
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th April, 1962.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3.00 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, O.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; His Honour Mr. E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to report that the Minutes of the previous meeting are not yet ready for confirmation; hence they have not been circulated.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 31st December, 1961.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados, and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended on the 30th June, 1961 in respect of schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Also, on behalf of myself, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (Materials for the Manufacture of Pottery) Order, 1962.

The Customs Duties (Esso Bunkering Installation, Machinery and Equipment) (Exemption) Order, 1961.

The Annual Report of the Department of Labour for the year 1959.

Also, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Message No. 3/1962 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding the appointment of the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly.

The Message reads as follows:-

"HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that arrangements have been made for the salary provided for the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly to be paid to Mr. E. D. Mottley, M.C.P. with effect from 10th April, 1962."

PETITIONS

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Petition of the Right Reverend Edward Lewis Evans, Lord Bishop of Barbados and Gordon Vivian Elton Hazelwood, Rector of the parish of St. Michael relative to the sale of a parcel of Glebe land belonging to St. Mary's in the parish of St. Michael to the Trustees of Kensington Cricket Grounds.

The Petition also seeks to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee a portion of land for widening the road in the same area.

The Petition is respectfully worded, and I beg that it be taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to Messrs. Da Costa and Co. Ltd. of a parcel of land situated in the Port Area, Bridgetown, for the purpose of erecting a building thereon to provide facilities for staff and stevedores.

Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited of a parcel of land at the Garrison St. Michael for the purpose of erecting a sub-station thereon.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to amend the Displaced Workers Allowances (Bridgetown Harbour) Act, 1961.

A Bill further to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905.

I beg to give notice also, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 1/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. George on 16th January, 1962, is ready.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 22/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph regarding the provision of an annual grant to the Choir for the Animation of the Sick and Incapacitated, is ready. 3.15 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to authorise the Bishop of Barbados and the Rector of St. Michael to sell to the Trustees of Kensington Cricket Grounds a parcel of land, part of St. Mary's Vicarage, and also to give to the Governor-in-Executive Committee another parcel of land, part of the said St. Mary's Vicarage.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SEALY: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that tenants at Jones Land, Black Rock, have been served by the owners with notices to quit the said tenantry?

2. Will Government take steps to alleviate the distress of the said tenants, either:

(a) by entering into negotiations for the purchase of the said tenantry, or

(b) by providing some alternative site for their houses?

Mr. SEALY: Also, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the roads running through the district known as Free Hill, Black Rock, in the parish of Saint Michael are in a pitiable state of disrepair?

2. Will Government take the necessary action to see the said roads be repaired as soon as possible?

Mr. G. V. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that there is urgent need for the establishment of a Day Nursery in the parish of St. Thomas?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is in the affirmative, will the Minister earnestly consider the siting of such a Nursery at Rock Hall in the said parish where there are Government lands available for such a purpose?

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question to be asked is by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, *re* no water yet turned in at two standposts erected in the district known as Branchbury.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, relative to that question, I may add that the water has been turned in two days ago; therefore, I do not intend to proceed with that question.

Mr. COWARD: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the fact that in the district known as Airy Hill Tenantry, St. Joseph, where fifteen (15) peasant families live, there is no water supply, and that residents there have to journey about 400 yards to Airy Hill main road for water?

2. In view of the above, will Government consider the advisability of laying at least a four inch main, and run water into the area?

3. If the answer is in the negative, will Government say why?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Chairman of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939, I beg to lay the Report of the Committee which met on the 3rd April, 1962. A minority report is also attached to that report.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I see it, that report was submitted by the hon. junior member for Christ Church. That is stated in the text before me.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Displaced Workers Allowances (Bridgetown Harbour) Act, 1961, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill further to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905, was read a first time.

On motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the Bill to authorise the Bishop of the Island of Barbados and the Rector of the parish of St. Michael to sell to the Trustees of Kensington Cricket grounds a parcel of land, part of St. Mary's Vicarage, and also to give to the Governor-in-Executive Committee another parcel of land part of the said St. Mary's Vicarage, was read a first time.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY TO MR. WALCOTT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the day is proceeded with, arising out of the traditions established in this Chamber and of course, arising out of the high regard and the esteem in which the hon. senior member for St. Peter is held by hon. members on both sides of this Chamber, I should like to express on behalf of the House the profound sympathy which hon. members feel with respect to the passing of his sister.

We understand that the deceased was one of those ladies who quite unostentatiously and without fanfare had made her contribution to the progress and welfare of the country; and if the tendered expressions of condolence on behalf of this Chamber would in any way alleviate the sad blow which the hon. senior member for St. Peter may feel on the passing of someone who was so near and dear to him, I think I can assure him that each and every one of us around this Table join with him most sincerely in regretting the death of his sister at a comparatively young age. 3.25 p.m.

We would like, in tendering our expressions of sympathy, to assure him that our sympathies are completely with him in this hour of sadness and sorrow. On behalf of the members of this Chamber I should like to extend to the hon. senior member for St. Peter our heartfelt sympathy in his bereavement. I should like to ask that Your Honour direct that a letter of sympathy be forwarded to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the other members of the bereaved family.

