
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th April, 1962.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes for the previous meeting of this House are not yet ready; hence, they are not circulated.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. HUSBANDS entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to lay:

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 31st December, 1961.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism, I beg to lay:

Report on the Audit of the Accounts of the Housing Authority for the year ended on the 31st March, 1961.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on my own behalf, I beg to lay the following:-

The Customs (Petroleum Product Bulk Storage) (Amendment) Regulations, 1961.

Report of investigation into the work and living conditions of Barbadian workers on the Farm Labour Programme in the U.S.A.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and appropriate the same for the service

of the year ended the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two.

A Bill to make provision for the imposition of duties on sales of land in areas where the Government undertakes or proposes to undertake substantial expenditure from public funds, to impose betterment charges on development of lands in such areas and to provide for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Mr. LYNCH entered the House and took his seat.

QUESTIONS

Mr. CARMICHAEL: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of any Company carrying on, on Government lands, the business of stone quarriers in the parish of St. James?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government state the terms and conditions under which they operate?

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that there is widespread dissatisfaction amongst some of the employees of the Northern District Council who work in the parish of St. Thomas on Road Construction etc., with regards to the terms of their employment and the prompt payment of their wages?

2. Would the Minister therefore initiate an immediate plan to have all the roads in the parish of St. Thomas turned over to the Department of Highways & Transport for repairs as well as the said employees, with a view to remedying the situation complained of?
3.15 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will the Government see to it that at Sandy Lane in the parish of St. James beach access is provided and well defined in order that the public may easily ascertain such access?

2. Will the Government see to it that consequent upon the proposed development of Heywoods Plantation in the parish of St. Peter an adequate beach access road be provided, marked and well defined?

3. Will Government see to it that the lands known as Cholera Ground in the parish of St. Peter be made available to the public for the beaching of the fishing boats and a beach access road?

Mr. HUSBANDS: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Government aware that supplies of supposedly prepared warm fresh cows' milk offered to pupils of the Primary Schools are irregularly inspected and tested as to their hygienic preparation and chemical content?

2. Is Government aware that on several occasions pupils in these schools have refused to partake of such preparations when offered as a school meal?

3. Does Government realise the necessity of having frequent and regular tests made as to the dietetic value of such milk?

4. If the answers to Nos. 1, 2 and 3 are in the affirmative, will Government see to it that regular and frequent inspections and tests are carried out at the premises where such supplies are prepared and/or at the schools where such meals are served?

Mr. BOXILL entered the House and took his seat.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:—

A Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and appropriate the same for the service of the year ended the thirty-first day of March, one thousand and nine hundred and sixty-two.

A Bill to make provision for the imposition of duties on sales of land in areas where the Government undertakes or proposes to undertake substantial expenditure from public funds, to impose betterment charges on development of lands in such areas and to provide for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. F. L. WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that there was a question submitted by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew — a question which, through inadvertence, was not recorded in my file. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew may put that question now.

Mr. CORBIN: To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:—

Is the Minister aware of the inconvenience and hardships incurred by the peasants who rely on the following roads in St. Andrew for the transportation of their canes?

- (a) Harewoods Road, Hillaby, St. Andrew
- (b) Work Hall Road, Cambridge, St. Andrew and
- (c) King Street, St. Simons, St. Andrew.

If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government try as soon as convenient to cause these roads to be done?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:—

Is the Minister aware of the narrowness of the Lakes-Windy Hill Road in the parish of St. Andrew?

Will Government take steps to improve this road?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is also a Resolution standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip. The hon. member may now give notice of that Resolution.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:—

WHEREAS this Government has deemed it necessary to assist its casual employees by amending the Casual Employees Pensions Act, 1961;

AND WHEREAS a large number of casual employees of Local Government has rendered thirty (30) to forty (40) years service in the now defunct Vestries and the present Councils, and should be entitled to receive similar benefits;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government enact legislation without delay to amend the Local Government Act in order to legalise pensions and gratuities to casual employees in such service.

VOTE OF CONFIDENCE re PASSING OF Mr. B. L. BARROW

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, at this stage, I am asking leave to move a vote of condolence in respect of the unfortunate passing of a former member of this House, Mr. B. L. Barrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to propose a vote of condolence in respect of the passing of a former member of this House, the late Mr. Bernard L. Barrow, who was a member of this Chamber representing the parish of St. John. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Premier to proceed with that vote of condolence now. *(After a pause)*. There is apparently no objection and therefore the hon. and gallant Premier may now proceed with that vote of confidence.
3.25 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the death occurred on Sunday morning last of Mr. Bernard Leslie Barrow of Massiah Street in the parish of St. John, a former member of the House for the same parish which I now have the honour to represent. Mr. Barrow was 88 years of age.

I unfortunately cannot claim the distinction of being closely related, to the best of my knowledge, to the late Mr. Barrow, but I am very happy to be able to share the same name that he so illustriously held during his life time. Mr. Barrow was a member of the House of Assembly for the parish of St. John, and was the junior member from November 1944 until late in 1946. During his term of office in this Chamber, he acted as Chairman of Committees on no less than sixteen occasions, and I might mention at this stage, Sir, that Mr. Barrow entered the House when the House was composed of people who had served for considerable periods of time, and therefore it must be regarded as an indication of the esteem with which Mr. Barrow was held by his colleagues in this Chamber that as so junior a member of the Legislature he was called upon to perform the duties of Chairman of Committees on so many occasions.

