbishop can go together. If the two of them can look at the public and say they are together now, anybody can come together at any time, because one has used so much strong language about the other that it is unimaginable. Again when the hon. member talks about Conservatives, what Party has more Conservative members than the Labour Party? Do you want me to call some names? You have Mr. Hutson Williams, Mr. Cameron Hewitt who works at Alleyne Arthur and who was a member of the Electors Association, and in the last General Election he ran against the two members in St. Michael. At the last City Council Election, he was nominated to run, but now he is a member of their Party. Mr. Cecil Knight was a member of the Electors Association, but now he is a member of the Labour Party. The hon. member says that this is something in which we are joining with the Conservatives. (Hon. M. E. COX: Is Mr. Knight a member of our Labour Party?) He must be more than a member; he must be a General. Do you think you know all the members? I thought you had a lot of members. I do not know all the members of

the Union. You cannot know everybody when you get over 50; so I do not believe you know every member. You should not say these things because when you say them they leave a bad taste in people's mouths. What is the D.L.P. to do with introducing this?

Mr. Speaker, I bring things to the House of Assembly and they see the light of day because I can put something in my argument. They are the only labour organisation in the Caribbean which says that peaceful picketing near or at the home of employers is obnoxious, but when I went back and read the Report of September, 1945 to show what the Minister of Trade had said, he was surprised. You would kill anybody at night.

Hon. M. E. COX: Surely the hon. member has a choice of vicious wicked words that just emanate from his stomach all the time.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not asking you to withdraw. The two of us are not making a speech.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order,.....

Mr. WALCOTT: What is the point of order; that I have a wicked vicious mind?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter will sit.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member gets up and says that I would kill somebody in the night, I do not think that is dignified for this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: But, Mr. Speaker, you must ask him to withdraw. He cannot tell me such things and ask me to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: He has not said anything about withdrawing.

Mr. WALCOTT: You permitted him to get up and talk about a wicked, vicious mind, so what does he want me to withdraw now? If he can get up and use those remarks and then ask me to withdraw, he has to withdraw his words too.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am glad the hon. member has reminded me, because the Minister said these things emanate from a wicked and vicious mind. In the heat of debate it is quite easy for the member occupying the Chair to hear things and have them put out of his mind. It is a bit of a strain and stress. I would have to ask both members to withdraw their remarks, that by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the member would kill at night, and that by the hon. senior member for St. Michael that these things emanate from a wicked and vicious mind. I will call on the hon. senior member for St. Peter first.

Mr. WALCOTT: I withdraw those remarks, Mr. Speaker.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Very well, Sir, as Your Honour pleases.

Mr. WALCOTT: When you read the records and see statements which have been made and then hear statements that they make subsequently, one can only consider them as anti-socialist and reactionary speeches. The Minister of Agriculture is a reactionary; he did not want people to have the vote in Local Government, and that is the action of reactionaries in this island. They did not want the Vestry system revised on the basis that people should not have the right to vote under adult suffrage.

4.05 p.m.

Do not come with your reactionary attitude and tell people that we want teenagers to vote for us. What is there re-

actionary about a boy or girl, 18 to 20 years of age, having the right to vote? They ask what you think is wrong with leaving it to 21 years and over. I ask, is there anything wrong with liberalisation of the voting machinery? Is there anything which you can bring to prove that at 18 years of age a man is incapable of exercising his vote? You ask me why it has not happened in England yet and why it has not happened in Canada and in some parts of Australia. You better ask me why it is done in a part of Australia and New Zealand. By lowering the qualifying age to 18 years for voting in those countries, tell me what has gone wrong. You cannot show me that in countries which have 18 years of age as the qualifying age, you have riots and bullets. Oh no, but you are trying to deprive the flower of our manhood, those of 18, 19 and 20 years, from the right to vote. Sometimes there are those of us who take an interest in political matters long before we are 18 years. The flow of community life and communications are of such today that people are brought closer in touch with one another. You go to political meetings in Barbados. Tell me if the greater percentage of people at those meetings are not of people of the younger generation more so than of the older generation. Are you suggesting now that the ones of 18 and 19 years do not know what the meetings are all about?

The hon. member said that he met an 18-year-old boy and the boy told him: "do not mind the D.L.P." He brings that kind of dialogue in the House. I wonder what he thinks people say of the B.L.P. What the Barbados Labour Party is symptomatic of is what we all have created. The Hon. Minister thinks that the Labour Party is an entity in itself created by Adams. These things are not created by any one person; they are created by people. I had as much to do with it as anybody else.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture told me to read the debates and I will see what he has done. I have the debates of 1948 at home and I can bring them and show him the things which he said against the Labour Party then. Sir, am I bringing forward legislation, when I bring forward this, to put somebody in power? Do you think the Conservatives will get more votes by bringing in 18-year-old people to vote? Are members of the Government suggesting that this is an attempt by me to get people to vote for me who would not vote otherwise? It seems to me as if members of the Labour Party are worrying about me more than I am worrying about them. They see one man running in St. Peter. Do they believe that they can run me out of Barbados? I was born in Barbados; I am not an alien. Mr. Hutson Williams was not born here. He is what you can call an alien. They talk as if I am an alien.

I want to make it quite clear. My reason of bringing in this Bill to lower the age to 18 years is to give broader representation to the people who live in Barbados. Next week is Commonwealth Training Week and today the emphasis is on youth and more so in this community when you consider that you have a very healthy young population. It is true that we do not have the statistical information in this island up-to-date so that you can look at the various age groups and say that such and such a number comprises the various age groups of the population. You cannot say with any degree of correctness that so many comprise the age groups between 18 and 21 years. But you do know that that age group comprises a sizeable part of your population.

I have the same Minister arguing against compulsory education from the point of view of cost. It is amusing because when I read their manifesto of the past, I see that they are advocating for free meals and free secondary education. It appears to me as if you only said so then so as to get the people to vote out the people who were in here then. You cannot work things like that. When you come today and ask for these things, would you say that you are asking for things which you did not ask for before? You said that you did not believe in double-chamber legislature, and when I said so in here, you said that I did not know what I was talking about. Now, you are saying that you are not in favour of single-member constituencies when in your manifesto you said that you will bring in single-member constituencies.

Sir, the Hon. Minister of Trade and I have never competed for the same thing yet. I only knew him politically. We never went to school together. I knew him as a man and I believe that he knew me as a man. The hon. member made some remarks to the effect that he cannot come down to my level; but you have to get down to his level. As long as you are in here with him, the debate has to be low, because as soon as you lift it too high, he does not understand your argument. I made mention just now that anything which I bring in does not meet with their approval. I only have to bring in a Trade Union Bill in which you can very well see that it is obnoxious legislation.

4.15 p.m.

Principles change by years. I am not asking anybody to vote for this Bill on any basis that it is for the benefit of the Democratic Labour Party. The hon. member always says something other than what is the principle in any matter. He cannot debate this matter on the question as to why the age should be eighteen years as against twenty-one years. He says all over the world the adult age is 21 years. The hon. member says that the D.L.P. cannot get into power and therefore this Bill has been brought down in order to assist them. (ASIDES) The hon. member is saying that he has not said so. Well, Sir, you will have to get a dictaphone so as to play back what he has said. The hon. member is power mad, but I am not power mad. As soon as you get power you should know how to use it. I want to say that political power is nothing with which you should be intoxicated; it is to be used in the right and proper way. People have been voting for me for the past sixteen years. The hon. member thought that when I left the Labour Party the people would not vote for me, but what went wrong? You have to realise that when it comes to people being returned to this Chamber you are not returned *en bloc*; you are sent in here on an individual basis from time to time. You may be associated with a Party, but you are returned to this Chamber on an individual basis. When you run in one constituency and you lose, what are you going to say? Instead of running Mr. Hutson Williams in the constituency of St. Peter, why does the hon. member not leave the constituency of St. Michael and run for St. Peter? You are a bigger "McGuffey" than he (ASIDES) You are a big boss; you run for St. Joseph and let somebody run in St. Michael. Some of us are lucky while others are not; luck does not always come your way.

Mr. Speaker, I always try to refrain from making personal references because in my whole political life I have avoided making any such references. I will attack a man who is against me, but I will not attack anybody's family. I will attack you because you are in politics and you have to answer; your family is not in politics and therefore I will leave out your family. As far as this Bill is concerned, I do not see how the hon. member could say that at the age of 18 years you are a teenager and you cannot understand the meaning of the vote. At the age of 18 years people are carrying a heavy load in the case of an industrial community. Suppose you had a referendum in Barbados for the purpose of deciding whether the franchise should be lowered or not? Do you believe that everybody would come forward? It is the attitude of this Government that whenever I introduce any measure, whatever it is, they feel that they must oppose it. The Government has no policy where the franchise is concerned so that they could say it is their policy that the qualifying age for a voter is 21 years. The Government's policy was not to have the qualifying age for voters at 21 years, but it was one of removing the barriers which existed in the past.

Why would you come here and reduce the qualifying age before you remove the barriers? We have removed the barriers ten years ago and I ask them to look and see if Barbados should undergo any change. The hon. member asked whether an 18-year-old person should have the right to vote and also have the right to run for membership of this House. I would like to say that that is not the amendment. In the United States of America, the qualifying age for voting is not the same as the qualifying age for membership of the Legislature. You can vote for the President of the United States if you are under 21 years of age and therefore you cannot say that because you put the franchise to be exercised at the age of 18 years the age for membership of the House should be under 21

years. In the United States of America, the President is elected and he chooses his Cabinet however he pleases, but the Senate approves of the people who have been so chosen.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite satisfied in my mind, and I would say that a large majority of the people are satisfied that the age of 18, 19 or 20 years could not be regarded, in the circumstances existing in Barbados, as an age at which people are incapable of exercising the vote.

4.25 p.m.

As I said, the 18 year olds today in my humble opinion, unless the hon. member believes in antiquity, are better equipped for using the franchise than the boy at 21 one hundred years ago. Even in the process of education, I have seen changes made that today what Universities permitted as standards are no longer accepted, and you have to be a little higher even if you are at the same age. The development is different, the atmosphere of the world is different and the people's outlook is different; but the hon. member talks about adolescents. You should not merely use words. The fact that you are an adolescent does not mean that you are a delinquent.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not see any damage being done to the older heads. All it means is that it brings these people into the voting age. I will tell members of the House that when you reduce the qualification for voting, younger people will vote for us. There was some bogus argument when women could not vote that they did not know about it; so you can see how many women were kept out. There was a referendum in Switzerland for women to vote. Women vote for us; sometimes the men are conservative in their outlook and are accustomed to voting smart and wasting money, but the women do not want money; they vote for you if they like you, no matter what anybody says. Even now at 21, Mr. Speaker, women voters as a whole are more loyal to you. With all due respect to my men voters, my political experience has shown me that more men turn against you than women. You would have to do them something for them to vote against you, and nobody can tell them that you did somebody something because they would ask you themselves. To every one woman's vote you lose, you lose ten men's votes. Women are more honest and they are studying things in the political life of the community, because very often they make their husbands view things with a measure of commonsense.

There was a time, Sir, when the same arguments against lowering the age to 18 were used against lowering the franchise and against giving women the vote; it is the same type of argument you hear each time you make an attempt to liberalise the franchise and the constitution. The ones who are in power always seem to think that this is something to put Conservatives in power. Power in itself seems to create a big complex; so that is why the hon. senior member for St. Michael looks upon this as a challenge to their power.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member concluding? It is nearly 4.30 p.m.

MR. WALCOTT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is done on the basis of liberalising the constitution to make certain people eligible. Why is it that a boy at 18 who can go to gaol and pay the penalty for his actions should not have a say in the community to which he belongs? My view is that he should have a say in sending us back here.

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

AYES: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. TALMA; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 5.

NOES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE; Hon. F. E. MILLER and Mr. SEARLES - 7.

HOUSE RESUMES GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. o'clock, this House now reverts to Government Business.

**HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON DIS-
PLACED WORKERS ALLOWANCES
(BRIDGETOWN) HARBOUR ACT,
1961.**

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Suspension, the hon. senior member for Christ Church was speaking.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I had reached the point where I was pointing out to the House the type of Regulations which were formulated in order to assist the displaced coopers when the bulk shipment of molasses came into force in 1954, and I was challenged by the other side. Regulations were drawn up which provided a measure of assistance of a permanent nature for displaced coopers in that lands at Six Roads, St. Philip belonging to the Government were divided into lots and given to the older displaced coopers of whom there were 44 or 45 at the time when I was in the Government, but there were only 26 or 27 lots available. I do not know if these lots were given to these people because I was not there to do it. Any member who says that it is untrue can look through the files and see it. I am suggesting that as in the case of the displaced coopers and the giving of this land for their rehabilitation, in like manner alternative schemes should be incorporated in these Regulations so as to assist these displaced Port workers on a more permanent basis after these hand-outs have been made. There are many other alternative schemes and suggestions which can be implemented to assist these displaced workers, but it is a matter for the Government to go into them.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am saying that this is the first time that this Bill has come before this House, and it is the first opportunity I have had of saying anything on it; so if I make any concrete suggestions here, it is the first opportunity I have had of doing so. The question of who gets the credit does not concern me particularly; the main thing is to see something permanent and lasting to assist these workers who are being displaced. When the Minister asks why I did not do this or that, I am doing it now. I was Minister at the time when the coopers were displaced and some of my suggestions were not implemented, because I ceased to be a Minister in 1956; but during my term of office they got bonuses twice from various Funds to assist them. Those are facts, and displaced coopers who are yet alive can verify what I am saying.