Mr. Speaker, while we are expressing our condolences to the hon. senior member for St. Peter I think that a measure of sympathy is also due to the hon. senior member for the City, now the Leader of the Opposition, on behalf of the loss of his sister-in-law which he has recently sustained. More or less we regard death as something which is inevitable; nevertheless when it comes it does leave in its train a measure of sadness, pain and sorrow over the parting of loved ones. I think it is but meet that those who share common sentiments of appreciation in cases like these should not hesitate to tender in the most emphatic manner these expressions of sympathy. On behalf of this Chamber I should also like to extend to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition our heartfelt condolences over the passing of his sister-in-law. I should also ask that the Clerk be directed

on behalf of this Chamber to forward a letter of sympathy to the bereaved members of his family.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion for the passing of the Resolution of condolence to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and to the hon. senior member for the City. It is always a shock to us when it happens that a relative as close as a sister or a sister-in-law who is almost a member of the household has passed away, and there is very little that you can say to alleviate the sorrow which is brought to the home. I think, Mr. Speaker, that enough has been already said in this connection and it is with sincere regret to us on this side that we have to pass this Resolution today. In both cases the parties who have gone to the Great Beyond have been relatively young and that makes it even more sad when one realises that each of them has not lived the full years. With those remarks, I beg to second the motion for the passing of the Resolution of condolence.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to add my tribute to the remarks which have been made by the hon. members, especially in relation to the grief occasioned the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I regard the hon. member as my colleague and friend. I knew his sister very well and I had much to do with her. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the House that she has made a contribution to the world, and it is unfortunate that in the prime of life she has passed away. I know only too well what that must mean to the hon. member and his family. As has been said, one can never grow accustomed to death and you must feel the shock when death comes. I should like to extend from this side of the Table our sympathy to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and to the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I, too, would like my voice to be heard on this occasion in the expression of sympathy to my colleague in the loss of his sister. I should not like to be too long in speaking because if I were in the position of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the sooner our expressions of sympathy end, the better it would be, because they remind one of the loss sustained. With regard to the now departed sister of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I knew that lady for almost as long as I knew the hon. member himself. I knew her during the days of my boyhood and I can say as much as, if not more about her than, those hon. members who have spoken. She was a simple soul. Like people who come along in these walks of life, that lady made her contribution to the progress of her immediate family circle and she did all she could for those with whom she came into contact.

I am in sympathy also with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition; I also knew his sister-in-law who was also one of my parishioners. Both this lady and the sister of the hon. senior member for St. Peter had their roots in St. Peter. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I have to make use of too many words in expressing my sympathy and feeling on this occasion.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be ungracious of me if I did not say to the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the hon. junior member for St. George and my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Peter, how thankful I am for the kind words of expression which they have spoken in connection with the death of my sister. I would like to say on behalf of the other members of my family how much we appreciate the kind sentiments which have been expressed by those hon. members. I should also like to take this opportunity to join with the others in extending my personal regards and sympathy to the hon. senior member for the City; we both share this common situation and, as the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, both of these deceased persons had their roots in St. Peter. It is a common bond of friendship which has linked us together. In extending my sympathy, that is added in view of the present circumstances, I would like to thank hon. members again on behalf of myself and the members of my family for their expressions of sympathy.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity which few of us like to have, but I really must also on behalf of my family and myself express thanks to the hon. members of this House generally, not only those who merely express their views, because the views of the speakers were expressed on behalf of all. Like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I too take this opportunity of expressing my sympathy to him and the members of his family, because I think I can safely say that outside of our difference in political philosophy and ideology, we have been a very friendly family for years, and therefore we both understand what it is to sustain such a loss.

I therefore thank hon. members very sincerely for expressing those sentiments which they have given us today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like on my own behalf and on behalf of the members of the Staff of the House to support the expressions of sympathy which have been offered to the two hon. members in respect of the bereavements which each of them has sustained, and to say how we join with members of the House in this Resolution of sympathy. It goes without saying that the request of the Hon. Leader of the House will be complied with that letters be forwarded to the relatives of the two deceased.

My added regret in respect of the loss which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has sustained is that I was completely unaware of the death and the funeral until I learned for the first time last night, and I therefore did not attend the funeral ceremony which I would otherwise have made a point of attending.

I will now ask hon. members to rise in their places for two minutes in silence as a token of our sympathy to the relatives of the deceased.

Hon. members rose for two minutes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, relative to the Message sent by His Excellency the Governor today and of my accepting the Leadership of the Opposition, I ask leave and Your Honour's indulgence to make just a few remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has asked for leave to make a brief statement in respect of his acceptance of the office of Leader of the Opposition. If there is no objection to leave being granted to the hon. member, he may proceed.

I take it that as a matter of courtesy the House will be disposed to permit the hon. member to indicate to us his acceptance, briefly.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I quite appreciate Your Honour's hint, and I promise you that I shall be very brief today.

When it was seen that party politics were here to stay in this country, the then Head of the Administration called on the now junior member for Christ Church to become the Leader of the Opposition. After consultation with my Party who felt that I should be the leader of the Opposition, I was recommended, but politely refused.

I am, however, not unmindful today of the responsibility of accepting the office of Leader of the Opposition in this Assembly. I am also conscious of the burden and duties which it must entail. As Peter de Mendelssohn puts it in his book "The Age of Churchill":—

"The duties of an opposition have often been defined, particularly by the Party in power, and each generation defines them anew. It is doubtful if Lord Randolph Churchill's definition ('It is the duty of the Opposition to oppose') was fully valid even in his own time; our own generations could hardly accept it without severe qualifications. An Opposition which followed his maxim, in his manner, would today very speedily bring down the entire edifice of Parliamentary democracy. It is certainly required to goad, drive, criticize, brake, warn, discourage, improve, indeed harass and defeat the Government. But all these legitimate activities are seen as making up the Opposition's share in

the sum total of governmental responsibility. They are felt to be justified to the extent that this share in responsibility is accepted; and this includes instances in which it may well be the duty of an Opposition not to oppose. The nation quite rightly views Parliament as a whole which must function as a whole because its ultimate responsibility is one and indivisible. This leaves a very narrow margin in which an Opposition may, on occasion, permit itself with impunity to obstruct rather than oppose. No one has seen this more clearly and affirmed it more often than Sir Winston Churchill. "The statesman who would effect a revolution in Great Britain", he wrote, "must not only persuade a party, he must convince the nation".