I am very fortunate that Mr. Barrow was a constituent of mine. I have never had or entertained any kind of doubt that he always exercised his vote with discretion and against the names of candidates whom he thought most fit and worthy to represent the parish in which he had lived for so many years of his life. Your Honour and other members of this Chamber can speak with greater authority as to Mr. Barrow's parliamentary career. I personally can speak about him as a constituent and as the father, grand-father and father-in-law of many persons in my parish whom I have come to look upon with a great deal of respect; as a man who was enterprising, and as a man who epitomised the true spirit of Barbadians, filling as it were, the gap between the 19th Century and the 20th Century when we in this country were emerging from a state of almost, should I say, indolence to a state of energetic enterprise, and the enlarging of the constitutional rights of the people of this Island and their economic privileges.

Mr. Barrow had, as far as I am informed, two children, seven grand-children and six great grand-children. He made a considerable success of his role as a businessman and as a planter in the parish of St. John. He was a man of extreme industry and consideration for the lot of the poor, and I think that it is those two qualities which inspired Mr. Barrow to come forward and represent the parish of St. John in the General Assembly of this Island, and he was returned even at his age with the confidence of the people of St. John behind him. He served on several Committees of the Vestry of the parish, and my only regret when I looked

around the parish of St. John and saw people of Mr. Barrow's qualities was that more and greater usage of his services were not made in such terms as being designated as a Justice of the Peace and other spheres in which I am sure he would have been able to render very valuable assistance.

Despite the fact that it was regarded at one time that a seat in the Legislature was a fee simple absolute in possession, if I may use a term of law, of certain families in this Island, Mr. Barrow like some other Barbadian pioneers was never afraid to challenge the *status quo*; he was not satisfied to sit down and see things happening to his people without raising a voice of protest on their behalf.

His funeral was attended yesterday by no less than eight present and past members of the Legislature - I believe there were as many as ten - and it is some indication of the impartiality and, I should say, the affable manner in which Mr. Barrow conducted himself inside and outside of Parliament that he was borne into the Church by representatives of all political Parties in this Island.

I do not want to say any more because I am sure there are other hon. members in this Chamber who would like to say something as a tribute to this great St. John statesman, and being a St. John statesman is something which qualifies you to be a statesman in any part of the world, even if I do say so myself. I am sure, Sir, that the members of the House will join with me on behalf of the Government in expressing their condolence and sympathy to the relatives of Mr. Barrow. His wife predeceased him some years ago, but I am sure you will direct that the expression of sympathy be sent to his relatives to indicate the sympathy which all members on all sides of the House hold and share on his unfortunate passing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is not only fitting, because I am a member of this Chamber and because the late Bernard Leslie Barrow was also a member of this Chamber that I should join with the Government in paying tribute and expressing condolence in this Chamber to the family and relatives of the late Mr. Barrow, but it is because I can well remember knowing Mr. Barrow when I was but a tot, a very small boy, I can remember Mr. Barrow in those days as a very hard-working man; but what struck me most about B. L. Barrow was that when I had to leave this country to enter the United States, if you ever met anyone from St. John, you could always find him asking you whether you knew B. L. Barrow.
3.35 p.m.

Long before I came into politics, the character of the late Mr. B. L. Barrow was brought forcibly to my mind. As I have said, I was not at that time interested in politics, but I distinctly remember an article which was written in a newspaper of this country which was then edited by the now Prime Minister of the West Indies - or the Ex-Prime Minister of the West Indies, I may say at this stage - when Mr. B. L. Barrow had the courage to offer himself as a candidate for this House of Assembly in which it was stated by the Ex-Prime Minister, Sir Grantley Adams, that the House of Assembly was no place for people who sell salt fish and pork; let Barrow go back and sell salt fish and pork. I considered Mr. Barrow a man without malice and hatred because I used to come in here, sit down and watch him. He did not bear any malice or hatred towards anyone, but he tried to do something for those whom he represented. There are men like the late Mr. B. L. Barrow, Mr. Jack Vaughn, Mr. Miller-Austin, Mr. L. E. Brathwaite and such men who offered their services to this country when it was considered sacrilege to offer yourself for service in the Local Government or the Central Government.

I therefore say that we in this House have a shining example set for us by the late Mr. B. L. Barrow who had the courage to offer himself as a member of this House. I remember most vividly when I was considered a young upstart that I wended my way to St. John and offered myself as a candidate for the parish of St. John, and Mr. B. L. Barrow on the platform in front of the hierarchy said: "Had I not given my word out already?" - and to use a com-

mon parlance - "for your guts" I would offer you my support because everybody seems to be afraid of offending the hierarchy of St. John." That is what he said in respect of my coming forward for that parish.

Mr. Speaker, the Island of Barbados and particularly the parish of St. John is poorer by his passing. I would say that there are men who did not have the opportunity of having a college and university education, but who have contributed to this country more so than Barbados Scholars have ever contributed. The late Mr. B. L. Barrow has so contributed by his shining example, by his own industry, courage and outspokenness in matters political and the way he felt about anything.