4.35 p.m.

I am saying that now we have to deal with 1,600 waterfront workers, we can gather from our experience with the coopers and therefore, we should be in a position to do something more concrete than what we have done for the coopers. When I look through the Regulations, I see nothing concrete being done for these displaced workers. It is just a question of voting some money to give them some money by way of loss of their work, in other words, giving them severance pay. I ask, what scheme or schemes have you put into effect to assist these workers? I say that the younger ones can be assisted to go abroad and they can also be assisted in your carrying out road development schemes such as the building of the East Coast Road. The older ones can be assisted by giving them plots of land. If you give them plots of land, they can have their kitchen gardens from which they can make a few dollars every week. But you do nothing for them. That is not good enough.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have thrown out my ideas in a general way and they can be improved on. I do not want to waste the time of the House. As a matter of fact, I cannot be accused of wasting time because I do not speak as often as I should.

Sir, there is another point which I should like to emphasize and it is one dealing with offences. I will refer you to Clause 8 of the Schedule to the Bill in the first place. Clause 8, subsection 2, reads as follows:-

"Any displaced worker who fails to furnish a report to the Board in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1) of this regulation shall be guilty of an offence and be liable on conviction before a court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding one hundred and twenty dollars and in default of payment to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months."

I realise that there must be some sort of penalty clause but when you talk of imprisoning people whom you are trying to help, that is going too far. You do not talk of imprisoning the employers who break the Domestic Employees Act. I am not in agreement with this subsection of the Bill and when we come to deal with it in Committee, I will oppose it. If we are out to help people out of their plight, there should be no question of imprisonment.

There is another Clause which deals with offences and it is Clause 14.

It reads as follows:-

"(1) Any person who -

- (a) hinders or obstructs any duly authorised person in the execution of any power or duty conferred or imposed by these regulations; or
- (b) (i) being a person from whom particulars may lawfully be required pursuant to subparagraph (a) of paragraph (2) of regulation 11 of these regulations, refuses or neglects to fill up and supply the particulars required in any schedule or other document, or refuses or neglects to comply with any lawful request to produce a document or record, or to answer any questions asked him or furnish any information required from him under these regulations; or (ii) being any such person as aforesaid knowingly makes in any schedule, form or other document filled up or supplied or in any information furnished pursuant to these regulations, or in any answer to any questions asked him under the authority of these regulations, any statement which is false in any material particular,

Shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding one hundred and twenty dollars and in default of payment to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months."

I am not in agreement with that. I feel that the fine is sufficient deterrent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel glad in a way to know that the Government is actually doing something by way of this Bill to compensate the displaced workers to some extent after all their years of service on the waterfront. That is a good gesture; but we are saying, while you are doing that which would give temporary relief to them, you should go further. You should see that a levy is imposed on each ton of sugar produced for at least a period of ten years so that this fund can be increased and so that you will have a revolving fund from year to year to help these workers. By that, there will be some measure of security for these workers and their families, and they will be able to catch their footing until they utilise other avenues of employment. This is only giving temporary relief; but as far as permanent relief is concerned, I am yet to be convinced that the Government intends to help these people because nothing has been included in this Bill to give me that impression. There is not one clause in this Bill which enables any measure of permanent assistance over a specified time.

As I have said, the Bill has my blessing but it does not go far enough.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to make a contribution to this Bill. There are a few points which I would like to clear up. I should begin by reading the Objects and Reasons. They read as follows:-

"The object of this Bill is to provide for the payment of allowances to certain categories of workers in the Port and in the sugar industry who have lost employment as a direct result of the coming into operation of the Bridge-town Harbour."

"The allowances to be paid will be met from the funds of the Displaced Workers Allowances Board established under the Act."

"The funds of this Board shall consist of -

- (a) such sums as may be provided for the purposes of the Act from time to time by the Legislature;
- (b) such sums as may from time to time be paid out of the Price Stabilization Reserve Fund for the purposes of the Act in accordance with regulations made under the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947; and
- (c) such other sums as may from time to time be paid to the Board."

Sir, first of all, I would like to know this. As I understand it, the Labour Welfare Fund has been provided to help all sugar workers in the island of Barbados but I see that this Bill provides only a sum of money for the displaced workers on account of the Deep Water Harbour. 4.45 p.m.

They are the only people for whom this Bill provides.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Not only does this Bill provide for workers at the Port but those who are displaced in the sugar industry.

Mr. CORBIN: In reading this Bill I see that there are people at the Port and so on, but the point I am making is that this Harbour has just come into operation, the people who are working at the Port are on the verge of being dismissed and a sum of money is being provided for them. What about those people who have been working at those sugar factories which have been demolished? Those people have been turned out without any consideration being given to them. While the Labour Welfare Fund has been provided by these same workers, up to today these workers have not received anything; they have not received anything in the space of about three or four years. These people have been laid off from factories such as Sandy Lane, Swans and Joes River; why is it that the Government is so urgent about providing for these displaced workers and they have not provided for these other people who have been working at the factories which have been demolished? These workers are unable to wear clothes, their children cannot go to school and why is it that no consideration has been given to these people?

I thought that the Government would also have provided a sum for those people who have been laid off for all of these years without any consideration being given to them. I understand that the sum of \$12.80 has been taken out of the value of every ton of sugar and placed in the three funds and that the factories have already drawn out their money. It is sad to think that other people have not been rewarded from this fund; that is not a fair deal. You cannot consider one section of the people and not the other. When you are thinking of the welfare of this country, the Government should think of the welfare of all. I have seen a man who has worked for many years at Bruce Vale, Haggats and Swans and such factories and he told me that he is now unable to work. Nothing has been provided for that man. You should think of these poor people when it is well with you.

I remember reading the history of slavery in this island and I remember that when the slaves were liberated, people had to go to the mountains and build places to help themselves and get mud and plaster it on houses. That is to say, that some of them went back to the slave trade. When these workers are not given any consideration, they are just like the slaves who have been liberated. To whom must these people go for help? If they go to the right it is hard, and if

they go to the left it is also hard; therefore I am asking the Government to consider the poor people who have been working at those factories which have been demolished and grant them some help for themselves and for their children. It is not fair not to give them a fair deal; it is not right that one set of people should be drawing out money from the same fund and others are not receiving anything.

I am here to air the grievances of these people who are now sitting by the wayside at the mercies of God waiting to see who will give them a hand. In the Northern District Council a man gets \$1 or \$1.40 a week, but that cannot even buy him kerosene oil so as to provide lighting in the house. I suggest that the Government should consider setting up a Board to deal with these people just as they are doing in the case of people who have been laid off as a result of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. Out of the value of every ton of sugar which is made today a portion is put aside for contribution towards the Labour Welfare Fund. I am not against this Bill; as a matter of fact, I hope it will soon come into operation so that these displaced people will be able to give themselves and their families something to eat and drink. Since the construction of the Deep Water Harbour a lot of people have been displaced and that is why I am asking the Government to bring down this Resolution for \$2 million and that Resolution would be passed unanimously for the purpose of sending people out of the island. I am sure that that \$2 million would bring back about \$200 million to this country. I am suggesting that the Government would not be losing anything at all. The population is being increased and what are we going to do to deal with this increased population? This Deep Water Harbour is the biggest project which we have had in this island and from time to time the population will become greater; I ask; what are you going to do with this increased population? 4.55 p.m.

You should bring down a Resolution to assist people now that the doors are open and let them go out and work for money. I know that some of the displaced workers would be glad to send out their boys and girls, because they know they will send back money and the island will prosper as a result. The Government should assist people in going to Great Britain, America and Canada, and I am sure that it would redound to the benefit of this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no more comments to make other than those I have already made, and I shall support this Bill 100% to relieve the plight of these people at this time. I hope that this money will be profitable to them and that they will use it to the best of their ability and not waste it, because they are getting older and I do not see that Barbados will be able to provide work for them.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall reply to just a few points made by some hon. members. As regards the points made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I should like to say that the member spoke for approximately four hours, and the burden of his contention was the method of appointing members to the Board. I need not go any further into that, because I have already stated Government's policy on that question. I will begin to deal with the hon. senior member for St. Philip who referred to his reservation on page 14 of the Report. As you know, he said that the Government wanted to lay a levy on goods coming into the Port to increase the cost of living.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I never said anything about the Government; I said the members of the Government Party who were signatories to the Report.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to read the Reservation again for the hon. member. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this was not intended to increase the cost of living, I do not know what it was. Paragraph 2 of the member's Reservations reads as follows:-

"With reference to paragraph 23, I am in absolute agreement that the Deep Water Harbour could be financed by the levy of a Port charge not exceeding 2% on all imports and exports."

My little knowledge about this thing, Sir, makes me know and understand that if 2% or whatever percent it is was levied on goods coming in and going out, especially those goods coming into the island, it must of necessity increase the cost of living.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I never really thought that I would have had to get up and explain so simple, so childlike and so elementary a matter to anybody in this Chamber. It is really inconceivable that there could be any mentality of such simplicity as not to be able to understand what is written in plain, simple English here. Those people who signed this Report were appointed to this Committee by the Government. The member for St. Michael was one of the members of the Committee, along with Mr. Bryden, Mr. Goddard, Mr. Hassell, Mr. Walcott, Mr. Mottley and all the others.

When the Report was drafted by the Chairman, they said in paragraph 23 that "from the foregoing estimates which are based on the best available figures, we are of the considered opinion that a Port Authority could meet its entire recurrent cost, (interest, sinking fund, depreciation, maintenance, staff, incidentals) after construction of a Deep Water Harbour, within a levy of 2% of the value of imports and exports." That is what they recommended and they all signed it, including the Minister of Trade. I was the only member of the Committee who refused to sign it. I said I was not agreeing with it and then I said in my own minority Report that I agreed with them that it could be financed that way, but I did not think it should be. That is what it amounts to. I said I was in absolute agreement that the Deep Water Harbour could be financed by this levy, but then I opposed it.

"The word 'since' introducing the second paragraph implies a reservation against the recommendation. You said 2% on imports and exports, and I said of course you can do it and the money you would get, if the imports are \$1 million at 2%, would give you \$20,000 or whatever it was, and with that levy you could finance the depreciation and sinking fund and the money invested to build the Harbour. But I said 'since, however, this levy cannot be operative until the Harbour has been actually constructed - that is to say, within at least five years - should there be developments in the economy of the country from which the scheme could be financed without placing this additional burden on the community, especially bearing in mind the recent increases in Customs Duty, it is to be hoped that alternative methods of financing would receive serious consideration.' What does that mean? It is so simple that I shall not refer to it at all, because only a blind man on a trotting horse could not see it. It means that you can get the money this way, but if you do it you are going to place an additional burden on the community; so until five years from now when it is financed by the levy, you should find some alternative method of doing it.

Hon. M. E. COX: My answer to that is that it is just as clear, if there is no possibility of finding money from any other place, to use the one here.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not say that at all. On a point of order, no Private Secretary wrote this for me. I wrote this myself and I knew what I was writing when I wrote it. None of my Clerks or Secretaries could write this for me. I was totally opposed to levying this 2% to finance the Harbour, because I said they has just increased Customs Duties. In other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will remember that previous to the first Five Year Plan, Customs duties were only imposed on.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This Resolution refers to Customs duties.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am only telling you not to make a speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not doing that, Sir. This Resolution of mine refers to Customs Duties, and previous to

the Five Year Plan, Customs duties were charged on *ad valorem* goods brought into the country.
5.05 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I must interrupt. The hon. member is making a speech. That has nothing to do with what is before us now. It is not fair to me.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is not fair to you? I was developing the point on its logical conclusion. You are now imposing Customs duties on the cost of goods coming here; therefore, you cannot go any further and impose additional costs on goods by levying 2%. You cannot do that. Only the Hon. Minister cannot see that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, what does he start off with? This is what he says:-

"With reference to paragraph 22, it appeared unlikely during the deliberations, that the sugar interests would have agreed to the contribution of \$2.00 per ton of sugar had they been apprised of the likelihood of the suggestion for a levy of a basic port charge not exceeding 2% on all imports and exports."

That does not say that he was not prepared to support a levy on the sugar industry.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Oh no. I rise on a point of order. I said that I was not prepared to agree with this levy specifically for contribution to the Deep Water Harbour Fund. He does not know what is meant by that. I must explain because he does not know what he is talking about. You recommended a levy of \$2.00 a ton for social welfare scheme. The merchants would never do it and the planters would not do it and I said that I would not agree with a levy purely for the Deep Water Fund alone. This is what I said;

"I should like to express my own reservation to any future proposal to levy this cess on the sugar industry specifically for contribution to the Deep Water Harbour."