I therefore accept with humble dignity this duty, and hope that for as long as I am here and hold this office, not oppose for the sake of opposing, but at all times to try to persuade the Party in power, and failing this try to convince the country.

I therefore pledge at all times to give support to the Government in power in matters that must benefit the nation, and oppose when I am convinced that it is not in the interest of the country.
3.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I have been brief enough and I hope from whom I have quoted and from whom I shall take as an example, that I shall fill this office with no less dignity than Your Honour did when you held it on the last occasion. I am fully conscious of my limitations by not being a gentleman of the robe, but I am not unmindful of my experience and commonsense, and I am not unmindful of my position in politics in Barbados; and I am more than mindful of the fact that as long as you work for and on behalf of the people, you will always remain in the hearts of those people and by that you will always be a member of this Honourable Chamber. I repeat, while I shall always give you support in matters for the benefit of the public, I shall always offer you opposition in matters which I think are not in the interest of the nation.

RESOLUTION *re* PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SERVICE IN ST. JOHN

Mr. SPEAKER: Private Members' Business. The first Order is to resume debate on a Resolution which was moved by the hon. junior member for St. John *re* the public transportation service in the parish of St. John.

When this House adjourned after the consideration of this Resolution at the previous meeting, the hon. senior member for St. George was addressing the House.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, speaking relative to this Resolution with respect to the public transportation service in the parish of St. John, I wish to say that I am well aware that it is a sore question today in the Island in relation to the travelling public; but although that is so, we yet have to consider every possible aspect of transportation.

I willingly agree that there are certain routes which would be uneconomic to any individual concessionaire to run a daily route, but there are other routes within the parish which should be serviced and serviced properly, but which are lacking in every true sense of the word. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my humble opinion in supporting this Resolution that something should be done and done at the earliest possible opportunity to alleviate the dire sufferings of the travelling public in St. John and the Island as a whole.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that this Resolution has come before the House and more so by the mover, the hon. junior member for St. John. I felt some weeks ago that that hon. member had a rush of blood in his head when he made an extravagant statement about the membership of the Transport Board. I did not believe then that he was speaking with any particular amount of accuracy so far as his facts go because he would never have brought this Resolution, and the reason why I say so is because at that time he criticised the Transport Board, and said that the members of that Board should be imprisoned.

But what has happened today? He is bringing forward a Resolution which when you read it, you will see that it is asking the public authority to see to it that a private source runs its buses better than it is running them now. Sir, I would not expect a young member of this Chamber to have a deep Socialist philosophy or to study what a public service needs within the context of a nation and how public transport service should be operated in relation to what this Resolution says. It reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the public transportation service in the parish of Saint John is irregular and inadequate:

"AND WHEREAS there is urgent need to remedy this situation;

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House request Government to issue directions through the appropriate channels to the private concessionaires plying in the said parish so as to ensure greater efficiency in the Routes under their respective controls."

Now, Sir, the whole examination of this is an examination to bring under public control transportation. The hon. member is only thinking of transportation in the parish of St. John and although he has not said so, it is implied by this Resolution: because the Resolution says: "Be it resolved that the House request Government to issue directions through the appropriate channels to the private concessionaires plying in the said parish."

Now, Sir, the Government cannot have private channels outside of itself to issue directives in these things; the Government cannot have agencies other than in Government agencies. For instance, a Government cannot have a bailiff to levy on people who owe private people money; the Government can only have a bailiff to levy on people who owe the Government money. You cannot have the Government issuing instructions to somebody unless the Government has some control.

I say that because I want to warn the public of Barbados that we are living in an economy in which the Government is one of the big sectors of the economy; therefore, there is no point in members believing that they can escape their responsibility and pass them over to somebody and still think that you have effective control. I say this without in any way supporting or defending any member of any Board; but I say this in the defence of public operations.

This Resolution is the antithesis of what the hon. member said of the Transport Board because he is now saying that a private concessionaire is not giving an adequate service in a small parish and his complaint is that private concessionaires should give better service. That is one of the things which would make these people lose or make money. The reason why private concessionaires are doing well is precisely because they do not put on an adequate service such as what is asked for in the hon. member's Resolution. Who can determine what service is adequate in the parish of St. John? Surely, it is not the hon. junior member for St. John who has brought in this Resolution, but the person who runs the route. The hon. member has people coming to him saying that they do not have enough buses on the route, but the concessionaire can say that we have these buses running at a loss. When the bus service is run by a public body, a Minister can go to that Board and have an investigation into the matter if any complaint has come to him, and ask somebody to do something about it.

3.55 p.m.

As far as I am concerned, I would allow hon. members to express their views on public control, but it does look to me as if this House is becoming very conservative in its philosophy. With due respect to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I congratulate him, and if it is a question of the resurging of the Conservative Party, I wish him all the best. The hon. member is an extremely good friend of mine; as a matter of fact, he is one of my best friends in Parliament, but politically we are East and West. (Mr. MOTTLEY: And North and South). Therefore it does not seem to me as if we

will get any nearer to each other because we are getting older and we are getting further away in our political philosophy.