Sir, the late Mr. B. L. Barrow was also a churchman of no mean standing. We became personal friends and we always discussed political matters. Whatever may be his political philosophy, his outlook in life could be summed up in this way: "Let me try to raise people up." As a member of the St. John's Vestry for many years, he made a tremendous contribution and paved the way for many of us to sit down in Vestries of this country. Because of that, we in this country are poorer by his passing.

The late Mr. B. L. Barrow reached the ripe age of 88 years and, as some of us may say, or have said, he was living on borrowed time. I regret that I could not have attended his funeral, but on behalf of hon. members on this side of the Chamber, I am saying that we wish to convey to his relatives our sincere condolences and we know that although he reached the ripe age of 88 years, his chair in that house and his counsel in that family will still be missed. We feel that the passing of Mr. Bernard L. Barrow is something which this Chamber, this Island and people abroad who knew of him should mourn. Let it not be said that he had an easy time as a Vestryman for St. John. Even his temerity to come forward for this House at the time when he did showed the courage of the man because when he offered himself he found those whom he thought would support him saying to him: "Go back and sell salt fish". However, God had it so ordained that he was able to come in here on his own and to show to the Island of Barbados that whether you sell rice, flour, biscuits, salt fish or pork, so long as your heart was in the right place, you would do what is right for the people. Let it not be misunderstood that it is the people who make kings and destroy them. And we have lived to see that it is the people who make you a king and who destroy you.

Sir, I have much pleasure in associating myself with this Resolution of Sympathy to the family and relatives of the late Mr. B. L. Barrow on his passing.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks made by the Hon. Premier and the hon. senior member for the City on the passing of the late Mr. B. L. Barrow. The hon. senior member for the City referred to the remarks or a phrase by the Prime Minister of the West Indies in respect of the late Mr. B. L. Barrow being a man selling fish and pork. I say that everybody cannot sell fish and pork and make a success of it. The late Mr. B. L. Barrow had something in him which no headmaster, or no principal of any College could put into a child or human being and, that is, sound commonsense. That spoke well for him and it gave him the courage to come forward and represent the people of St. John more from a Local Government element than from the Central Government element.

The late Mr. B. L. Barrow was a man who would not embarrass himself in his political career for a good name as some people do. What he thought was right he would support, and what he thought was wrong he would not support. That is the courage which we want every politician of today to be endowed with. Do not do anything to please others and displease yourself. The late Mr. B. L. Barrow was one of those men who never tried to kill his conscience. He did not have many friends in many circles, but he had more friends in other circles. He was a plain speaking man and where a dollar was to be spent, he would see to it that it was spent wisely, and when it came to the dollar which was being spent belonging to the taxpayers, he would see to it that it

was well spent and more wisely spent than even if it was his own dollar.

The late Mr. B. L. Barrow represented the taxpayers of St. John faithfully and well in the old Local Government and, added to that, he came forward as a member of this House for that parish and he represented them. All that speaks well for him and he leaves behind an example which most politicians should follow.

I will end by saying: "May he rest in peace".
3.45 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I must associate myself with the remarks which have been made by various speakers especially the Premier, concerning the late Mr. B. L. Barrow who was one of the representatives in this House for the parish of St. John for many years. I myself am from the parish of St. Andrew and on behalf of my people I would have to pay tribute to the late Mr. Barrow. Although he was in St. John, his name was heard all through St. Andrew and, I believe, throughout the length and breadth of Barbados; that is when you have faith and courage. I remember meeting Mr. Barrow last year and he told me this: "My desire is for the good of the people of St. John and those throughout the island of Barbados." He also said that he would contribute his goodness to anyone who was willing to receive it. As far as he talked with me, I could see that he has fought with the beasts at Ephesus and with the principalities and powers in order to get where he was; I admire the faith and courage which he possessed. I congratulate him as I think of the respectable age to which he has lived, the age of 88 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard of the criticisms made by the various powers when Mr. Barrow was coming forward for membership of this House; but when it comes to these things, the Most High God looks at the desires of man and He gives to every man according to the fruit of his doings. The Most High God has said that those who obey him can go up to 70 years and as to those who are faithful in the land and who have gone to save people, He will prolong their days. Surely the Most High God has prolonged Mr. Barrow's days. Mr. Barrow has not died a poor man; he has built up himself and has left wealth for his relatives and children. That is a man who had faith, courage, ability and dignity. I congratulate him and I hope that the Most High God will cause his soul to rest in peace.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, although I rise with a tinge of sadness at the death of Mr. B. L. Barrow, I am very pleased to hear the kind remarks which have been made here today about the late gentleman. I knew him for the past 32 years and I must say that I have learnt quite a lot from him as a business man. He was a very straightforward businessman who could not be bought in any way at all. He has worked faithfully and honestly for the people of St. John; he not only served the people of St. John but he has always tried to help the people of this Island as a whole. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my sympathy to the members of his bereaved family.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to associate myself with all the remarks which have been made by the various speakers and the tributes which have been paid to the memory of the late Mr. B. L. Barrow with whom I have had the privilege and pleasure of being associated as a member of this House and whom I have had the privilege of addressing on many occasions when he was Chairman of Committees. I join with all hon. members in associating myself with the tributes which have been paid and I now ask hon. members to join with me in standing for two minutes as a mark of respect to the memory of the late Mr. Bernard L. Barrow.