In other words, if it were for other things as well, you can do it.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member was dealing with the financing of the Deep Water Harbour and this is what he said:-

"With reference to paragraph 22, it appeared unlikely during the deliberations, that the sugar interests would have agreed to the contribution of \$2.00 per ton of sugar had they been apprised of the likelihood of the suggestion for a levy of a basic port charge not exceeding 2% on all imports and exports."

Then he said;

"I should like to express my own reservation with regard to any future proposal to levy this cess on the sugar industry specifically for contribution to the Deep Water Harbour Fund."

Is it not the \$2.00 which you are referring to?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sit down.

Hon. M. E. COX: You understand it in your way and we understand it in the way in which it was meant.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order. I drew this to the attention of the Committee which was meeting on this matter and every single person on the Committee understood what I meant. The Committee met for months and months on this matter. It was not done in a night and a day. It is mystifying to me that anybody in his right senses can read into it something which is not mentioned here.

Hon. M. E. COX: What really happened was that the hon. senior member for St. Philip was unwilling to tax the sugar magnates in order to contribute to the construction of the port.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It would take somebody of a mind so devious and Machiavellian as the Hon. Minister to arrive at a conclusion like that. Even a corkscrew would be straight to his thinking. In every single Session, I brought in a Resolution calling on the hon. member and his Government to implement what was recommended by the Royal Commission. As a matter of fact, I will tell you more. I have had the pleasure of being told by a member of the British Parliament with regard to the special fund which we get now accruing to the Labour Welfare Fund, that we were lucky in getting it because the Governments of the West Indies were loth to implement that suggestion of the Royal Commission. Sir, you will find not less than twelve or fifteen resolutions in my name calling on this Government to implement that recommendation of the Royal Commission.

Hon. M. E. COX: What is the meaning of that?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not going to have the hon. member twisting anything I have said. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want the Question Book brought to me.

Hon. M. E. COX: Must I sit down here and wait until the Question Book is brought to him?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Never have I heard anything which I have said in here so wilfully distorted as he is doing now. I am not standing for it at all. I have not come in here through him. He has sat repeatedly in here, and Your Honour also, and heard me repeatedly begging Mr. Keith Walcott who was then running the Government to levy this cess as was recommended by the Royal Commission.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have made that point already.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want the Question Book to verify it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You cannot hold up the Chamber for that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You are sure to find it in there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member take his seat and let the Hon. Minister of Trade continue his reply.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have been told in a most malicious and wilful manner that my reservation was for the Deep Water Harbour Fund alone. I want the Question Book.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But you cannot hold up the Chamber for that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I wrote here is that I was opposed to any decision to levy this specifically for the Deep Water Harbour Fund.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But you have made that point already.

Mr. CRAWFORD: But he does not understand it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But you cannot make him understand. Do not try to work miracles.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Only God Almighty can do it.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is only interrupting me. He is standing up there all the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Philip. You have made your point. If you want the Question Book, sit and wait until you get it.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If it is beyond the conception of people what is meant by "specifically", I cannot put it in their heads. Although it is written here in black and white that you should make the levy for the Deep Water Harbour

alone, the hon. member wants to say that I did not want to make the levy for the sugar industry. That is a most confounded and dastardly lie.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have made that point.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will not sit down here as any puppet for any of them. As to any point which is raised I am prepared to put my point to the House. What I have read out is exactly what the hon. member read. This is his reservation; if he wants to twist that now.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: I object to that. I will not have that at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member said: "if you want to twist it".

Mr. CRAWFORD: That means that I do not understand what is written there. Every time he says that I will rise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am speaking on a point of order so as to correct the misinterpretation which has been made by the hon. member.

Hon. M. E. COX: While I am on that point, let us say that the hon. member has brought things to this House from time to time. My experience today, and not today alone, is this: who has brought forward this question of emigration more regularly on a platform than he? The hon. member has said today that we are exporting all of our people and asking the other territories to be almshouses for us. That is what the hon. member said today.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Their attitude deserves the contempt of Barbados. They expect Trinidad and even Germany to be Almshouses for Barbados. Everybody understands that except the hon. member.

Hon. M. E. COX: In 1946 the hon. member read out something which he did not allow anybody to see, to the effect that if they had won the Elections, 10,000 people would have gone out.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. That is another fabrication. In 1946 I was in St. John and when I was there a cable was brought to me from Bridgetown. That cable came from the Panama Progressive Society. I had just returned from Panama whence the Federal Prime Minister and myself had been sent cables asking us to investigate conditions affecting West Indians. I was told that he never replied to the people. I spent four weeks in arranging business with the Panama Progressive Society and the British Foreign Office. A Jamaican called Mr. Mornan had been appointed at the British Embassy to represent West Indian interests. When I returned, the Panama Progressive Society sent the cable to me; I gave the cable to the two candidates who were running with the National Congress Party at that Election. Dr. Wilson and Mr. Blackman are still alive and in the island; I spoke to Mr. Blackman up to yesterday. I gave them the cable and I never saw it again. The cable read "Success to the National Congress Party in this Election." When the two candidates got in the House some nonsense was said. I have never heard one denial that what I said was not true. It is a matter of indifference to me as to what the hon. member or anybody else says.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not believe one word which the hon. member says now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not asking you to do so.

Hon. M. E. COX: All that happened is that.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not entertaining anything about any cable.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The cable came to me about ten minutes to four.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is the end of it.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member referred to emigration today and he has been talking on several occasions about this Government not trying to get people out of the island, whereas they have been very active in trying to get people out of the island. Now the hon. member says that we are not finding employment for our people and we are asking Germany to be an Almshouse for our people. How does that square with his emigration programme?

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I said that no other member of this Chamber has been more active and insistent in finding avenues for employment outside for the people of this country than I have been; but I want to say that emigration is not the only solution for our unemployment problem. I quoted "Mitchie" Hewitt today in relation to what Trinidad is doing industrially. I said that in the same manner in which Trinidad is developing their country industrially, why can't we do that instead of trying to find Almshouses for our people outside?

5.25 p.m.

I said all we were thinking of doing is finding almshouses outside. I am not here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to explain to him in detail how you develop a point. I can do it, but apparently, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you said that because so-and-so is so-and-so, so-and-so must be so-and-so, people regard both of them as separate statements; they do not understand you are drawing an analogy, comparison or something.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying that the hon. member criticised the Government and the figures that I gave, and told us that the Jamaica Government is doing everything possible, developing industries and trying to find employment for their people, and we are doing nothing. Only week before the last at a Conference Mr. Manley told us in no uncertain manner that we can never imagine how unhappy the plight of the Jamaican people is. He said there was over 20% unemployment in Jamaica as far as the labour force is concerned. Today Jamaica and Trinidad are doing exactly what we have done since 1955; they are both establishing Liaison Services in Great Britain to find employment for Jamaicans and Trinidadians.

The Premier of Trinidad wrote me through his Minister asking me to submit to him our plans on how we have this thing organised since last year. I have also received a letter from Mr. Grant, a Minister in Jamaica, asking about our plans. I have written to both and they are now setting up offices despite the industrial development that is going on in those two territories to find work for their people just as we have done since 1955. My colleague has just reminded me of the Minister of Trade in Trinidad who has gone to the States to try and get a quota for Trinidad, despite the fact that this place is so highly industrialised as well as Jamaica.

To talk about establishing industries in this island to absorb all our people is the height of nonsense. We have a growing population of something like 4,000 every year, and I quoted the unemployment figures last night for members.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so far as I know, today all the remarks made in this Chamber on this matter were in the context of talking about finding work for the people displaced through the Deep Water Harbour. Nobody so far as I know said that you could find industries to employ all the people in Barbados. So far as I am concerned, I am sure that everybody else understood what I said today, and it is that a mere *ex-gratia* payment to these people was not enough, and that since the Committee had recommended that towards the end of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour serious consideration should be given to finding alternative work for these people, the Government should not have sat supinely down and made no arrangements for finding any kind of work for anybody at all, so that when the money is

gone there is no work at all. That is what I said, but he is now twisting that to suit what he said.

Hon. M. E. COX: I hope the hon. member would not constantly interrupt me. He is not prepared to let me bring the facts out. I said that I gave the figures last night and the hon. member is refuting them and saying that somebody gave me those figures which I quoted, but that they are not correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not having that at all. I never told him that at all. I quoted the figure he gave in terms of thousands. He got up and said he never said so, that he said them in terms of percentages, and I called on the hon. senior member for St. Peter to verify them, and he too said the Minister said them in thousands. That is an entirely different thing from what he is saying now.

Hon. M. E. COX: I told the House last night that since 1955 over 10,000 jobs were created in this island. I will read what I said again: "An examination of the recent census relating to the labour force suggests that employment in the island has risen from 73,900 in 1955 to 84,000 persons in 1960. As a proportion of the labour force, unemployment has fallen from 20% to 17% over this period." A full statement is then set out here which deals with emigration and some of everything I have here. From 1946 when we had the Cumber Report to 1950 the effect of migration was an increased population; more people entered the island than left it, and the net amount during this period was 4,037. From 1951 the trend was reversed. The island lost through migration from 1951 to the end of 1960 a total of 16,116 persons. Of this number 14,788 migrated since 1955. I can go on to quote figures all the time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I want to say in all good faith from the outset that I am absolutely ignorant of what the Minister in charge is saying. I want to understand it clearly, because I do not want to criticise anything and then be made to look like a fool. I heard the hon. member read out that there were 10,000 new jobs, and for the benefit of the public I would like him to tell us if the industries are mentioned in which these jobs were created since 1955. He is Minister of Trade and I am not going to say that he is wrong until I am satisfied. Ten thousand new jobs are quite a lot to be created with the thousands of people going out of the country; so I would like to know in what industries they are employed. The beer industry is not open yet; there is a brick industry; and the sugar industry has laid off a lot of people through mechanisation and through closing down some of the factories.

5.35 p.m.

What I want to get at is this. I am speaking as regards the City and I like to know when I am speaking that I am speaking on sound ground. You talk of 10,000 new jobs. You have the brick factory, the furniture house at Grazzettes, the starvation house which is robbing the girls who are making the shirts and which should be closed down. I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me what are the industries that absorb 10,000 jobs. Can he tell me that?

Hon. M. E. COX: I can only tell him that that information has come from a very reliable source. It comes from the Statistical Department, a department in which the Government has the greatest measure of confidence.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect to the Hon. Minister, I will say that if I had a Statistical Department, I would have to go to that department for my information; but I think a Statistical Department which says that 10,000 new jobs have been created is telling the damnest lie in creation. What 10,000 new jobs have been created? Where are the industries to get that? The Hon. Minister reads that and I am sure that he does not believe it. You cannot tell some Negro people that.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City is already on a point of order.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I heard the hon. senior member for the City said that you cannot tell some Negro people that. I would like him to withdraw that remark.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I withdraw that. We have 200,000 people in this country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has explained that more than once.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I accept what the Hon. Minister has said that this information is from the Statistical Department. Sir, you have been the Chairman of the Northern District Council for some time. You have been in business for a long time. I believe you stand second only to a few of us in your business knowledge. Do you really believe that those statistics of jobs created are correct?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister replied to you that he got those figures from the Statistical Department and I think that is sufficient.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am finished. All I will say is that I do not believe the Hon. Minister will accept those figures.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, having had all these interruptions, I do not intend to proceed any more with my reply.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before you put the question, Sir, I am still on a point of order. I have not interrupted the hon. member. A member is entitled to ask a question. If my question has caused the hon. member to say that he is not proceeding any more to reply, well then, I must ask a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has signified his intention already.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot help talking about these figures. I will only say now to him that this Statistical Department is very questionable; you better see about it.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would like to draw to your attention that I was endeavouring but unsuccessfully to get the Question Book on the matter to which I made reference and I understand that there is no record of questions during 1948. I regard that as a very serious state of affairs and I sincerely hope that you will draw the matter to the attention of the Speaker that these records are missing and that some steps be made to replace them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I promise the hon. member to put your complaint before Mr. Speaker.

The question that Clause 1 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 2, 3, and 4 were called separately and passed.

5.45 p.m.

Clauses 5 to 11 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, as I intimated when I was moving the second reading of this Bill, I am now asking leave to make a minor amendment to this Schedule. After sub-paragraph 3 of paragraph 6 of this Schedule, I

am asking that a new sub-paragraph to be numbered (4) be inserted as follows:-

"Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) of this paragraph the Board may in their discretion grant to a displaced worker his allowance in lieu of such weekly payments".

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Schedule as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this Schedule has fifteen paragraphs. Are you putting the whole Schedule?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member referring to the amendment which has just been made?