I was glad when the hon. member introduced this Resolution and spoke on it. That is an indication for hon. members to see that there are few private routes and the hon. member is now criticising the inadequacy of the private routes. There are also some routes run by the Transport Board which are inadequate. You have buses running to Bayfield half full (A MEMBER: Half empty.) or half empty. These are things which should be looked into. I think that the time has come when the Government, instead of requesting that instructions be issued through the proper channels, should set up an enquiry instead of having these broad criticisms made about the Transport in a glib way and sometimes in a slanderous way. When people can make strong slanderous statements, they must be able to go to the length of saying: "I make these statements because I am satisfied that I can produce evidence as to them." I have made some strong statements in this House and I am prepared to call names and bring forward evidence to substantiate what I say, even if I have to go on oath and say what the position is. However, with regard to transport, I am satisfied that this Government is not aware, by any evidence, of the exact situation in the transport service because the Government has not instituted any enquiry into the system in order that it could know the income which could be derived, the operational difficulties and so on. I go further and say that the Government owe it to the public that they should institute an enquiry with such terms of reference that it can be shown if any economy can be effected in the present transport system without losing its efficiency.

From what this Resolution wants this Government to do, that is, that it wants the private concessionaire to improve his service in this parish and without making any excuse for any concessionaire, what I know of the transport service is that the more service and the more efficiency you make in the service, the lower the income is going to be for the service you render, because that in itself does not bring in a higher income. Because you run buses on a route more promptly, that does not bring in more income; it gives the people who live in that route a better service, but it does not provide more money. If you run ten quarterly services it does not mean that you have increased the population; what you have to think of in public transport is how quickly you can take off people at the cheapest cost; you want to cheapen your cost of transport. There are too many statements being made in a general way about transport, but in a specific way you cannot get the information. That is what is important; you cannot do anything about anything at all in a general way, but in a specific way you should be able to pinpoint something.

This Resolution emphasizes that there is a private concessionaire who is not giving proper service; therefore, you want an enquiry into the transport service. The hon. junior member for St. John has brought down this Resolution which says that this private concessionaire in the constituency which he represents is not providing a proper service, but he says that the Government service is not adequate either; the answer to this question, therefore, is that you have a chaotic situation. You give the buses to private people and you have some control; but you cannot control a businessman to the extent that he must run a bus service. Even the attempted control by the last Government created a situation in which the bus owners left the buses and the Government had to take over the bus service when the Government was not prepared to take over that service, because the Government thought that the private concessionaires were bluffing. We say that transport is one of the essential services in any community; do not let us believe that we can run the transport service by any jack-ass carts or by pickups. The days for running the transport service by means of "Fly" buses are over. It is not now a question of going around the lights, you go to Eagle Hall corner and back up and the driver stops to buy fish! It is not now a question of your going to Christ Church and you are taken to the Garrison, and then the driver goes back to Bridgetown because he has heard that somebody is picking up more people; then he goes to Brittons Hill because there are people there and he does not

want to lose these passengers. Those days are over. You must have normalcy in this kind of competition; it is inimical to the economic life of the community to have this cut-throat competition among businessmen and believe that it is a question of the survival of the fittest. Speaking for myself, if you are losing money, that money should be invested in pursuits which would help the community. My personal opinion is that the days for private bus companies providing people with service on single routes or on all routes should come to an end.

4.05 p.m.

It is bound to be unprofitable after a stage because rolling stock is a bit too expensive to keep up efficiency for any long time. Some of the people who make money make it at the expense of certain other things. That does not mean that transport in itself is an unprofitable business, but it means it is too big to be controlled by a single unit. I feel that the Government is in an unfortunate position in that three months after it has been elected to power it has to make a lot of investigations into many important things, and I would say to the Minister that he owes it to this community if he is dissatisfied with the transport system — it should be his business to set up a Committee or a Commission with such terms of reference to carry out an effective investigation.

I heard one hon. member say something and I will challenge him. He is a businessman but he has only succeeded in business today because a lot of people in that business dropped out and went by the wayside. The days for eighty-nine Friendly Societies are over, and the days for the small man in big business are numbered just like the plantation system. For a small plantation with 50 acres to grow canes, you could as well go and grow hollyhocks. What are you going to do? Work yourself until you bleed? I say that as a Trade Unionist because I see what is happening. They cannot pay wages. I have checked with all of them; I have checked the small men in Barbados and I challenge anybody in here who is running transport that he does not pay a single man a straight wage of \$30 a week apart from what he gets as commission, which is \$1,500 per annum for a man to live on. Any man working for \$30 a week in transportation is getting it via commission and not out of a straight salary in which you can say that whether or not the business makes a cent he is going to be paid \$30 a week. I have to deal with them in the Trade Union and I know.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a taxi-driver in Barbados working for \$30 a week out of the employers' pockets. I challenge anybody to say that.

Mr. SEALY: On a point of order, the hon. senior member for St. Peter might be a good Trade Unionist, but when it comes to transport I believe few of us here can be....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I cannot concede to that. The hon. member cannot rise on a point of order to comment on the speech I am making.

Mr. SEALY: What I want to dispute is the hon. member's saying that there is not one garage or taxi-driver in this Island who can work for a straight \$30 a week out of his employer. I would like the hon. member to come and see my books at any time. If he wants to talk about the Trade Union,.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will have an opportunity to make a speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Michael has directed attention to the point which he desired to bring to notice and on which he is entitled to make a speech later on.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not have to look at hon. member's books. I do not know if he understands what I said. I said that not one taxi-driver in Barbados is paid a straight salary by the garage owner; I am not talking about what he makes up or earns. The hotel people get \$70 a week, but the hotels do not pay \$70 a week as a wage; they pay a straight wage and then give a tip. I am not talking about

casual employees. There are men who work in the road in some of these parishes. In St. Philip, the parish which the Hon. Leader of the House represents, there is, I think, a Highways Authority; in St. Peter I think there is a Highways Authority and I think there is also one in St. George. The men working in the road in St. George are building roads for the people of Barbados, and when we drive from Bridgetown through these roads, nobody is going to stop us and tell us that the Local Authority repaired those roads, and I fail to see how there could be any logic in depriving these people of a basic condition of employment that exists in the public service, when out of the Public Treasury we all have to pay taxes for these things.