Hon. members stood in their places for two minutes as requested by His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk will be directed, of course, to send a letter of condolence to the nearest relatives of the late Mr. Barrow.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re PUBLIC TRANSPORT

SERVICE IN St. JOHN

Mr. SPEAKER: We are now in the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business. On the last occasion we were debating a Resolution in connection with the public transportation service in the parish of St. John. That Resolution stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John and when the time for Private Members' Business expired on the last occasion, the hon. senior member for the City, the Hon. Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition in this Chamber was addressing the Chair. The hon. member may continue his speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution which the hon. member has brought forward, 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."

When I started to speak on the last occasion, I merely had the opportunity of a few seconds in which to say a few words. I did not say very much. The hon. senior member for St. Peter had his say on this matter. He is a Trade Unionist and it is well known where we differ and where we are friendly on this question of nationalisation. We do differ on nationalisation as such, not on everything that can be nationalised; but we say that we differ on this matter. If we differ on nationalisation and the people decide that you are to be in power, you can do what you want to do. It is then a matter for the Opposition to say that if you are nationalising anything, then it must be done in a proper manner. If we find that people in private enterprise have been able to do certain things much better than the Government can do them, well, there are certain essential services such as public utilities and I will say here that I know that the hon. member, if he could reply at this stage, would talk about the water service and so on. If the hon. member were here when we were dealing with the passing of the Public Utilities Bill, or if he were to look up the records, he will find that I led off the debate then and I suggested that transport should be put under the heading of public utilities.
3.55 p.m.

I remember then the now hon. junior member for St. George made the suggestion that you should include Rediffusion, but it was pointed out then that Rediffusion was not an essential service such as transport. I would agree with any Socialist that public transport is a necessity and a public utility, but at the time the last Government did not see fit, even up to when they went out of power, to regard transport as one of the items of public utility. Public utility means any person or company (including the lessee, trustee, receiver, or liquidator of such person or company) who owns or operates equipment or facility for the production, generation, storage, transmission, sale, delivery, furnishing or supplying directly or indirectly to or for the public, of electricity or gas. Here is where I do not agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Public transport is a public utility and as such there should be an Authority to direct it, whether it is run by private concessionaires or by Government. There should be a Public Utility Board to show how you should run, the fares you should pay and the price you should pay for this public utility service.

Mr. Speaker, I agree at the outset with the hon. senior member for St. Peter on the question of a public utility service, but I will show later why this should not be run by a Government. When I point out these things, I would like the Government to investigate. I repeat I should like to see

transport directed by a Public Utility Board and private concessionaires, but that does not mean that I am suggesting that private concessionaires should have an opportunity to overwork people or not pay the wages claimed. I am as strong a Trade Unionist as anybody, because I lived in America and know what it means. Those who have to go to work and use their hands or, maybe, do a porter's job must know what it is to be a Trade Unionist, and I do not think for a minute that anybody in this Chamber would say that because I say it should be run by private concessionaires, I am agreeing that private concessionaires should be able to do what they like. I believe the buses should be given to private concessionaires, and then the Public Utility Board should be able to direct and regulate the service.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member is referring to me, but I only want to direct Your Honour's attention to the fact that the Resolution is a private concessionaire's Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I was only giving that hon. member similar latitude to what I gave the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he spoke earlier in the debate - similar but no more latitude.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope I have no more latitude, but just as I was going to make my point, the hon. member anticipated me. This route is being serviced by a private concessionaire, but I am going to make this clear and plain here this evening: what else could any private concessionaire do who was being held up to ransom by a Government? Since 1954 the last Government would not sign the contract. The member was expected to invest \$150,000, but he was held up to ransom because they could walk in any morning and the man who was running the concession about which the hon. member speaks would lose it. What would you expect him to do? How could he go to the Bank and get backing? What authority would he have? What did the last Government say to him? They said he was entitled to run this concession for six, seven or ten years, and he can run it as long as he is going to be a yard fowl - to use the hon. member's expression - for the Government; or in some cases as long as some members of the Government could have..... I do not want to say what I have been hearing. It is alleged that so long as they could get shares or drawbacks, one could continue to run the buses. But what I want to say is this: the present Government should either take over all the buses or give them out on concession for three or five years as the case may be; the point I am making and what the hon. senior member for St. John should know is that the concessionaire who runs this route can be told by the Government tomorrow morning that he has no more concession.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. junior member for St. John when he asks that Government issue directions through the appropriate channels to see that his constituents get a proper service; but how can his constituents get a proper service when the Government itself is not running it? I have no quarrel because the people in this country wanted the last Government is power, and they decided to nationalise. I will go a little further, and I am not asking for any latitude, but I want to make some shocking statements in this House, and I hope this Government will look very carefully into them. The Government has appointed a new Board to the Transport Board, and it is going to shock members of this House that since these new members have called for statements, it has been discovered that the last Government owed nearly \$700 to the Transport Board and the Board cannot find whom to sue. I challenge any member to contradict me now. In one case money is owed by the Barbados Labour Party and in another case by the Labour Party; so I draw this now to the Premier's attention.