Mr. WALCOTT: I want to see the amendment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what I was asking the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: Originally we had discussed this matter about the amount to be given and it was stated that the administrative authority should have authority to vary the method of payment. I have no serious objection to the manner in which this paragraph is worded as to what is likely to take place, and what we want to avoid is where we said that an amount should be stipulated. In view of the fact that the matter has not been put in that way, the amendment may go through. Hon. members should know what has been agreed to so that they will know what the position is. The Union had suggested that you should put a fixed amount of over \$100 or \$150 but the way in which the paragraph now reads can meet that position. It could also meet the position which we did not want to have because you may have instances where you may want to pay this amount.

This paragraph is more liberal than what we were suggesting. We did not want to run into the inroads of being called upon to pay out all the money. The present Bill did not give the authority to pay out more than a weekly amount. It may be that the Board will have to make its own regulations as to how these amounts should be paid. That is for the purpose of avoiding people asking you why did you give Mr. So and So all of his money and now you do not want to give me all of mine. It may be that the Board should be able to regulate that.

The question that the Schedule as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the Hon. Minister moves the third reading of this Bill, I should like to draw to his attention that we have spoken about the question of age. I do not know if the Schedule would meet the question of the age. They had not been regarding some people above 58 and such lump sum stops at 50. 5.55 p.m.

As the lump sum payments stop at 60, we have suggested that if the age of 58 was used instead of 60, it would not interfere with the principle of the Bill. You do not want to tell a man that he cannot go down and still deprive him of the option; so if you put the option at 58, it would satisfy those who could not go down, because the ones at 58 are too old to go down. We felt that the age of 60 was a bit high to carry down and we do not want to keep a man who is 58

too long. That is all I wanted to deal with, because I heard the Minister say that he had an amendment to insert. I want to know if this amendment is to cover that aspect of the age, or if it is regarded that we will have to abide by the age of 60.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving that this Bill be now read a third time, I would like to explain that this question was apparently discussed between my Permanent Secretary and the hon. member, but we did not feel it was necessary to make any change from 60 to 58 because of the fact that 60 years is always regarded as the retiring age. If the hon. member will remember, in the case of displaced porters and coopers, when we got to 60 we gave those people an additional 50% because it might have been difficult for them to find gainful employment after that age. We felt that 60 years was reasonable and we have been told that in view of the fact that the Mercantile Association and those who are responsible for the Port and handling of cargo down there had refused to accept people over the age of 58, that that was the reason why the Union had requested that the age be reduced to 58. We did not feel it was justifiable.

We have given the Board fairly wide discretionary powers, and although I am not saying the Board can do it because it may be a question of testing, I believe that if a person was displaced or anything like that and wanted to draw his payments, the Board would be quite within its jurisdiction to make advances or full payment to that person. I do not think that the age of 58 or 60 is anything to worry about.

Mr. WALCOTT: When I look at paragraph 4 of the Schedule, I think that would cover it. It says "notwithstanding the provisions of subsections 1, 2 and 3, of this Section, the Board may in their discretion grant to a displaced worker his allowance in lieu of such weekly payments."

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Bill was passed.

AMENDMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1961.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with the amendments from the Other Place to the Local Government (Amendment) Act, 1961.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to deal with the Amendment to the Local Government (Amendment) Act, 1961, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am objecting as I said earlier.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I heard correctly, you have declared that there was no objection.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I put the question and paused a while, and I did not hear anyone, so I said "there being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister."

Hon. M. E. COX: That is what I understood. The amendment is simple. I know the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Philip. It is customary when the Other Place amends a money Bill to send a letter to the House pointing out that the Other Place had amended it and asking that the House waive its right. I understand that that has not been done in this case. As a matter of fact, I am told that this is not a money Bill as such; the Attorney General

has ruled that it is not a money Bill. However, Sir, what I would like to say is that whether or not it is a money Bill, or whether or not the Other Place has sent to us asking us to waive our right, the Government had authorised the Minister without Portfolio to make this amendment in the Other Place; therefore it is done with the consent of the Government, and the House is asked to accept it. I do not think that that contravenes any power which the House has, because the Executive Committee Act has not been amended and therefore the House is still solely responsible for all the funds and for dictating how they should be dispensed with. I do not think therefore that there is any question of infringing upon the rights and privileges of the House. 6.05 p.m.

I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, this matter has nothing at all to do with the Executive Committee Act. To begin with, Sir, if the Government wanted to amend this Bill, from the nature of the Bill itself, they had no right adopting the procedure of the Minister without Portfolio amending it in the Other Place. This is a question of creating a precedent which can be referred to in the future as a basis for action and which may lead not only to confusion but to serious clashes between the two Houses.

In the first instance, it falls upon the Speaker of the House to decide whether or not a Bill before the House is a Money Bill; and I think the Government would be well advised to have this position cleared up, especially in view of the fact that clashes of this sort are bound to occur in the future. Therefore, we have to take the utmost precaution to ensure that nothing can be thrown at us in the future over which we need to be ashamed.

Now, "May's" is very clear on this question of the prerogative of the Speaker to certify whether a Bill before the House is a Money Bill or not. And in this connection, I would like to turn your attention to page 574 of the Edition which we have in this Chamber. Apart from that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to sit here at all and agree to the passing of these amendments to this Bill as has been amended by the Other Place. I cannot for the life of me think that any Attorney General in Barbados will go on record and say that a Bill like this amending taxation is not a money Bill. It is a very serious thing to give that advice. As a matter of fact, it is a more serious thing for the Attorney General not to advise the Government that this Bill should not have been amended originally in the Other Place. His advice should have been that this Bill should have been sent back to this Chamber for amendment.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention the Executive Committee Act of 1891 and this may help the hon. member. Frankly speaking, we do not subscribe to their argument. Section 4 reads as follows:-

"The initiation of money votes by bill, resolution or otherwise, by individual members of the House of Assembly shall cease, and shall be made only on the responsibility of the Executive Committee in the manner provided in this Act; provided always that nothing in this Act contained shall be construed to restrict or in any way interfere with the right, hitherto always exercised by individual members of the House of Assembly, to introduce any bill, resolution, or any other measure of legislation, so that, as is hereinbefore provided, such bill, resolution, or other measure of legislation does not create any charge upon the revenue of the Colony, or in terms provide for the expenditure of public money."

This Bill — the Local Government Bill — which we have passed, does not in any way interfere with the Treasury of Barbados. It has nothing to do with the expenditure of funds as far as the Treasury is concerned neither does it have anything to do with the putting of funds into the revenue of this colony or taking money out.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is a taxation Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: It is for Local Government Taxation over which we have no control. None of the money collected through Local Government taxation is used by the Central Government. That is used and administered for the benefit of Local Government by the authorities concerned. That is the position; so I hope the hon. member will see that inasmuch as it is not in any way concerned with the Treasury over which the House of Assembly has control that the Attorney General — and I am assuming this — concluded that it was not a Money Bill as such. If it were a question of putting money into the Treasury, then it could be argued in the way the hon. member is arguing.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is not a question of whether it is taxation for either Local Government or Central Government. It is a question that so long as it is taxation, it is a money Bill. This is a question which was fought out in England as to whether or not the House of Lords has the right to interfere with a Money Bill. In all established constitutional practice, the House of Lords can only give assent.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sure that if the hon. member would reflect, he would see that it is a question of whether that taxation goes into the Treasury.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is my opinion that it means any Bill creating a charge on the public revenue is a money bill particularly as in this instance of your imposing a new taxation rate upon the people. It is not a question in any way of whether it goes into the revenue of the Central Government or the Local Government. Such bills must be introduced in the Commons or in the Lower House. Such is the present standard in regard to the initiation of taxation and the control of the public revenue. (Hon. M. E. COX: This is not the public revenue.) It is an incidence of taxation upon the people whether it is taxation by the Local Government or the Central Government. That argument may be the technique coming from legal luminaries. I remember when we of the Opposition attempted to interfere with taxation of this kind, they said that we could not do it. They said that it must come from the Crown.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I remind the hon. member that a Local Government Bill was passed some time ago which included the power to tax and it was sent back here with numerous amendments from the Other Place and nobody mentioned anything about it being a money bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Was the rate interfered with?

Hon. M. E. COX: If it is a Money Bill, it is a money Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Minister ought to know that in England that is a subterfuge which is resorted to on several occasions. You want to get approval to legislation, and you insert a financial clause in that legislation and say that it is a Money Bill and because of that, you say that the House of Lords cannot interfere with it and because of that, you got that legislation passed.

6.15 p.m.

You want to get controversial legislation through the upper Chamber. You insert financial clauses in it and you say that it is a money Bill. You tell them that they cannot interfere with it and by introducing the two of them together you get them passed. They may have had a Bill of this sort to which the hon. member refers, a Bill which referred to finance, but it was not specifically a Bill imposing taxation on the people. These things must emanate from the Commons and the only power which the Lords have is to assent to them or reject them. I am sure that you are bound to hear more of this outside. It is a question of what must be done to protect what is a cherished right which we have inherited. You cannot violate the constitution like that and get away with it.

Moreover, the time will come when they will refer to a change in a Money Bill by the Other Place and be-

cause of this amendment they will not have a leg on which to stand. There should be no means of changing taxation which has been imposed by the lower Chamber. On that ground I will vote against this Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the Attorney General had said what the Minister has told us, I do not think he could say it to this House of Assembly. It is a matter for the Speaker to decide whether this is a Money Bill or not. It is not a question for determination by the Attorney General.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. I do not think it was the intention of the hon. member that we should be guided by the Attorney General.

Mr. WALCOTT: In the final analysis the Speaker has to decide this matter. This is something which deals with the privileges of this House as distinct from what the Attorney General says from the point of view of expediency.

Hon. M. E. COX: We cannot ignore the advice of legal people; I do agree with the hon. member that it is a matter for His Honour the Speaker to say whether the Bill is a Money Bill or not. What I have quoted as to the Executive Committee still holds good today. It deals specifically with money which is going into the Treasury and money which is coming back out. This money is for the Local Authority.

Mr. WALCOTT: There is no dispute between the hon. member and myself on that point. The hon. member should put himself in the position of an ordinary member of the House and not of a member of the Government. We have to bear in mind that this matter is not so much one for today but for the future. If you once allow the Other Place to get the inroads of dealing with something like this, even if the Government agrees with them, on another occasion they will come back at you. This is what "May's" says about Money Bills: "A certain class of Bills, the main object of which is the expenditure of money or the imposition of taxation...." The hon. member must bear in mind that in relation to this Bill which he has introduced, the Government decided that, in the future, the taxation to be levied in this island for Local Government purposes shall be levied by the Government. You have laid down in an Act that this taxation shall be so much and so much and the Other Place cannot vary it. The Governor-in-Executive Committee Act is a different thing from Parliament having the right to deal with a Money Bill. The Speaker has not got to take his reference from the Executive Committee. The Premier has to bear in mind that the imposition of taxation is what we are passing through this Chamber and the Local Government Act only imposes taxation after we have given the Councils the power to do so. In this specific Bill, the position is different; in this Bill you say that the amount of taxation is 17.5%. This is a Money Bill because it imposes taxation in this island. The Other Place cannot say that it is only taxation for Local Government purposes; it is a Bill which is being passed through this House of Assembly imposing taxation in the island of Barbados. It comes within the ambit of a Money Bill automatically.

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the argument which we are carrying on here is whether the amendment of the Other Place is an amendment to a Money Bill or not. I am referring to "May's", Fifteenth Edition at page 487 where it says this: "A certain class of Bills, the main object of which is the expenditure of money or the imposition of taxation must, in accordance with the requirements of the standing orders regarding charges on the people, originate in Committee of the whole House."

I am humbly submitting that by no stretch of the imagination can you say that the Bill, which was passed in this House and which had inserted in it an amount of 17.5%, is not a Money Bill. I might say that if a private member of this House had been permitted to make an amendment to that Bill Your Honour would say that it is a Money Bill. It is for Your Honour to decide whether this is a Money Bill or not. "May's" does not qualify the taxation. The Local Government Authority could not decide whether the taxa-

tion is going to be 17% or 18%; that was done by the Government. The Government set out to have a Bill on the Statute Book, which imposes taxation on the people of Barbados for Local Government purposes.

6.25 p.m.

I am humbly submitting that the Other Place had no right to amend this Bill before it was sent back to us; therefore it is a question of the privileges of this House and it is for Your Honour to decide if the Other Place acted in accordance with the constitutional practice that they cannot interfere with money matters.