I would therefore like to see the hon. member introduce not long from now in this same Session a Bill making it possible for all public employees to come under this, and I hope that that would spur employers generally. I know it will be a charge on the Treasury but it would not break it, and I hope that not far from now either by legislation or for social security every person who employs people will be made to pay some contribution towards the subsistence of those people so that when they grow old they do not have to depend on old age pension or something like that, or go at the Almshouses begging. There should rather be a proper system in which we all make our contribution. I hope therefore that the Hon. Leader of the House will accept that principle of having a Bill that would include all public employees. Now that the hon. senior member for St. James has returned, I think he would support me in saying that in the Northern District Council there are people who are casual employees, and a deputation went to see him some time ago requesting certain things from the Local Authorities. Now that we are passing this Casual Employees Pensions Act, as I said earlier, I would like to see in a comprehensive way a Bill like this covering all of the people employed by all the Authorities so that the Authorities would not be in any doubt as to who is eligible. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is a very reasonable request, and I hope that the Government gives it the consideration that it demands.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must say that although the hon. member who has just spoken and I differ at times, there is no difference in our views on this occasion. As a matter of fact, I believe the City Council is at present dealing with his Union, and this was one of the things which on behalf of the City Council I faithfully made a promise I would see carried out, but I do not think it can be done this way. The Casual Employees Act gives the right to persons who have worked for 265 days in the year for a period of ten years to receive a pension, and I agree with him 100% that such employees who work for Local Government along similar lines should have a similar right of receiving that pension. They do not as a matter of fact get all the rights and privileges given to public employees such as Civil Servants and the like, but the Bill does say that anyone who works for 265 days in a year should be entitled to a pension. That is one of the things which I feel should be done immediately. I was told that there must be an amendment to the Local Government Act.

Mr. Speaker, I speak on behalf of the City Council and I believe the Chairman of the Northern District will speak on behalf of that Council. I feel myself that it is absolutely necessary that those people whom we have employed for seventeen and eighteen years every day doing manual work such as scavenging, should be entitled to such a pension. As a matter of fact, I would say that they are the only persons up to now in Local Government who are not pensionable, so to speak. I do not want to pat myself on the chest, but I can remember well when together with Mr. Val Gale, I got introduced in the House of Assembly the idea of making people like washers, cooks and people of the like pensionable. The only people who are not pensionable now are the scavengers who are as important as the Chief Sanitary Inspector or even the Medical Officer of Health, because you are not going to get the Medical Officer of Health going down the street and taking up a dead dog or hog; therefore these people should be given consideration.

I have made it abundantly clear, Sir, that I might not always be there but that no one should suffer as a result of

not having this legislation passed, because we saw to it that we did break the law so that such persons should get a pension even if we had to go via another Act which we could not be caught under to give a pension, but always with the hope that somebody in Government would interfere, thus giving me the opportunity of becoming more popular on a thing like that. Some people always fall into a trap which they do not realise is set for them. I believe the Minister in charge of Local Government should see that the Local Government Act is amended. I repeat that this is one of the things I had promised on behalf of the City Council, and I would urge other members to agree that those persons who have worked for 265 days for a period of ten years like persons who work in the Highways and Transport and other places, should be entitled to draw a pension if they have to retire medically unfit or by virtue of old age. Those are the things in the Act.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, I am glad to have an opportunity to speak on this Bill. I do believe it is high time for such an Act to be amended in order to relieve the poor people who have toiled all day for these many years. There are many people, Sir, who have laboured for 45 and 50 years and are walking up and down today depending on public assistance and old age pension. I think it is high time that this Act should be in force in order to relieve the poor people who have to work so hard. There are people who have worked for sixty years on estates and they are not entitled to a pension, and I am sure that if this Act were amended, they would receive a pension. These are people who have built up the economy of the Island from the time they were born until today, and they have been suffering for these many years. I am thankful that the Most High God has put it in the Premier's mind to bring this amendment into force. 4.45 p.m.

You should think of those people who work on the highways in the Northern District. They are just bowing their heads. Even now, I have people under my jurisdiction, some who have worked for 40 years, some who have worked for 20 years and have not received a pension because this Bill was not in force; therefore, I am sure when this Bill comes into force those people who work in a private capacity would be able to compel their employers to give them a gratuity or a pension. You should think of these people. Some of these people went out to work from the time they were ten years old and some of them are 70 years now and still working in the field. Some are falling down from weak heart, some from starvation or from some other affection of the body, but they cannot stop working because if they do so they would have to beg. I am sure when this Bill comes into force that they will be able to demand some gratuity or pension from their employers.

I am thinking of people who are working in the Northern District area. Those who are working at the Almshouse, when they serve ten years, get a gratuity or a pension but the people who work in the field for 70 years, there is no recompense for them; they are laid off without a cent. It seems to me as if they are under the old Slave Act because after working for all that length of time, they have to go by the wayside and beg their bread.