I have sat here in this House with people who were immoral, unjust and dishonest in Local Government and who did everything, and had it not been for the broom and the upset in this country coming along, nobody would ever have known these things. I do not want to make reckless statements about members' characters, but nobody would have known that the Labour Party owed the Transport Board nearly \$700 for using buses for election, and the

solicitors cannot find whom to sue for the money. I put that to the Government of this country, and it is for the Government to go into this matter and make me out an impostor or a person making reckless misstatements or say I am not telling the truth. The Minister of Communications, Works and Housing is not here and I hope the Minister who is holding the portfolio for him will make a note of it.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more to say, and it is going to be very difficult. How could the hon. senior member for St. Peter expect any Government to run the transport service along those lines? Nearly \$14,000 is owed by the Transport Board to the son of an ex-member of this House, and I want the public to know that if the present Board calls for every voucher it will be found that a number of things which they have been buying from this firm at two or three times the value could have been bought by any private concessionaire at a cheaper price from any garage. 4.05 p.m.

I repeat that for your information, I am sorry the hon. senior member for St. George is not here but I challenge either one of them to say.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. George is here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I mean the hon. junior member for St. George. The Board was called on to resign and that member said that he would have to consult his son before he stood down. I have challenged them very many times. They have been making all these reckless statements about my actions in Local Government that I felt that they would have called a Commission of Enquiry so as to see if they could send me behind bars. I am saying that this Government should insist on having an enquiry into the Transport Board and call for every voucher. Let them do that and ask why when you could pay \$6.00 for something, you paid \$20. Is it any wonder when they paid \$20,000 to the Garrison Gasolene Station? Ask them if the Garrison Gasolene Station sells spare parts. You should go and buy spare parts where you can get them at the cheapest rate. I would like to know who directed the business. Write this down. Only yesterday they discovered that in the case of a bus which was chartered out, there was no record to show for it. Surely, you could not have either of the buses belonging to the senior member for St. Joseph on charter without his knowing about it. Buses of the Transport Board were chartered out and there is no record to show that they were chartered out. What is more, members of the Government - some of them - knew about it. (A VOICE: Which Government?) The last Government. They were well connected with it. Buses were chartered out on several occasions and no such entry was put in the records. I want them to challenge me on this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course, we agree that you should not put in the Estimates any money for this Board. I went to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and discussed this question with him. I ask him: how can you agree to pay an inspector more money than you pay to the man who is driving a bus? I watched a driver of a bus with sixty odd people in it. It is a hard job to drive such a bus. I therefore asked the hon. senior member for St. Peter: how is it that an inspector is worth more than a driver.

I am not accusing anybody of dishonesty. I do not know who the person is, but what I discovered was that one person who is the wife of the senior Director of the Transport Board gave out the tickets. It was also discovered that one bus runs up to nine o'clock without any tickets being issued.

I hope the Ministers of this Government would not attempt to interfere with the running of the Board but I am not making any fun about this. You had the position where the wife of a director was giving out tickets and a bus running until nine o'clock without any tickets being issued. The position with private concessionaires is that they go to sleep at one o'clock on nights and wake up at half-past four on mornings. I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that you should fight for the best wages for the workers. I agree that he should not let a concessionaire in St. John get away with it. What I cannot agree to is that you should sit

down and know all of these malpractices are going on and do nothing about it. Let me say that the first thing which the new members of the Transport Board have done is to ask for a statement of the liabilities and assets. Do you want me to tell you something more? An amount of \$7,000 in tyres was bought from Messrs. DaCosta and Company Limited. All tyres have serial numbers. Sir, I would like you to pick me and put me on the Board just for once. I would show Mr. Ronald Mapp who has been abusing me in the Press who I am.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. By the farthest stretch of the imagination, you cannot say that what the hon. member is saying has anything to do with the Resolution before us. I do not have any brothers; I had one sister and she is dead. However, I cannot see how this Resolution worded as it is can relate to the hon. member's argument on the Transport Board. It would have been all right if we were dealing with a Resolution on the Transport Board. (A VOICE: You spoke for a long time defending the Transport Board.) The Hon. Mover of the Resolution made a criticism of the Transport Board and his Resolution is one which is criticising the service given by a private concessionaire; therefore, I asked him how he is going to reconcile the two statements. That is what I said. I did not make the Transport Board my main argument. I would like to have a debate on the Transport Board at any time, but I do not see how you can debate the Transport Board under a Resolution which is ostensibly on the operation of a service in St. John.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my preamble is rather long.

Mr. SPEAKER: Some hon. members lack the gift of conciseness.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am one of those. The hon. senior member for St. Peter accused me of criticising the Transport Board.

Mr. WALCOTT: Oh no. I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. senior member for the City has said that I accuse him of criticising the Transport Board. I said that this Resolution before us is not a Resolution dealing with the Transport Board; it is dealing with the bus service in St. John.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, you will recall that the hon. member made about half an hour's reference to the Transport Board in his speech in order to show that the Transport Board was doing a better job than private concessionaires and, therefore, he would not be criticising the Transport Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am beginning to feel that I allowed the hon. senior member for St. Peter too much latitude on the last occasion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I shall not take as long as he.