I think, Sir, that as far back as 1911 this was one of the things fought out. This might be a matter of expediency, but I will tell the Premier that there are certain fundamental issues that transcend expediency. The Other Place is very jealous of its powers; they are so jealous of their powers and right that they do not intend to give up one thing. We may have quarrels among ourselves down here, but when it comes to our rights and privileges, we are at one. This is no Party issue. This is just as if a person came in here and wanted to be rude to any member whether it is the Leader of the House or any other member; I would jump over and throw him outside. This place belongs to us, and no one can come in here and interfere with any member; so we have no sides inside this House when it comes to the privileges of the House. After we have been elected by the people to come here, this becomes our Club; so when it comes to this question of privileges and with all due respect to the Other Place we have to stand on the privileges of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need say anymore because this is an occasion which shows that you need a Speaker and one who is acquainted with all the procedure. It is a matter for your prerogative and your prerogative only; it is not a matter for the House to decide, but for Your Honour. I think we have made our position clear. My position is not opposition to the amendment, because if the Government wants that amendment inserted, it has a right to have the Bill reintroduced and insert the amendment, and I think the House would be quite willing to do that. I do not know what would be the procedure if they brought it down tomorrow or the next day. I want the Premier to know that our opposition is not to the subject matter but on the question of our privileges.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on this question the Government took the advice of its legal adviser because we wanted to be sure about it. It is true that the Attorney General advises us and he says in his opinion it is not a Money Bill but it is a question for the Speaker.

Now, Sir, for the years that I have been in this House, as you will know we have always applied this criterion to such Bills. Is this Bill putting money into the Treasury or taking money out of the Treasury? The proceeds of these taxes do not go into the Treasury. As a matter of fact, the Bill provides for the collection of these taxes and an account is opened at the Bank which must be administered by the Local Government Commissioner. The money does not go anywhere near the Treasury. The Local Government Commissioner is supposed to keep an account and see that money is collected and deposited into the Bank in the name of the Local Government Commissioner. You will see, therefore, that the money does not go anywhere near the Treasury, and therefore on that definition it is not in our opinion a Money Bill. The hon. senior member for St. Peter quoted May's Parliamentary Procedure, but I can very well understand why May's does not make any reference to the particular point relative to Local Government taxation, because as far as I can remember, there is no such thing in England. The British Parliament does not deal with Local Government taxation, so that May's really does not apply in this situation.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, no better speech could have been made than that which has just been made by the Premier, in that he has made the points which

I am about to make doubly clear. In the first place there was an amendment before the House quite recently whereby a uniform rate was created for the District Councils and whereby the City Council will have to assist to some extent the other District Councils. I would not go into all that now. The object of this amendment is still to retain that uniform rate, but it has been changed from 17 1/2 cents to 18 1/2 cents, an increase of one cent; and the Other Place has seen fit to increase the rate. Although it is the rate dealing with Local Government taxation, it is in truth and in fact a Money Bill as far as this Chamber is concerned relating to the taxation of Local Government. It is a Money Bill and it creates a charge on the revenue of this island for the very reasons which the Premier has introduced, in that the Government still gives subventions and grants to the District Councils in order for them to be able to balance their budget, and it means that when the rate is increased from 17 1/2 cents to 19 1/2 cents, it then relieves the Government to some extent of money which they would give by way of subventions. That creates a charge on the Treasury, no matter how you turn it and twist it. The ultimate effect of this amendment is directly creating a charge on the Treasury or revenue of this island whether it is positive or negative, whether it is giving or taking back. It is a Money Bill and what is more, Mr. Speaker, it is a question of the imposition of taxation; and according to the various authorities quoted by my colleagues, the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for St. Philip, anything dealing with the imposition of taxation can only emanate from or be initiated by the Executive Committee in the House of Assembly and not the Executive Committee elsewhere.

6.35 p.m.

Your argument could have been, if you wanted to increase it, that there is a member of the Executive Committee in the Council who could do it. You could have run that line of argument if you wanted to be facetious. You could have said that you did not use that argument. It is a member of the Executive Committee who should do it but in the House of Assembly, and it can be done nowhere else. It is a Money Bill affecting taxation of the Local Government. Whoever interpreted otherwise is trying to deprive this Chamber of its ancient rights and privileges and is trying to interfere with the constitution of this island which has been handed down over 300 years to us. We will not allow anybody to hoodwink us. The amendments should have come from the House of Assembly.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, because I consider very strongly that this is a question of the privileges of the House of Assembly, I believe that it is right that every section of the House should make a contribution on the matter. I think it must be appreciated that there is a difference between the Government and members of the House on this matter. The Hon. Leader of the House mentioned that the Executive Committee Act has not yet been amended fully and that the authority in a situation like this still rests with the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I rise on a point of order. It is true that the Executive Committee Act has not yet been amended. What I said is that we still are guided by the Executive Committee Act, Section 4, which explains in detail what members of the House can do and that Money Bills must originate in the Executive Committee and be passed by the House, and the House is the sole dictate of how those funds can be disbursed.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I am glad to hear that. The House must do that. I will say now that the Local Government Bill has been amended in the Other Place presumably on the advice or with the understanding of the Government. I believe it is the Government who advised that amendment. However, we are not to be wary in demanding our privileges and, as a matter of fact, we are now talking on Bills with respect to our new constitution. You are saying as regards a lot of your constitutional changes that you are leaving them to be brought about by conventions; therefore, anything done by the Other Place creating a precedent can be used against you.

The Attorney General is the person who advises the Government and he says that in his opinion it is not a Money Bill. You have two legally trained people as Clerks of this House and I can say categorically that the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk differ on this interpretation themselves. Therefore, it is left to the Speaker to decide this matter. I will expect that the Speaker will rule.

Section 199 of the Local Government Act shows you that the amendment which is made can finally be a charge on the Treasury. I am going to use the words of the hon. senior member for the City. He said that originally he never advised the City Council in its first two years to ask the Central Government for any subvention. I can personally interpret this to mean that you are going to control and reduce the City Council's revenue because of the uniform trade tax and the City Council might be inclined to say that they can ask for a subvention because they feel that their revenue has been curtailed as a result of what you are doing. That possibility exists; if you can connect the argument that you are asking for a subvention because your revenue is curtailed, then you can interpret this Bill to be a Money Bill and therefore, it is possible for it to create a charge on the Treasury.

The argument was made that the Local Government Act was amended in many ways previously and it was not termed a Money Bill. The Local Government Act was an Act of principle. It was not an Act of dollars and cents, but this particular amendment now brings the dollars and cents into it.

What is your amendment? You said, to which we agreed, that the rate should be 17.5% for trade tax and now by the amendment of the Other Place, you say that it should be 18.5%. I think that this is a matter for the Speaker to decide. It is essential for us — not on a Party basis but rather on a constitutional basis — to protect the rights and privileges of this Honourable Chamber. We have to be sure that we do not allow a precedent to be created, because according to our conventions, something like this may occur in the future and we will be guided by precedent. I expect that everyone is interested in the preservation of the ancient rights and privileges of this Honourable Chamber. The Attorney General advises the Government but he does not necessarily advise the House of Assembly and the rights of the House of Assembly are what we are concerned about.

I do not think that there can be any objection as to whether it is 18.5%, 19.5% or 20.5%. The situation in which Your Honour is placed is one in which you must finally decide as to whether these amendments coming from the Other Place are in order or not. You have to say whether this particular one especially is in accordance with the rights and privileges of this Honourable Chamber. I say that it can be a possible charge on the Treasury and I think the possibility is enough argument for us trying to protect ourselves. I do not want deliberately to feel that we are prolonging or delaying consideration of this issue but when it happens that you can get so many divergent legal opinions on this matter — the Attorney General advising in one case that it is not a Money Bill and hon. members of the House are of the opinion that it does create a charge on the Treasury — I believe the only answer to that is for Your Honour to maintain the *status quo*.

6.45 p.m.

It is not possible in this case to be guided by the legal adviser to the Government as such.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. The hon. member has said that this House should not be guided by the legal opinion of the Attorney General. I want to say that nobody is asking him to accept the opinion of the Attorney General. I happen to mention that on our behalf; we wanted to get a clarification of the matter and we referred to the Attorney General.

Mr. STRAUGHN: The one thing which the Attorney General must do for us is to advise. The question is whether the House should be guided by the legal opinion which the Attorney General gave to the Government *per se*. The only way in which we can protect the rights of this Chamber is to maintain the *status quo*.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will take up the hon. member on what he had said in sitting down.

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order. I said it when I was on my feet. (Laughter).

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member who has just sat down made reference to Section 199 of the Local Government Act. This Bill came back to us with several amendments and we accepted them. If it can be argued that this is a Money Bill, then the amendments which we accepted from the Other Place were also in connection with a Money Bill.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I want to repeat that one of the things which I said just now was that the Local Government Act, in its original state, was not in the form of a Money Bill. It was a matter of principle; it only became a question of dollars and cents when it referred to the rate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I feel that this is not a Money Bill and I am entitled to say so. Section 199 of the Local Government Act distinctly says this in sub-Section (1):—

"There may be paid out of moneys provided by the Legislature to a Council in respect of any expenditure incurred or to be incurred by them for the purpose of the discharge of any of their functions under this Act or any other enactment, such sums as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may direct and subject to such conditions as he may determine; and different sums may be paid subject to different conditions to different Councils."

I will ask this simple question; I will prove that this is not a Money Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what the House is interested in.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am showing the House that we must be consistent. When this Bill came in here would I be in order, as a private member of this House, to have that Section inserted? The answer is "No". I am arguing that this particular Section was not in here and if I had got up and moved that this Section be inserted in the Bill, would Your Honour allow me to insert that Section? Your Honour would say "No" because it would be making this Bill in a Money Bill; it would be giving the authority to take money out of the Treasury.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. There is nothing to prevent you from amending anything, but where the amendment falls down is where you are inserting something which becomes a charge on the Treasury.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I maintain that if the Government had brought down this Bill without that Section, I would not have been able, as a Private Member, to insert that Section, because that would be considered as taking money out of the Treasury. The original Bill went before the Other Place and it was sent back here with several amendments. We decided to agree on those amendments. Now this Bill went before the Other Place and they have made an amendment. I agree that it is not for the Attorney General to advise this House, but the Attorney General or the Crown Law Officer must advise the Government and it is for Your Honour to decide whether this Bill is a Money Bill or not. It is not a Money Bill in the sense that long ago in England what they would do, if they wanted to get a Bill through the House, is to insert some section which is not directly taking money out of the Treasury and say that it is a Money Bill. This amendment is not taking any money out of the Treasury or putting money into the Treasury.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is imposing taxation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not agree that this is a Money Bill but it is for Your Honour to rule in a matter of this sort.

6.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, to explain what.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has spoken twice. I have sat down and he is talking about a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I notice that when I am speaking you would not allow me to speak. Sir, we just passed a Money Bill and it has many clauses to it. If you were amending the quorum, that would not change the money; that is, if you change the number to five instead of six; but if you say...

Mr. SPEAKER: Have I heard all the rulings?

Hon. M. E. COX: I would just like to say something before you make your decision. I noticed just now that the hon. member smiled when I said he could not change. Your Honour will agree that the Rule states that as far as Money Bills are concerned, only members of the Governor-in-Executive Committee can deal with them, and not even a floor member can second one of those Bills. A particular Minister has to sponsor that measure right through and no other member can make an amendment to it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not think the hon. member heard what I said. I said that you passed a Money Bill just now, but if you go back and change the quorum from five to four, it would not in any way affect the question of the money; so the hon. member is not right in saying that we could not amend it if the House carried the amendment. The hon. member says that the Chairman shall preside at all meetings. For example, there is a Clause in this Bill saying that a member may resign his office in writing. This House could leave out the words "in writing" if an amendment were introduced and passed to that effect on the suggestion of an ordinary member of the House, because as such it does not create any charge. Any Bill that comes before us, can be amended so long as we do not impose a charge on the Treasury. We cannot initiate a Bill, but after you have initiated a Bill in here, it is our Bill and we can pass it the way it should be passed, not you. There may be amendments which you do not accept, but the Speaker cannot rule us out of order for saying that "in writing" be deleted.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock.
7.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to draw to Your Honour's attention that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been asked to give a ruling as to whether the amendment now under consideration before this House constitutes a breach of privilege by the Other Place.

In a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1961, originally there appeared in Section 173 an imposition of a rate in relation to Local Government of 17 1/2 cents. In the amendment that has been returned from the Other Place, that rate has been changed to 18 1/2 cents. It is on this question that I am asked to make a ruling. I will read Section 4 of the Executive Committee Act, 1891-22.

"The initiation of money votes by bill, resolution, or otherwise, by individual members of the House of Assembly shall cease, and shall be made only on the responsibility of the Executive Committee in the manner provided in this Act; provided always that nothing in this Act contained in this Act shall be construed to restrict or in any way interfere with the right, hitherto always exercised by individual members of the House of Assembly, to introduce any bill, resolution, or any other measure of legislation, so that, as is whereinbefore provided, such bill, resolution, or other measure of legislation does not create any charge upon the revenue of the colony, or in terms provide for the expenditure of public money."

Here in this Section 4 responsibility for the initiation of money votes resolution and otherwise is laid fully on the representatives of the House on what is known as the Governor-in-Executive Committee. That ends that.
7.50 p.m.

In Standing Order No. 59 of the House of Assembly, paragraph 1, I read:

"Except on the recommendations of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, the House -

(a) shall not proceed on any Bill (including any amendment to a Bill) which makes provision for imposing or increasing any tax, for imposing or increasing any charge on the revenue or other funds of the Colony or for compounding or remitting any debt due to the Colony; and

(b) shall not proceed on any motion, the effect of which is that provision shall be made for any of the purposes aforesaid."