I am going to support this Bill wholeheartedly so that it would come into operation as soon as possible and relieve these people. It is a good Bill and it should be supported by all hon. members of this Chamber. Some of these people are family of ours or friends and they are suffering. Now that we have an opportunity like this, I hope that hon. members would support this Bill so that it would come into operation as soon as possible and that these poor people would benefit by it or get recompense when they retire.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I was particularly happy, Mr. Speaker, when I heard the hon. senior member for the City speak on this matter because there is quite a number of persons who might even be representatives of this House and yet know absolutely nothing of Local Government. I am very happy in this House knowing that I have him there as an expert on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Whom do you mean by 'him'?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: The hon. senior member for the City, the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, however happy persons would be over this Bill - and I myself am happy over it - if I understand the Hon. Leader of the Opposition correctly, this can only be perfected if the casual employees of the Local Government be also considered. I would say that it would be a headache to every Councillor if this Bill is passed and the time is not short before adequate provision is made in this respect for employees of the Local Government. We are unlike the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who may be better able to straighten his way, probably because of more funds at his disposal in the City Council than we have in the Northern District Council and particularly when there is not that latitude given us. Therefore, I am looking forward, and I have no doubt, because according to the policy of the Government, all and as many as possible must benefit. There should be no mistake about this so that persons would not be deceived or become suspicious when they hear that legislation is being provided in this respect for the benefit of one set and not the other.

Mr. WEEKES: Sir, I must commend the Government for bringing this Bill before the House on behalf of the casual workers. It is my opinion that the Local Government Act should be amended to include employees of the Councils. Employees of the Councils find themselves without the necessary protection; therefore something should be done to help them.

We, who are members of Councils, implore the Government to do something to have the Local Government Act amended so as to help the casual workers of Councils in this respect.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to say anything on this Bill but I would like the Hon. Leader of the House to explain it again because it does not seem to me that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew understands it or it does not seem as if I understand it. I say that because the hon. member has said that a Bill of this sort should have been in existence long ago because the people who work in the field from ten years to 70 years suffer and do not get a pension. What he has said makes me to understand that this Bill is for private employees but I understand it to read public employees.

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew also said that he thanked God for putting it into the head of the Hon. Premier to bring in such a Bill. I would like the hon. introducer of this Bill to explain it again because as I understand it, it is not for private employees.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I said in my previous remarks that I am glad that the Hon. Premier has brought in a Bill like this because I understand and know that there are lots of people who have worked for many years, from the time that they were ten years until they were 70 years and have been turned off from their work without any consideration. If this Bill is passed, it would mean that these employers would be compelled to give their employees a pension or gratuity according to the time which they have worked. (A VOICE: No, that is wrong.) Well then.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot proceed to make another speech. He has made his point.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, as soon as this Bill is passed, no private employee can demand a pension or gratuity as a result of it. All the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has to do now, because his Government can work miracles, is to get them to work miracles faster and compel them to bring in a Bill to do for private employees what this Bill seeks to do for the casual employees of Government.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was here all the time. He heard what was said on the introduction of this Bill; therefore he does not have to go outside of the introductory remarks in order to discover for his own information what the Government seeks to do. He needs not misinterpret what somebody else said in here on it.

Mr. SMITH: I am not misinterpreting anything. The Hon. Minister sat in his seat and listened attentively to his colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. I am speaking because I can see that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew means well and he would do all that lies in his power to help poor people.
4.55 p.m.

He would do all that lies in his power to help the poor people; but surely, I cannot stand here and let him misinterpret the Bill. I cannot allow the hon. member to do that; I am saying that now is the time for him to call on the Premier to bring in a Bill to amend the Local Government Act and do everything which is possible to help everybody as he wants to do. In that case, I would be only too glad to support the hon. member. Surely he cannot make one believe that as soon as this Bill has been passed, he can call on his private employer for a pension too. That is wrong and the Hon. Leader of the House should have told the hon. member that he is straying. (MEMBERS: Question.)

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I should like to say that we enjoy a joke in this Chamber, but in the attempt at being facetious, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has appeared ridiculous.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that I am appearing to be ridiculous.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member risen? A point of order?

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. I object to the hon. member's remarks that I am appearing to be ridiculous.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The position is, Sir, that the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for the City have both proposed that legislation should be enacted to enable Local Government employees, after they have served in the Parochial Service, to be accorded similar treatment on their retirement as Central Government employees are accorded. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is fully aware that this Government would be the last persons who would deprive any public employee of his or her rights on retirement. In actual fact, as to the hon. senior member for the City, he has pointed out that although there is no legislation covering Local Government employees to this extent, these employees do not suffer as a result; but he wants, Mr. Speaker, that the position be regularised for Local Government employees to the same extent as what the Central Government employees enjoy.

The Government does not hesitate to assure both hon. members that all the necessary steps will be taken in order to ensure that every employee of Local Government bodies is entitled as of right to the same rights as those employed by the Central Government. On the general question of social security, which was also raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, you can rest assured that no time is being lost and Government is most actively engaged in collaborating with the United Nations Expert so as to ensure that within the very earliest possible time the people of this country will enjoy some comprehensive system of Social Security.

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. W. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON being in the Chair.