Mr. SPEAKER: I allowed him the maximum.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I have said today was brought to my notice and it is my duty to draw it to the notice of the Government. Quite recently taxpayers' money have been invested making a comparison between private concessionaires and the question of nationalisation or Government running transport with a tremendous sum like that. Then, when they are buying tyres for the transport buses like that, I say that that is something which the Government should have an investigation into.
4.15 p.m.

I ask the Government to have an investigation as to how long these tyres last and on what buses they are put. I think that the hon. junior member for St. John is absolutely right to ask that a private concessionaire who is plying buses in St. John should ply them efficiently. I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. Peter will agree with me; in fact he cannot deny this; you either run all the services or none of them. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is the con-

cessionaire for a part of St. John, and Mr. Simpson and Mr. Lucas are the concessionaires for the other parts of St. John. The hon. mover of the Resolution is all right in his criticism from the point of view of satisfying his constituents that he is seeing to it that the children are provided with the opportunity of getting to school and that the people know that they will get from and to their homes. One of these buses costs about 20,000 to \$25,000. A man must have ten of these buses and therefore he has to spend a \$1/4 million. He has not got to show what property he has at the Bank; the rolling stock would be sufficient; but he wants an agreement that his particular company should be the company to operate here for the next five years. Any Manager of any Bank would decide on a depreciation of 20%; a man will show his books and the Bank will back him up for buses to the extent of a \$1/4 million. If I were in St. John, when I see buses leaving the children, I would want to know what stupidity it is - I was not brought in here in any box cart and I will criticise anybody - to impose a fine of \$25 on a conductress who was trying to get children to school and impose a fine of \$10 on somebody who was racing away on the roads. I will criticise the Judiciary, the Judge or anybody at all; that is why I am in here.

I say that the hon. junior member for St. John should discuss this matter with his Government. There are people who are willing to run an efficient service; but can you do this if you know that if you did not satisfy Mr. Cox or Mr. Mapp or allow so much for an Election Campaign, you would not be allowed to continue the service? While I do agree with you as a criticism of the Private concessionaire, if you cannot run this route, at least you should give to the Company or the people some guarantee that they have it for three, four or five years. Mind you, I shall never be converted to nationalisation as such, but I shall not be opposed to some things being nationalised. I shall be opposed to all things being nationalised. The Labour Party in England found out this mistake about this question of general nationalisation; it is not the policy which will put you back in power. I believe that the Public Utilities Act should be so amended as to bring transport under the Act. I say that if electricity or gas is a necessity then I maintain that transport is a public utility. All of us are not blessed with the wherewithal to have motor cars, but all of us must move about somehow; and if the majority of people are benefiting by something then it must be a public utility. I maintain that the Public Utilities Act should be amended. Only a fool would have thought that if Rediffusion is a necessity, electricity is not a necessity. I remember that one day in New York the whole electricity system went off when an operation was going on, when knives were being used. I say that transport is a necessity and an independent body would be the best authority to fix the fares. Everybody knows the famous phrase of the Prime Minister of the West Indies that bus fares will be raised only over his dead body. Well, his body is not yet dead and bus fares have been increased. If a Public Utilities Board is appointed, they would be able to go into matters and say that not only must you run services on the straight routes, but you must also run them to the nearest point where you can drop people; you must run transport where the people must benefit from that transport most.

It is our considered opinion on this side of the House that this Government should make right the wrongs and the ills committed by the last Government, and they can do that very easily. You have about ten or twelve concessionaires around here and you have businessmen in your Government. Ask them if they would borrow money or mortgage their land and buy a bus for \$25,000 or \$30,000 not knowing whether you would take it away from them and give it to somebody else who is one of your yard fowls. I do not think that any sensible person would do that. I say that it is about time that this Government make right the wrongs and the ills which have been perpetrated by the last Government.
4.25 p.m.

I counsel Government that there should be an amendment to the Public Utility Act to include transport services, whether or not the Government runs them itself. This country is overburdened with a lot of stupidity; so do not follow the example of the last Government. You have a Pub-

lic Utility Board and public transport is a public utility. It is stupid to take money out of people's pockets and throw it away. If they can satisfy you that busfares are not paying, I think that all of you are too young to say that something would be increased over your dead bodies. It is said that the greatest gift of a politician is a short memory, but some people think that the greatest gift of an electorate is a short memory. Nobody has died, but bus fares have increased.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the hon. member for moving the Resolution, and I have made those remarks because I have sat and borne a lot of scandal and slanderous remarks which people did not have the courage to say in certain places, but used the little dirty, yellow rag "The Beacon" for writing slander and scandalizing people in this country whose shoe laces they could never even stoop to untie; but we took it, and little did they know that behind these doors when the Government was changed we would find out that they were using the people's money when I see that the Manager of the Transport Board allowed them to owe \$700. I see the hon. junior member for St. Joseph look at me, but I have never made a statement in this House yet that I could not prove. I have never tried to make a statement against any person because of colour; it makes no difference to me. I want to say also that sooner or later the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Trade Unionist, will hear something else is going on. I throw this out as a warning. They were using this Board and the buses to run their campaign and little did they know that we would find out that members were running their own garages; little did they know that we would find out that people were hiring buses out, having them on charter and not entering them on the books.