2. "All aids and supplies and aids to the Governor are the sole gift of the General Assembly; and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies are to begin with the General Assembly; and it is the undoubted and sole right of the Assembly to direct, limit and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants, which may not be changed or altered by the Council."

In paragraph 2, we understand that all aids and supplies to the Governor is the sole gift of the General Assembly and it is also laid down here for what purpose such aids and supplies and conditions of such aids and supplies are controlled. Reference is also made in this paragraph to the limitations and qualifications of such grants which may not be changed or altered by the Council.

Now, going by May's, the 11th Edition, page 574, you will see, from "Origin of the Lords' position", this:

"The Commons, having during nearly three centuries claimed the right to include the members of the House of Lords in the taxation levied upon the subjects of the Crown, advanced this claim still further by resolving, 1671, "That in all aids given to the king by the Commons, the rate or tax ought not to be altered by the Lords;" and by a second resolution, 3rd July, 1678, "That all aids and supplies, and aids to his Majesty in Parliament, are the sole gift of the Commons; and all bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons; and that it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants, which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords".

Now, we come to the "Commons' privileges and legislation by the Lords". May's says:

"By the practice and usage based upon that resolution, the Lords are excluded, not only from the power of initiating or amending bills dealing with public expenditure or revenue, but also from initiating public bills which would create a charge upon the people by the imposition of local and other rates, or which deals with the administration or employment of those charges."

Well now, in the 16th Edition of May's, page 814 - and I will go to page 815 also - there is the Heading "Amendments infringing privilege with respect of local rates".
I go on:-

"The Commons now generally waive their claim regarding amendments made to bills that they have sent to the Lords dealing with municipal, country, and local rates and assessments; more especially when those amendments effect charges upon the people incidentally only, and are made for the purpose of giving effect to the Legislative intentions of the Commons."

Going to page 815, May's says:

"Influenced by these considerations, as appears by the debates which took place on three occasions, in the years 1838, 1847 and 1849, with the expressed sanction, not only of Mr. Speaker Abercromby, but of Mr. Speaker Shaw Lefevre, the Commons waived the exercise of their privilege, and considered amendments made by the Lords, which, not only by the omission of provisions, but by distinct enactment, changed the area, and therefore the burden, of local taxation, and imposed rates higher than the rates fixed by the House of Commons."

From what I have read and quoted, you will see that the Other Place has no right at all whatever to change, amend and to alter a local bill.

8.00 p.m.

It is, of course, the right and privilege of this Chamber to waive its privilege. My ruling on what I have cited and discovered in "May's" is that there is a distinct breach of privilege of this House and it is my duty from what I have read expressly from the Eleventh Edition of "May's" to tell this House that such an infringement or breach has been done in this case by the Other Place in amending the Local Government rates. Erskine May lays that down. It is a matter for all members of this House to waive their privilege; it is their concern.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in view of your ruling which, no doubt, we all accept on this question, may I be permitted, in moving the first reading of these Amendments, to ask the House, in addition to agreeing to the Amendments, to waive (A MEMBER: You waive the privilege first.) I should like to ask this House to accept this amendment as a waiver of the privilege of the House. I therefore beg to move that this House waive its privilege in respect of the Amendments of the Other Place to the Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958, inasmuch as the said Amendments (a) further the intention of this Honourable House and (b) rectify an error made by this Honourable House on the passing of the said Bill.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I should like to say that we, on this side of the Chamber, from the very beginning entertained no doubt at all that this Bill was a Money Bill and therefore..... (Hon. D. D. GARNER: Is that necessary?) It is necessary because the Government said that they had been advised by the Crown Law Officer that the Bill was not a Money Bill and we did not concur in that view. We are sustained by Your Honour in your ruling and we extend our appreciation to you for sustaining the rights (Hon. M. E. COX: That is unnecessary.) It is unnecessary in your own opinion, but not in the opinion of other hon. members. We were sustained in our decision to take the stand which we did.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The Hon. Premier made the position quite clear. He said that this advice was given to us by the Crown Law Officer, but it was a matter for His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Premier said that they had been advised by the Crown Law Officer that this was not a Money Bill, but it was a matter for Your Honour to decide. In other words, the hon. member does not know what a Money Bill is. Your Honour is the Speaker of this House, not the legal adviser of the island. However, the point is that Your Honour is not a Crown Law Officer but you have brought to bear on the matter all the processes of your non-legal mind. They could have done the same thing; they are not supposed to accept everything which anybody pushes at them.

The stand which we, on this side, have taken has been reinforced by Your Honour's Ruling. We want to go on record as being in appreciation of the fact that Your Honour was jealous and careful enough of the cherished rights and privileges of this House as not to allow us to violate the rights which have been fought for and won by elected Chambers over a period of three centuries, and to maintain for this Assembly the position of dominance which it has al-

ways enjoyed in matters of finance in its relationship with the Other Place. In waiving our right on this occasion, we are doing so with a full appreciation of the fact that of our own will and accord we have taken this step, knowing full well that we had the power to do otherwise, if we so willed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think that since we have raised this matter we should extend to you our appreciation of the profound care which you gave to this matter. We should also extend our appreciation to the Officers of the House for the research involved in this matter, which research was very careful and sound. I think that all sides of the House will be grateful to Your Honour in this matter. I must also express my appreciation to the members of the Government for the manner in which they have accepted a matter which is a privilege of the House which they should preserve. There was no difference of opinion as to whether our rights should be preserved or not. If the members of the Government would allow more of that spirit to prevail, our meetings in here would be very happy indeed. When these things happen, when we see that anything has gone wrong and we try and rectify it, that is in the interest of all sides. To Your Honour I express our thanks and appreciation in this matter.

8.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am extremely grateful for the expression of appreciation extended to me, and I again assure this House that I will always remember, as long as I am the occupant of this high office, that I am the defender - and, I hope, always to be a vigilant defender - of the rights and privileges of this ancient and most honourable Chamber.

The question that this House waive privilege in respect of the amendments of the Other Place to the Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958 in as much as the said amendments (a) further the intention of this Honourable House and (b) rectify an error made by this Honourable House on the passing of the said Bill, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded in each case by Hon. R. G. MAPP, the amendments were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 28 as the next Order of the Day. It is a small amendment to the Trade Act. It is very simple and has been circulated to members a day or two ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take Order No. 28 as the next Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

TRADE (AMENDMENT NO. 2) ACT, 1961.

Hon. M. E. COX: As the Objects and Reasons point out, Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Trade Act, 1910, so as to permit the charges imposed by the Tariff Book upon ships anchored elsewhere than in the Deep Water Harbour and the Careenage to be levied and raised. It is as simple as that.

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, I am not opposed to this Bill, but I will take this opportunity to say something to the Minister as this has something to do with the Harbour and the Tariff Book. The Minister said earlier today that he had agreed with some of the jobs at the Harbour. I want to draw to the attention of the Minister of Communications that the Minister of Trade is one that agreed with the Union that they should employ people on the tugs, but they are shifting people from one tug to the other and bringing in whomsoever they will. It is stupidity and causing Government to pay out money to displaced workers who could be employed, be-

cause these other people would not be entitled to any money. I would like the Government to inform Mr. Reid to pull these people off the boat early, because he is causing trouble. The Minister has agreed with us that all jobs at the Deep Water Harbour would be given to displaced workers first, but Mr. Reid and somebody at the Harbour Master's Office have employed people we do not know anything about. The Deep Water Harbour is very deep and we do not want any trouble with anybody going overboard; so I would like the Minister to inform Mr. Reid and all concerned that such persons as are being employed on "The Pelican" or "The Lord Combermere" at the Deep Water Harbour must go through the channels already recommended. I forgot to mention that to the Minister earlier today and I hope that he would see that it is rectified.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I did hear that the hon. member had raised this question, I believe, in another capacity, and I made enquiries. I have been informed that with regard to these particular posts, there was the question of being in a hurry at the time and the question of specialist posts which were needed on these tugs. I have found the Port Manager very co-operative. (Mr. WALCOTT: He has to be.) I would not worry to refer to what happened in the past. He knows that this is the second Port Manager we have had, and to be frank, if I do not find him co-operative, I would deal with him. The hon. member knows that I would deal with him as I dealt with the other one. There are some officers whom from their conduct I understand we have to watch, and I am watching them very carefully, because they must understand that they cannot act as in the old colonial days. We are not going to tolerate anything like that.

The hon. member earlier today made reference to this particular gentleman, and I believe he was referring to a Newspaper interview which, I think, was unfortunately worded. I understand the Port Manager has spoken to the hon. member and has told him that he is sorry if the wrong interpretation to what he said came out in the newspaper. What he said was in reply, I understand, to some question-and-answer business. To a question which went something like "Was Mr. Walcott speaking as Mr. Walcott or on behalf of the Union", the Port Manager replied he did not know if he was speaking as Mr. Walcott or on the Union's behalf, or something like that. When the reply came out in the paper, the question did not come out, and I was told that the Port Manager telephoned Mr. Walcott to clear up any misunderstanding. I understand that he has spoken to the hon. member in his capacity as General Secretary of the Union to explain what took place. He is very co-operative so far as the Union is concerned; I am not talking about being co-operative with me because the member knows that the Port Manager either co-operates or clears out; but to all parties concerned he has been very co-operative.

I hope that the hon. member would take these things in the best spirit, because it does not help Barbados if the Port does not start off on the right foot, and we want to preserve the best spirit. During all our discussions I have found the Union's representative very co-operative, and I can only express the hope that that spirit will continue.

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

8.20 p.m.

On 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 in the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to thank the Hon. Minister for the explanation he gave in connection with this matter. It was not raised with any bad feeling towards the officer and there is no bad feeling for him. I think I should make it clear. If you read something in the newspaper, and you read it twice and then the second time a report like that came from the Officer and he was

imputing some personal reference that he did not know if I were speaking as General Secretary or on my own behalf, then I should take some action. I saw the gentleman and spoke to him very plainly because I am one of those people who do not like to bear you any malice. I spoke to him on my way in. Prior to that, I have found the gentleman to be very co-operative and I will say that I have found him to be a person of good feeling. I did not have to go to him. He came to me. I found him quite willing to co-operate.

I can assure the Hon. Minister and the Government that, so far as I am concerned, in my capacity as General Secretary, we intend to co-operate with anybody who wants to co-operate with us. As I have said before, if you do not want to co-operate with us, well then, we cannot co-operate. We have given the Hon. Minister and the Government advice and it was given on the basis of doing the best for Barbados. As long as the Government is willing to treat us as we treat them with respect, they will receive our co-operation.

The question that Clause 1 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BILL, 1961.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume Committee on a Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion Clause 13 was being discussed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, since we have had a little respite on this matter, I have gathered more information and I think the Government should be prepared to give up its attitude as to this Section of the Act.

Constitutional changes have nothing to do with if you are going to lease land. What I think the Government should note is that the greatest amount of land coming to the Government at any one time is that which has come to them by way of constructing the Deep Water Harbour. You have there 92 acres of land. I do not think the Government should embark on a policy of leasing or renting out that land and say that they are not coming to us for approval of the lease even if it is a lease for three years. That land is a new capital asset for Barbados; therefore, do not keep back any information regarding it from us. A lot of people will be bounding for land there. Tell us what is your policy of leasing land at the Deep Water Harbour.

I want to say to the Government that the Workers' Trade Union agreed to the building of the bulk installation plant there and the people in the sugar business are only paying a peppercorn rent for it. All of the other countries which have bulk installation plants, the people in the business had to erect those installation plants themselves. It is true that ours belongs to the nation and that is why I ask that a National Committee be set up to examine these things in order that we may have before us all aspects of these matters.

Sir, I do not feel the Government should start to lease the land at the Deep Water Harbour until a lot of careful thought is put into it. What part of it have you reserved for yourself? Have you given that a thought? It is known that the land-sharks will come to you and want all that land from

you. You do not know what space you want. Take for instance this. You do not know if the workers want motor car space there.

I do not think it is fair for the Hon. Minister to say that you are not coming to the House of Assembly with a lease unless it is a lease for ten years and over. We are not taking away anything from the Executive Committee; the Executive Committee is taking away these things from us. It seems as if you do not have confidence in the Legislature. This is not anything to cause worry in your administration. I say to you: do not be afraid of the Legislature because we are part of the nation and the nation has elected us here. This idea of only coming to us if the lease is for ten years and over is not good enough. What is the position if it is for nine years and 364 days? You will not be obliged to come to us. I have spoken at very great length on this matter before. I have been into it and I know what has been planned in certain quarters and I repeat that I am not in agreement that you should only come to us for authority to lease land if the lease is for ten years and over.

8.30 p.m.

I do not think that the Government has a policy yet as to this idea of the Deep Water Harbour and the leasing of land down there. That is \$25 million of our money. We have to be very careful; everybody wants a freeness over this thing, but you have to pay for what you want. There should not be this idea of a free ride. This idea must be stopped. If you create sites for people then they should pay for them.