The two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: 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. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are some amendments received from the Other Place to the Bill intituled an Act to exempt the Barbados National Trust from the payment of Stamp Duties, Registration and Recording Fees and Local Government Rates, and I am asking leave to proceed with these amendments at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those amendments have not been circulated, but perhaps the Hon. Leader of the House will explain what is the nature of those amendments.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are only two amendments to the Bill. In the first place, there is the amendment to Clause 2 sub-section (b) in line six where the correct year in connection with the Registration Act should have been 1961 instead of 1903 as appears in the Bill. Therefore, we want to amend the year 1903 to read 1961. Similarly, in Clause 4 sub-section (a), line 4 with reference to the provisions of the same Act, the year 1903 has been changed to the year 1961. Those are the two amendments. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to proceed with these amendments which he has very fully explained. I take it that there is no objection to leave being granted the Hon. Minister to deal with these amendments. As it appears that there is no objection, leave is accordingly granted the Hon. Minister to deal with these amendments. 5.05 p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the amendments were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this marks the end of Government Business for today, and I am going to move that this House do now adjourn.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave to make a Statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Premier is asking leave of the House to make a Statement. Would the hon. member give an intimation of what is the subject matter?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I made a Statement a few weeks ago on the floor of this House about sending a telegram to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Premier is asking leave to make a Statement in connection with a previous Statement which he had made apropos sending a telegram to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Is there any objection? There appears to be none. Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, you will remember that during the course of a debate initiated by the hon. senior member for St. Peter I made a Statement to the effect that I had sent a telegram to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. There was a Bill engaging the attention of the United Kingdom Parliament which included provisions for legislation or powers of the Legislature to be exercised by Orders-in-Council, and I had asked for a re-assurance that these powers would not be used in any way to derogate from the present constitutional position prevailing in the West Indian territories. I also intimated to hon. members that I expected to receive a reply from the Secretary of State in a very short space of time.

Various sections of the Press, because they are wallowing in the ignorance with which such sections are prone to wallow, particularly the Weekly Press and what is popularly described as the gutter Press, have been making all sorts of wild statements about the reply from the Secretary of State. Quite apart from that, in no way importing into the article which I read in one of the Daily Papers the consideration which apply to some sections of the Weekly Press, or any of the strictures which I am making against the irresponsibility of the Weekly Press, it has been brought to the attention of my office, Sir, that on Page 1 of the "Daily News" a proposed Conference in Antigua on Monday is referred to and the headlines go on "To discuss Colonial Secretary's Reply".

Mr. SPEAKER: I would just remind the hon. member of Standing Order 26 (1) which reads as follows:-

"A member shall not read his speech, but may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not arguing; I am making a Statement and the Clerk is quite wrong to direct Your Honour that I am reading from a newspaper in support of an argument, because this is not an argument. An argument has two sides; this is a statement which has only one side.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member not argue now. (Laughter)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I want to make it clear again that when I refer to the irresponsibility of some sections of the Weekly Press, I make no reference to the extract which I want to read from the "Daily News", but I do not want to elevate the reports which appear in the Weekly Press to the standard of journalism by referring to them in this Chamber. In one of the Daily papers it is said that a Conference has been called to discuss the Colonial Secretary's reply to the telegram which I intimated to hon. members that I had sent to the Secretary of State, and it goes on to say that "the purpose of this conference is to discuss the reply from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the cable despatched some weeks ago by Mr. Barrow on behalf of the 'Eight'".

The cable sought clarification of the Order-in-Council making provision for the appointment of a Commissioner on the dissolution of the West Indies Federation."

Now, Sir, what I want to say is this: there is going to be an informal meeting or a semi-formal meeting of the Chief Ministers only of the seven other Caribbean territories and Barbados in Antigua on the 16th April. The purpose of that Conference is not to discuss any reply received from the Secretary of State. I have personally received two replies from the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the contents of these replies have not been disclosed to the Press, to the Cabinet or any other person. I found myself constrained not to disclose them because they were addressed personally to me, and I am asking for a clearance from the Secretary of State before I can disclose the contents of these cables. The other Ministers are unaware of the contents of these replies received from the Secretary of State, but I only want to make it clear that he has replied, but somehow or the other in sending the replies, they were despatched in a personal and confidential manner and not in the way in which they could have been publicised or circulated; so to suggest that this Conference is being called to discuss these replies is totally and absolutely incorrect. 5.15 p.m.

One of the purposes of this informal meeting - it is a meeting rather than a Conference - between the Chief Ministers and myself is to discuss the immigrant service in London because we do not want the immigrants in the United Kingdom to be at a disadvantage.

I just want to make that clear because it may lead to a certain amount of misconception. As soon as I receive a reply, I will disclose it to the House. I say that because hon. members might think that this would be disclosed to the

Chief Ministers on Tuesday but these replies have been disclosed to no other hon. members than myself, and possibly His Excellency the Governor.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 24th April, 1962 at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, just before you put the motion for the adjournment, there are two matters which I would like to discuss with your permission. One concerns a matter which I would say that it is unfortunate that there was no opportunity to discuss it last Tuesday owing to the fact that we had no meeting.

Just a few weeks ago, the captain of the Indian cricket team, Mr. Contractor, was here and he received a serious head injury as a result of which surgery was necessary. I feel that the matter is of such significance owing to the art of surgery which was required that we should say something about it and pay tribute to Mr. A. G. Leacock, the Surgeon Specialist at the General Hospital. I have no doubt whatsoever that the Hon. Minister of Health would want to share our views in respect of this matter. I am thinking of the risks involved and the reputation at stake. I am thinking of the Surgeon Specialist at the General Hospital, Mr. A. G. Leacock performed this operation then, not as a Surgeon-Specialist in his own right - and I am sure hon. members would agree with me - but just as a means of saving the life of the patient, Mr. Contractor. I think, purely out of modesty some tribute should be paid to Mr. Leacock.

With those few remarks I close this matter.