Mr. SPEAKER: Was this taking place in the parish of Saint John?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Not with the private concessionaires, but I am making the comparison which the hon. senior member for St. Peter did make. It is now the end of Private Members' Business, and I think I should sit.

Mr. SPEAKER: Private Members' time has now elapsed it being after 4.30 p.m. of the clock, and we turn to Government Business for today.

HOUSE COMMENCES GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism, the hon. junior member for St. Michael, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to Messrs. DaCosta and Company Limited 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.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with these two Resolutions which stand in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the moment I am concerned only with one, but I am grateful for the intimation. The hon. member will be asking for similar leave in respect of Order No. 2.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries is asking leave to take Resolutions Nos. 1 and 2 which stand in the name of his Ministerial colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Michael. If there is no objection to leave being granted, and I hear none, leave is granted.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND TO MESSRS. DaCOSTA AND CO. LTD.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks, as the Addendum sets out, in accordance with the provisions of the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951, the approval of the Legislature of the lease of a parcel of land in the Port Area, Bridgetown, to Messrs. DaCosta and Co. Ltd. for the purpose of erecting a building to provide facilities and services for staff and stevedores.

It is proposed to lease approximately 1,300 square feet of land at the rate of two cents per square foot per month, to be paid annually in advance. The period of the lease is to be 10 years with option of renewal for a further 10 years. A condition of the lease to be, that Government be given the option of acquiring the building at the appraised value on termination of the lease either by non-renewal after 10 years or at the expiry of 20 year period if another lease is not then arranged. The other terms for the lease are to be the normal ones for such undertakings.

Mr. Speaker, the regular terms of such a lease have been agreed on, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not in any way opposed to this Resolution, but I am not quite sure as to the wording, and maybe the Hon. Minister in charge would put me right. The Addendum says that this Resolution seeks in accordance with the provisions of the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951, the approval of the Legislature of a lease of a parcel of land to Messrs. Da Costa & Co. Ltd., for the purpose of erecting a building to provide facilities and services for staff and stevedores.

Firstly, Sir, I thought that Port Contractors Ltd. was the responsible authority down there, and secondly, I know that Da Costa & Co. Ltd. is a very big firm which employs people in all walks of life. This is not clear and the Minister should be in a position to explain. Why is it that Da Costa's want this and not the Port Contractors, and what staff is this for? Is it for the staff there or the stevedores? Is it a mis-print? The Minister should be able to tell us that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister if he can give any information or, maybe, draw it to the attention of the substantive Minister. I have no objection to this 1,300 square feet of land being leased, because I understand there are even more acres of land there than was anticipated. What I object to as a matter of principle is that you must put your house in order. Charity begins at home. I object to this quick method of releasing land to Da Costa & Co. Ltd., when up to this day since the opening of the Port in May last year the Government has not seen fit yet to provide one of the common facilities for the men there, that is, a place for their bicycles and a proper entrance to the compound.
4.35 p.m.

We have no right stepping over any hard stones. Men with soft feet have to step over hard stones leading up to the compound and I vehemently object to this lack of appreciation for the worker. With things with which the working-class people have to be provided there is this stay-in-the-backyard attitude towards them. There is the wrong idea that he must wait at the end until everybody else has been satisfied. I am objecting to that.

Moreover, I am not objecting to your giving Messrs. DaCosta & Company, Limited, this lease of land, but I am thoroughly disgusted with the delay with respect to all the matters at the Port and sufficient warning has been given. When we come to dealing with the Bill to amend the Displaced Workers Allowance Act, I will have a lot more to say. That is a disgrace.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter make it clear exactly what he is criticising? Is he meaning the shed for bicycles? He said that we are making haste to give Messrs. DaCosta some Land and then he went on to comment on the shed for bicycles. I want to get his information correctly.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister had not been listening. I speak loudly enough that when anybody misses what I have to say, you have to send them to a medical practitioner to see what is taking place with their hearing.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: We are not dealing with Hansard now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let there be no asides.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that I have an objection to the haste in which this lease was being made to Messrs. DaCosta and Company Limited. I also said that today is 25th April, and up to today no bicycle sheds are built for the men and this is nine months that that matter was finalised. That was part of the original plan. It was stated that the workers should have somewhere for their bicycles.

Moreover, the Hon. Minister must have seen for himself that if you want to go on the compound, there is no proper footpath and the workers have to travel on a lot of hard stones. Why was a footpath not made? Are the workers not entitled to have somewhere proper to walk on? There is the concept that a working class man can go through the back, and this kind of thinking must stop.

Another thing is this. You have that old tumbled down building on that part which was once Pelican Island. That is not suitable today. Build something up around it. The Port Contractors have a better building for their office than the Government has for its officers, and you have this stupid waste of money that you have an old bogus building and you do not have a decent place for your officers at the Port where you have 92 acres of land.