The Report says that we should get considerable income from this 92 acres of land. We are in this House of Assembly and I would say that nobody is higher than we are in this Parliament. I do not think that the Executive Committee should take away that right from us. More people are going to come to us now because everybody will be looking for a job and we should stop every avenue of this matter. I am indeed sorry to see that, after a period of four weeks, the Premier has not rescinded his attitude of this period of ten years. I feel that Barbados is too small an island for us to have a public lease which runs for ten years. I understand that you are going to put some departments down there. I want to examine a lot of things which are going to happen. These are not party matters; these are national matters. I think that you should open up this matter and do not have the idea that you are leasing land down there and we do not know anything about it. I feel that a Bill like this should find favour with all this reasonableness. In relation to every lease you want to make, you should come to the House of Assembly in connection with it. Sometimes it is merely a formal matter. With ordinary Reports we are told that the leasing of land is something about which we should know.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I agree to some extent with the hon. member. It is Government's property about which we are talking and every citizen is not as interested in Government land as we are. With regard to the Deep Water Harbour there is no settled policy as yet, but it must be borne in mind that every lease will have to be determined on its own merits. The hon. member ought to know that there cannot be any general policy where the leasing of land is concerned. One person may want to lease land for 20 years, another person may want to lease it for fifteen years and somebody else may want a lease for forty years, and each lease will have to be determined on its own merits. We are not trying to take away anything from the Legislature. I think that it was the Act of 1950 which gave the Government a free hand where the leasing of land is concerned. Section 2 of the 1950 Act says this:-

"The Executive Committee may let any lands which they possess for any term and on such conditions as they may think fit."

We are not seeking at this stage to extend the matter as far as that; we say that the Executive Committee should be given the power to lease land for ten years and in relation to anything over that period, we must come before the Legislature. I still feel that there is the question of trust; does this House consider that they can have faith enough in the Executive Committee to give it the authority to lease land for a period of ten years or do they want on every occasion, whatever the size of the land and for however

short a term the lease is, to bring the matter before the Legislature? I still feel that it is a question of having faith in people. I cannot see any good reason for the hon. senior member for St. Peter still maintaining the stand which he took as regards a short-term lease of land for under ten years, as has been suggested here. The hon. member knows that, in the case of one property in the heart of Bridgetown when another Executive Committee was in power, there was a lease for 42 years. That lease has not yet expired. We would not encourage any lease to that extent. I do not think that we are asking for anything which is unreasonable; we are just as jealous of Government property as other hon. members are.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, we are not taking away the right from the Executive Committee; they are the people who are to determine the lease. What we do say is that when they have determined a lease, at least the Legislature should know about it and it should not be based on any ten years. The hon. member read the Act of 1950, but the present Act is that when you make a lease, the matter comes before us.

8.40 p.m.

Under the present Act if you make a lease it comes to us; it can be a lease for a day as in the case of the Garrison Savannah; but what is important now is that you would be leasing any area, of whatever size it may be, without coming to the Legislature if it is not for a period exceeding ten years. The other Bills with which you are dealing, like the Attorney General's Bill and the Chief Secretary's Bill, are Bills that affect the Constitution, but a lease has nothing to do with the Constitution. The Governor-in-Executive Committee is always going to be a local Act and the Secretary of State does not have to approve if you are going to make a lease for two or three years; that is our business.

Mr. Chairman, by a certain time we will have self-Government, which means that we will run things ourselves. What is the point of going to the Deep Water Harbour and leasing land to anybody for such time as the Government may decide without our being able to approve just as in the case with compulsory acquisition? Everything Government acquires compulsorily is brought to the House; it does not go by the size. If you want to acquire a quarter or half an acre of land compulsorily, you come here; there is nothing facetious about coming here. You do that because you want to know if anybody objects to your acquiring it compulsorily or if it is fair and right. The hon. member must remember that we are passing an Act for all time. We are not suggesting that the members of the Cabinet would do anything improper, but you must bear in mind that some things can be done which may come in for public scrutiny; so when you come here it helps. The Premier may not be there always. We have had instances, not necessarily in Barbados, where people have acted in an irresponsible way.

There is nothing wrong in coming here when you have land to lease, Mr. Chairman, because it would have the full glare of publicity, and every possible angle is going to be safe-guarded. It is a public safe-guard to bring these things to the Legislature. There would be no aspect of collusion, and no idea of somebody using his influence to get a member of the Government to do something. The Cabinet is small in number and the Cabinet is not the Legislature. They can determine if the lease is going to be for three years or ten years and what the rates are going to be, but I cannot see anything wrong in the Legislature approving of the things which the Cabinet does as far as leases are concerned. That is the present law at the moment and there is nothing wrong in continuing that way. The note to the effect that it is an unnecessary restriction on the administration is an insult to us. This is Parliament and I feel that we should reserve the right of approving leases which the Cabinet has prepared. We cannot run the country by the Legislature preparing leases, but I do say that after you have prepared them, you should let us know. You should not work on the basis of ten years, because it may involve \$300 or \$1 1/2 million, and the Legislature in its own wisdom would determine whether it is worthwhile. The leasing of land is much more important than some of the frivolous things of which we approve in this House of Assembly, and I say that, in view of the fact that the Deep Water Harbour is the most recent thing you have acquired, it would appear that this amendment has

come along at this time as a means of preventing the Legislature from approving of leases and things that would take place at the Deep Water Harbour.

I want to tell the Premier, Mr. Chairman, that we have to give very close examination to some of the very land at the Deep Water Harbour. Every industrialist can see that you have 92 acres of land at the Deep Water Harbour and may want something for nothing, and soon and very soon all would be gone and you would have got no money from it. As it stands, I feel that we should approve of the leases and not on the basis of ten years.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I wonder if the hon. member would agree to the Legislature being informed of every lease up to ten years, and above that having the whole thing brought before the Legislature. As far as the Deep Water Harbour is concerned, no businessman who wants to lease a bit of land there would want it for a small term of years, so that could not come to this at all. Anybody erecting a building there would want the longest term possible, possibly 45 or 50 years; so this could not cover the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, on the last occasion when this Bill was undergoing the second reading, I think I made my contribution then; but for fear lest it may be misunderstood that I am here and say nothing, I would like to give full support to the remarks and propositions of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, who in truth and in fact has stated our case. Let me add to what he has said that it does seem very surprising, to say the least, that a vital amendment such as this to the Executive Committee Act is being brought down at this time when the Deep Water Harbour has just been completed and with 92 acres of land or thereabouts as a result of the construction of the Harbour. That means that the Government has a large area of land to lease or sell or deal with in the open market, and it does seem strange that an amendment such as this has been brought down more or less to coincide with the opening of the Harbour, at a time when land has been reclaimed and when the necessary operations and construction will soon be taking place. Everything therefore points to the fact that this is linked up in some way with the land which is being reclaimed at the Harbour.

Dealing generally with the question of leases, I should like to give an idea of the legal aspect. Any lease for under three years can be accepted in the spirit which is evinced in this amendment. In other words, if it is a short lease you can more or less go along with the Government on this matter; but you can have a short lease for three years with an option for another three years ad infinitum which may run into 30 years. It is all right for the Premier to say that if a merchant or any businessman wants a site at the Deep Water Harbour, he will hardly want it for less than 30 or 40 years.
8.50 p.m.

I will only remind the Hon. Premier that in drafting leases it may be possible under the guise of a lease for nine years, that lease can cover a period of nine years and can be renewed for another nine years; it can be drafted in such a way that it can be renewed after every nine years and therefore, that lease can run into a period of 99 years without coming here. That is one of the legal aspects which one has to consider; therefore, what may appear to be a simple lease which may not be sent to the Legislature at all may actually run into a lease for 99 years or for a very long period of years. It is possible to draft a lease in such a way that the option for leasing it for the same period can be renewed, particularly if any businessman has put down any structures there. I am saying that if a Proviso had been included in this provision whereby the power of the Executive Committee would have been limited probably to a certain time, in other words, if a Proviso had been inserted to the effect:— "The Executive Committee may lease any lands vested in them for a fixed term not exceeding ten years or may dispose of any personal property vested in them and may, with the approval of the Legislature, lease for any period exceeding ten years any such lands or may grant, sell or exchange the same; provided the land does not exceed £200 per annum."

You may say that in dealing with small matters, the Executive Committee may not want to come down with such matters but in a case where the lands exceeds £200 per annum, then, you will come here for approval of the lease. If there was such a provision, well then, I think that may satisfy hon. members.

I repeat that it is possible to lease 40 acres of land down there at peppercorn rent for nine years with the option to renew the lease for another nine years and another nine years and on and on in that way until the lease runs into a 50 year period. Those are the pitfalls which one has to consider.

This Clause is not as innocent as it looks. Anyone who has the slightest knowledge of a lease would know that what seems a simple lease can turn out to be a lease for a very long period of years. It can start for a period of nine years with the option of leasing it for a successive period of nine years. I am not saying that this particular Government would do it, but you do not know which Government would do it. It is possible, with this Bill in its present form, that half of the Deep Water Harbour land which is reclaimed can be leased out without the leases being brought down here.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to withdraw my motion as regards the passing of Clause 13.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 13 be deleted.

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

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

Clauses 14 to 18 inclusive were called and renumbered 13 to 17 respectively and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

9.00 p.m.

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

INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume Committee on a Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion when we were in Committee on this Bill, Clause 5 was postponed, Clauses 6 to 8 were passed.

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Clause 5 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 5 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of the Bill in Committee with an amendment.

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

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

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

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

CHIEF SECRETARY (ALLOCATION OF FUNCTIONS) BILL

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 repeal the Chief Secretary's Office Act, 1903, and to make provision for the allocation of the functions of the Chief Secretary and for other matters incidental thereto.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with the abolition of the Office of the Chief Secretary. When this Office is abolished, the work of the Chief Secretary will be divided up amongst other officers. Clause 3 of the Bill is important. It provides that, in order to avoid any doubt, the remuneration and pension rights of the last substantive holder of the office of Chief Secretary will not be prejudicially affected by the abolition of this office before the expiry of his pre-retirement leave. In fact, the last holder of the office has gone on pre-retirement leave and he will soon be resigning if I am not mistaken. In any case, provision is made that his pension rights will not be affected. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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. 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 in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Clause there are to be certain deletions, those deletions being sub-clause (2) and (3). I am therefore asking leave to delete those sub-clauses.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 3 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 3 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is another consequential Bill dealing with the constitutional amendments. In this case it deals with the appointment of the Chief Justice. As set out here, the appointment of the Chief Justice will no longer be subject to the instructions of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, and the appointment of the Chief Justice or acting Chief Justice shall be made by the Governor after consultation with the Premier; and the appointment of a Puisne Judge or acting Puisne Judge shall be made by the Governor acting on the recommendation of the Judicial and Legal Service Commission. This is in consequence of constitutional amendments and follows the same procedure as Jamaica and Trinidad.

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

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

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

On the 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 in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

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

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I just remembered something which would not materially affect this Bill now, but I do know that my Council is anxious that something be done quickly. I do not know if there is any move afoot to have the Supreme Court of Judicature Act amended further, and I would just like to draw to the Hon. Premier's attention that we are eager to have that part amended in which you have to have plaintiffs signed the way they are being signed. Perhaps opportunity should have been taken to have it done at the same time, but it was not taken then, and I thought I should mention it now.

The question that Clause 1 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 2 to 7 inclusive, were 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.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (APPOINTMENT, CONDITIONS OF SERVICE AND DISMISSAL) Act. 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 6 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill relating to the appointment, conditions of service and dismissal of the Attorney General.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is another of the constitutional amendments which deals with the appointment and dismissal of the Attorney General.

The Objects and Reasons point out that the Attorney General will no longer be appointed by Her Majesty's Prin-

cial Secretaries of State, but by the Governor after consultation with the Premier; and in the case of removal of office, that would be done by the Governor on grounds of misbehaviour or inability to discharge the functions of his office.

Further, Sir, as regards his salary, this Bill points out that the salary and terms of this office may not at any time during his continuance in office be reduced and that except by resignation or removal from office as aforesaid his tenure of office shall endure until he shall have attained 60 years of age.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive, were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 4 there is an amendment proposed. In line 6 of Section 4, I am asking leave to delete the words "person qualified for appointment" and insert the words "suitable person", so that it will now read "appoint a suitable person as Attorney General to perform those functions, etc."

I beg to move that Clause 4 as amended stand part.

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

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

9.20 p.m.

Clauses 5, 6, 7 and 8 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL BILL, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the second reading of a Bill relating to the appointment, conditions of service and dismissal of the Auditor General.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 7 is another constitutional amendment Bill. In this case it deals with the appointment, conditions of service and dismissal of the Auditor General.

Clause 3 provides for the appointment of the Auditor General by the Governor by instrument under the Public Seal after consultation with the Premier and the Public Service Commission; and Clause 4 makes similar provision for the making of acting appointments.