Now, Sir, the other matter which I want to discuss is in connection with the decision of His Excellency the Governor as to who should be the Leader of the Opposition. In my saying this, it is just a matter of expressing myself and I think some comment should be made on it. We accept the decision of His Excellency the Governor and it is now like bowing to the inevitable because in my opinion that was not the decision of the electorate. It was a decision made by the Governor purely on the strength of the two sections which are now in the Opposition. It is unfortunate. We accept the decision without any grumble but I must say that decisions like this are usually taken in the ballot box by the electorate and it is unfortunate we have to accept it this way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is trespassing now. He has now become controversial. The hon. member mentioned the announcement of the Leader of the Opposition and then said that he accepted it. That is as far as he should go on this motion for the adjournment. I even observe that another hon. member has returned to the Chamber since the hon. member has gone further than saying that.

Mr. MILLER: Is that an indication that what I am saying is controversial?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I think that the hon. member has returned in view of what was said further by you.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, we have 240,000 souls in this Island. I think that decision is very contrary to the wishes of the electorate. I am saying that we accept it and there is no controversy over it; however, I think at this stage we should say something. We accept it but in the sense of the word it is more or less bowing to the inevitable. We have to bow to certain things.

I still feel that it is a question of where we live and there must be some good reason as to why dictatorship was brought to a sudden end and democracy still lives to give freedom of living to the people of the world.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member might well give notice of a Resolution in order to discuss the matter as fully as he wants.

Mr. MILLER: But there is nothing controversial in what I am saying.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is speaking on the motion for the adjournment. He has gone as far as and further than he should go in speaking on this matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW rose to speak.

(A VOICE: Sir down, man!)

Mr. MILLER: Who is that saying to me "sit down, man"?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to know why the hon. member was allowed to speak at all. He has a limited right to speak on Statements made by Ministers. He can initiate debate on Statements by giving notice of a Resolution. What the hon. member is doing now has never happened in this House at all.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with what the Hon. Premier has said on this matter at all because I have the right on privilege to speak, unless Your Honour is going to change the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking on a point of privilege?

Mr. MILLER: If you allow me; if it is the only course.

Mr. SPEAKER: But no point of privilege has arisen. Let the hon. member proceed by way of a substantive Resolution of which he would give notice but he is not entitled to proceed any further than what he has proceeded with already. The hon. member knows that too.

Mr. MILLER: In my sublime ignorance, it is my belief that the matter on which I am speaking is in the public interest and because of that I have a right to discuss something in that orbit.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member rose on a motion for the adjournment which was moved and seconded and one is entitled to speak on a motion for the adjournment but not to raise controversial questions. That is my ruling. I know the hon. member would continue to respect my ruling and defer his further comments until he has brought in a substantive motion to deal with what he is speaking on.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I just want to know if I must condition my mind to the Standing Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may condition his mind by refreshing his mind on reading the Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, again with the greatest respect to the Standing Orders, on a point of privilege, as long as the House is in Session, I can speak on a point of privilege unless there is some amendment to the Standing Orders. However, I do not want to infuriate Parliament on what I would regard as a normal thing. It is borne out in the Standing Orders that I can speak on a point of privilege on a matter if I regard it as of public importance whether it is on the motion for the adjournment or otherwise.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to draw your attention to Standing Order No. 15 because what the hon. junior member for St. George is continually saying is that a member can rise on a point of privilege when he decides that something is a matter of public importance. That would be making nonsense of a point of privilege because we would have twenty-four points of privileges in here.
5.25 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: I did not follow the hon. member, but on a point of privilege I can instantly.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. It is the understanding of the House that no hon. member is able to debate a Statement made by a Minister. Your Honour has

ruled that on a motion for adjournment the hon. member may refer briefly to certain points provided that they are non-controversial. The hon. member's remarks have infringed both of these rules and I do not think he should be allowed to continue his remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already pointed that out to the hon. member and the Clerk has had instructions to speak to the hon. member privately as well; therefore, it can be no more than assumption that the hon. member is still out of order, that he cannot continue in this strain on this motion for the adjournment but he may take up the matter properly otherwise.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Since the hon. member cannot interpret correctly what Your Honour is saying, Your Honour's only solution is to put the question for the adjournment. I do not see that there is any other alternative at all.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, may I continue, with your permission?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot continue along those lines. The hon. member must be aware of that. He can appeal to his Party colleagues to remind him of the Rule.

Mr. MILLER: Your Honour did not hear me; Your Honour is anticipating me.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I must draw Your Honour's attention to Rule 68. It reads as follows:-

"1. A motion directly concerning the privileges of the House shall take precedence of all other public business.

2. If during the sitting of the House a matter suddenly arises which appears to involve the privileges of the House and which calls for the immediate intervention of the House,

the proceedings may be interrupted, save during the progress of division, by a motion based on such matter."

Nothing has taken place here today whereby the hon. member has the right to do what he is doing and claim a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hesitated to remind the hon. member of this Standing Order but I will do it now. This Standing Order No. 36 (1) reads as follows:-

"The Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House or of the Committee to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or tedious repetition of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other Members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech."

I appeal to the hon. member not to let me have to invoke that, but invoke it I must if the hon. member continues.

Mr. MILLER: With the greatest respect, it is not a question of controversy or even the Rule which you are applying. I would like to be advised, I should like to say that the Rule to which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has referred, does not apply in the case. Am I correct in believing or assuming that on a point of privilege you can instantly change it to a motion? If, for any reason, I make an appeal to Mr. Speaker on a point of privilege, can that be changed to a motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of privilege has arisen. The question is that this House do now adjourn until this day fortnight, Tuesday, the 24th April, 1962, at 3 o'clock p.m. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. Accordingly, this House now stands adjourned until this day fortnight at 3 o'clock p.m.
5.33 p.m.