Provision is made in clause 5 for the payment of the revenues of the Island of the salary of the Auditor General. This will be determined by the Governor-in-Executive Committee with the approval of the Legislature but cannot be reduced during the continuance in office of the Auditor General.

Clause 6 provides that the Auditor General shall remain in office until he attains the age of sixty years; he may, however, resign his office at any time by writing under his hand addressed to the Governor; clause 7 provides that the Auditor General may be removed from office only for inability to perform the functions thereof or for misbehaviour; it also provides that the Auditor General shall be removed from office only by the Governor by instrument under the Public Seal, if a specially constituted tribunal consisting of not less than three persons who hold or have held the office of a Judge of a court of unlimited jurisdiction or appeal recommend his removal.

The appointment of the persons to constitute the tribunal to enquire into the question of whether or not the Auditor General should be removed from office is left to the Governor acting in his discretion and he may appoint such a tribunal either whenever he thinks the removal of the Auditor General ought to be investigated, or if the Premier or the Chairman of the Public Service Commission represents to him that the question ought to be investigated. However, if the question of the removal of the Auditor General from Office has been referred to a tribunal, the Governor may suspend the Auditor from performing the functions of his office pending the determination of the reference to the tribunal.

Clause 8 preserves the validity of any existing appointment to the office of Auditor General at the date of commencement of the Act.

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive were called separately and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

~~Still there~~ PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION BILL, 1961

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 provide for the establishment of a Public Service Commission, for the functions to be performed by such Commission and for other matters incidental thereto.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 8 is another of the constitutional amendment Bills and in this case, it deals with the Public Service Commission.

The object of this Bill is to repeal the Public Service Commission Act, 1951, and to provide for the constitution of a Public Service Commission with greater powers in place of the Commission which was established by the Public Service Commission Act, 1951.

Clause 4 provides that a member of the Commission shall not, within a period of one year from the date on which he last held or acted in that office, be eligible for appointment to any office power to make appointments to which is vested in the Governor acting on the recommendation of the Commission. Moreover, members of the Commission are prohibited from being or becoming members of the

Executive of any Association of civil servants and from attending meetings of any such association or Executive except with the permission of the Commission.

Clause 5 provides that, subject to eligibility for re-appointment, a member of the Commission shall hold office for a period of three years unless at some earlier date he is removed from office by the Governor, or resigns or becomes disqualified.

Clause 6 empowers the Governor to fill temporary vacancies in the membership of the Commission and clause 7 provides for the payment of remuneration and allowances to members of the Commission. The remuneration and allowances of a member cannot be reduced during his continuance in office.

Those are the most important parts of the Bill.

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

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

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. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 25 inclusive were called and passed.

The two Schedules were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

JUDICIAL AND LEGAL SERVICE COMMISSION SERVICE

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:— To move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Judicial and Legal Service Commission, for the functions to be performed by such Commission and for other matters incidental thereto.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is again a Bill dealing with the Constitutional changes; in this instance, it is a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Judicial and Legal Service Commission. As is set out in the "Objects and Reasons", the Bill seeks to repeal the Judicial and Legal Service Commission Act, 1956, and to provide for the establishment of a Judicial and Legal Service Commission with greater powers and wider functions than those of the Commission established by the Judicial and Legal Service Commission Act, 1956, which we are now about to repeal.
9.40 p.m.

Paragraph 3 deals with the appointment of the Commission which will consist of the Chief Justice as Chairman, the Attorney General, the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, and not more than two other persons — to be appointed by the Governor — who are not members of the General Assembly.

Clause 4 provides for the tenure of office of the two members to be appointed by the Governor; Clause 5 empowers the Governor to grant leave of absence from his duties to any member of the Commission; and Clause 6 empowers the Governor to fill temporary vacancies in the office of an appointed member.

Clause 9 empowers the Governor, after consultation with the Commission to appoint a Secretary and such other officers as may appear necessary.

Paragraph 7 of the Objects and Reasons sets out the appointments that are to be made by the Governor acting on the recommendations of the Commission. Clause 21 provides for the punishment of any person who is convicted of influencing or attempting to influence the Commission.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, 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.

Clauses 1 to 10 inclusive, were called and passed.

Clause 11 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 11 stand part.

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

Mr. TALMA: Before you put the question, Sir, I would just like the Premier to enlighten me if possible as to the true meaning and interpretation of this Clause. It states among other things that a quorum shall consist of the Chairman of the Public Service Commission — or the member of the Public Service Commission nominated to represent him at that meeting — and two other members. In other words, three members, provided one is the Chairman of the Public Service Commission or his nominee and two other members not necessarily the Chief Justice. I will read the Section, Mr. Chairman.

"At any meeting of the Commission a quorum shall be constituted if there are present the Chairman of the Public Service Commission — or the member of the Public Service Commission nominated to represent him at that meeting — and two other members, and if a quorum is present the Commission shall not be disqualified for the transaction of business by reason of any vacancy among its members, and any proceeding of the Commission shall be valid notwithstanding that some person who was not entitled so to do took part therein."

In other words, if a person who is not a member of the Commission took part, it would still be a valid meeting. I do not quite appreciate that. Although the person may be a Judge, if the Commission is wrongly constituted, their findings would definitely be invalid. The Clause says "any proceeding of the Commission shall be valid notwithstanding that some person who was not entitled so to do took part therein." That is not a democratic way of doing things.
9.50 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: With regard to the question asked by the hon. member, first of all, a Commission of this sort which may deal with the appointment, dismissal or discipline of a man, might ask somebody to come in and give expert advice and I am wondering whether this would not refer to the nominee of the Public Service Commission. The Chairman would be the person but for some reason or other he may appoint somebody to sit in for him.

The question that Clause 11 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 12 to 18 inclusive were called separately and passed.

Clause 19 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 19 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: This Clause reads as follows:-

"A person shall not in any legal proceedings be permitted or compelled to produce or disclose any communication, whether written or oral, which has taken place between the Commission or any member of the Commission and the Government or the Governor or any member of the Governor's personal staff, or the Head of a Department of Government, or any communication between any member of the Commission and the Chairman or between the members in exercise of or in connection with the exercise of the functions of the Commission, unless the Governor, after consultation with the Chairman consents in writing to such production or disclosure."

What do I understand by this? Is this a Secret Service Act? What is behind this? I see in all the other Acts where you have to give evidence, you have to come out with it in the open. Is this something dealing with the Official Secrets Act where there is something with which we cannot come out in the open? I just want to know what this is to protect.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: There are certain communications which should not be disclosed and if you look at the end of the Clause, you will see that it says unless with the consent of the Chairman. I think that is the answer.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Premier by reference to his file can say from what this particular section is copied. Undoubtedly, from what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, this Clause is extremely wide and it might well effect a turn of legal proceedings. You say that a person shall not in any legal proceedings be permitted or compelled to produce or disclose any communication whether written or oral which has taken place between the Commission or any member of the Commission and the Government or the Governor or any member of the Governor's personal staff, or the head of a department of Government or any communication between any member of the Commission and the Chairman or between the members in exercise of or in connection with the exercise of the functions of the Commission, unless the Governor, after consultation with the Chairman, consents in writing to such production or disclosure.

It would be interesting to know from where this section is copied; what Act or Acts has it been copied from? One can quite understand within the Official Secrets Acts that there are matters involved in the safety and security of the State and as such they cannot be put before the glare of legal proceedings in public. But in the vast majority of cases as regards this Commission, there would not be matters to effect the security of the State. One wonders why this Section is written in this manner and if there is a precedent to it. I have no doubt that reference to the file would say from which Act or Acts this Section was copied. It would show the precedent which guided the draftsman to the insertion of this Section.
10.00 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I do not see any more information in the file.

The question that Clause 19 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 20 to 25 inclusive were called and passed.

The two Schedules of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is designed to bring the provisions of the Pensions Act, 1947, into line with the latest constitutional changes agreed on by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Government of Barbados. Similar agreements have been entered into by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Governments of Trinidad and Jamaica with respect to persons who are resigning. Sections 3, 6 and 8 of the Principal Act make provision for the making of regulations and the power of approval in relation to certain matters was vested in the Secretary of State for the Colonies. This power has been transferred to the Governor acting in his discretion or on the recommendations of the appropriate Civil Service Commission. That means that the power which the Secretary of State for the Colonies formerly exercised in cases of this sort in relation to retiring officers is now placed in the hands of the Governor acting in his discretion and also in consultation with the appropriate Service Commission.

A pension, gratuity or other allowance to be granted and paid under this Act to an officer will not any longer be computed in accordance with the provisions enforced on the actual date of the Officer's retirement as was provided by Section 3 sub-section (3) of the Principal Act. This provision has been replaced by new provisions which specify the law applicable to the grant and payment of pensions, gratuities or other allowances to officers, or to their widows, children, dependents or personal representatives.

In short, pensions will be granted on the old lines, but some new arrangement has been agreed to by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Governor will be acting in his own discretion or in the discretion of the appropriate Service Commission. It is stated that this provision will not be very likely exercised. Of course, fortunately for us, we have not got many Englishmen serving in our Public Service, but with this new change for the granting of pensions, an officer will have to show that if he remains in the Service he will suffer some hardship. He will not be allowed to resign on some whim or special fancy; he will have to show that he will suffer some loss or some other indiscretion in connection with his retirement. That will also include transfer. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.
10.10 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to this Bill, but I would like to draw to the Premier's attention that on this question of pensions, I feel the time has come when the Government should look at pensions in a completely different light from anything they have done in the past. There is this nibbling when we are dealing with salaries and pensions, and I feel that you should adopt a formula for pensioners, and the formula should be on this basis: when an officer retires from the Government Service, he should be entitled to a pension until he dies on the amount calculated as his pension on that post, and should that post increase by any amount and he is still alive, he should get a pension equivalent to the amount the post has reached. That is to say, if a man retires as Chief Justice, mason, carpenter or boot-black, if the salary is adjusted, his pension as long as he lives should be adjusted on the salary that the post pays.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that a man should suffer because he lives longer than people expect him to live. If he retires and the salary was \$100 a month, he gets a pension on \$100 a month as his last salary; but if the salary goes up to \$200 his pension should automatically be based on the increase in the salary. There is nothing original about that, because it takes place in the United States of America and it is something that should be done here. The Government has a system of giving people 15% or 20%; but if the incumbent of the same office which a man was holding happened to retire a day after, you will find two people who were in the same office drawing two different kinds of pension.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the holder of any office should be entitled to such an increase in his pension, and that the matter should be viewed in a modern light; that is, a man's pension should be based on the salary of the office, and then you would not have to look on pensioners as distinct from other people, and they would never suffer since their pension would be geared to the salary of the post. The pension of any person who retires should be adjusted automatically if there is a salary adjustment, and there would be no grouse because the man working for a salary would be in the same position.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, 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.

Clauses 1 to 10 inclusive, were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in Part II of the Schedule, I would like to make an amendment. In the Amendments to the Regulations, No. 22 (b) (iii), I am asking leave to substitute in line 3 the words "paragraph (a)" for the words "paragraph (a) and (c)."

I beg to move that the Schedule as amended stand part.

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

10.20 p.m.

THE PROMISSORY OATHS BILL, 1961

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 Promissory Oaths Act, 1870.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Order No. 11 is another of the constitutional amendment Bills and in this case, it is a short one in connection with the Promissory Oaths Act. This Bill seeks to amend the Promissory Oaths Act, 1870 so as to delete references to the Executive Council appearing therein and to substitute therefor references to the Privy Council.

The opportunity has also been taken to repeal Section 6 of the principal Act and to re-enact it in a form in keeping with the changes effected by the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956 and the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956.

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

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

The question 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 in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE TRAINING SCHEME BILL, 1961

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 Training Scheme Fund Act, 1953.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to make a number of amendments to the Training Scheme Fund Act, 1953 which have become necessary as a result of the proposed enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of new Service Commissions with Executive powers.

Instead, therefore, of merely obtaining the advice of the Public Service Commission, the Governor, before awarding Scholarships or training courses out of the Fund will now be required to act on the recommendation of the appropriate Service Commission—that is—on the recommendation of the Public Service Commission, the Judicial and Legal Service Commission, the Police Service Commission or the Local Government Service Commission, as the case may be.

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

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

The question 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 in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 were called separately and passed

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that closes Government Business for today.

The Order Paper for the next meeting was fixed.

10.30 p.m.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR THE HON. PREMIER HON.
R. G. MAPP, MR. BRANCKER, HON. L. ST. A.
THORNE, and HON. M. E. COX**

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment, I should like to ask leave of absence for four weeks as from next Tuesday on behalf of the Hon. Premier, the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and myself. I am also asking for two weeks' leave of absence as from the 13th of next month on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Education.

There being no objection, the leave asked for was granted.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 20th June, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon. In making that motion, I would like to thank hon. members for their co-operation in assisting us in getting through with the very important business which has been passed so expeditiously.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 20th June, 1961, at 12 o'clock (Noon) was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

10.40 p.m.