You cannot have idiots running the Government. You have a Shipping Office on the Wharf and you do not have a suitable Port Office on the Deep Water Harbour where you do your main shipping business. You still carry on your business in an old bogus office. I would have to take that building and reconstruct it into something more in keeping with things today. I would construct a proper building for a Shipping Office on the Deep Water Harbour site and let the Clerks come up along the Wharf when they have business to do there. The distance is not too great. I can leave my office and get to Eagle Hall, travelling the longest route, in less than five minutes. How long is it going to take you to go to the Deep Water Harbour? If Da Costa and Company Limited wants to have people near the Port and because of that they intend to construct a building there, I have no objection to your leasing the land to that company, but I think that charity begins at home and you should put your house in order first. I am not concerned with the price at which you are leasing them this 1,300 square feet of land.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to give the answers to the hon. member who has just sat down. In the first place, there is no undue haste. Application was originally made on 29th February, 1961 and the matter was dealt with by the former Cabinet since July, 1961. That Cabinet went out of office; so then a new application had been made and it is now considered. Therefore, you can see that the matter was pending for quite a long time - over a year - so that there was no undue haste in meeting the requirements of Messrs. DaCosta and Company Limited.

So far as the hon. senior member for the City is concerned, he wanted to know something about the stevedores.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the Hon. Minister would give way, what I wanted to know was this. We are given to understand that the Port Contractors Limited are the responsible persons for dealing with the Port and they are a separate entity altogether. What we are saying is that Messrs. DaCosta and Company Limited is asking for this lease of land so as to erect a building for their staff and stevedores. If I did not know my Barbados, I would not know what this is at all. This is not something in which Messrs. DaCosta and Company Limited wants to put something on for their staff and stevedores.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The representatives of certain interests got in touch with the Governor-in-Executive Committee and requested office accommodation for their staff and stevedores within the new Port. Since the Government is not in a position to supply such accommodation which it is essential that such interests should have for the functioning

of their business, it was considered that provision should be made to rent to them a special portion of land at the Port on which they can erect a building to their requirements.

The position is that the Government does not have the necessary accommodation and the application was made on behalf of the shipping interests stevedores and steamship agents. Messrs. DaCosta and Company Limited made the application and will be constructing the building which will be erected on an area of 1,300 square feet. The building will cost around \$24,000 to \$30,000 and the payment for the rental of the land is at two cents a square foot payable in advance and the period of the lease is ten years with option of renewal for a further ten years.
4.45 p.m.

The Government is to be given the option to acquire the building on the appraised value on the termination of the lease either by non-renewal for ten years or the expiry of a 20-year period if another lease is not then arranged.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I must confess that the Hon. Minister does his work properly. I pay tribute to the way in which he does his work; but, up to now, reading what he is now reading is not an answer to what we want to know. We are given to understand that Port Contractors Limited are the people responsible for running this; we know that Port Contractors Ltd. run the Port and DaCosta & Co., Ltd., have a share in it. The hon. member should make it clear to us.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is whether it is Port Contractors Ltd. or DaCosta & Co., Ltd. That is the point on which the hon. senior member for the City is seeking illumination.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I hope that this will satisfy the hon. member. In truth and in fact Messrs. DaCosta & Co. Ltd. and the Port Contractors are not actually one and the same people, although there is a very close relationship between them. The application has come from Messrs. DaCosta & Co., Ltd.. There is a letter here acknowledging the receipt of one which was sent with regard to permission for the erection of a building in the Port Area. The letter states that the terms of the lease as set out are agreeable to the Company. The application has been made by Messrs. DaCosta & Co. Ltd., and it is signed by Mr. Chapman, a Director. As I have already said, the application has been made on behalf of the company; that is all the information which I can offer.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that Port Contractors are only a company for landing cargo in Barbados. Port Contractors Ltd. is not a shipping agent; the representatives of shipping companies have their respective shipping agents. Messrs. DaCosta & Co. Ltd., Messrs. Gardiner Austin & Co. Ltd. and so on, will function as shipping agents. Port Contractors are only a company for landing cargo. Their business at the Deep Water Harbour is that they are dealing with buildings where the Government has cargo in them; ships do not come consigned to Port Contractors.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for Christ Church was speaking.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, A limited company capitalised at a certain amount of money must exist. I am not opposed to the Government leasing land to anybody, but, at the same time, I cannot see that you can lease land to Messrs. DaCosta & Co., Ltd. for the purpose of erecting buildings when Port Contractors Ltd. is a company in law.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point of elucidation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is absolutely wrong but, as I say, I am not opposed to the Government leasing land to anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. senior member for Christ Church resume his speech.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the application for the lease of this land was originally made in the name of Messrs. DaCosta & Co. Ltd. and it was signed by Mr. Chapman, one of the Directors, as early as 10th April, 1961. There is a letter showing that all the negotiations were made with Messrs. DaCosta & Co. Ltd. and not Port Contractors as such. We cannot enter into any lease with any entity which has not yet made application or which, at no time, has made any application for such lease. Messrs. DaCosta & Co. Ltd. is the only limited liability company which has made this application. What is before me are the terms of a lease between Messrs. DaCosta & Co. Ltd. and the Governor-in-Executive Committee; we are seeking the approval of the Legislature for the granting of this lease in the normal way and in accordance with the terms as set out in the Addendum to the Resolution.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE TO THE BARBADOS LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY LTD.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael, the Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to the Barbados Light and Power Co. Ltd. of a parcel of land at the Garrison, St. Michael for the purpose of erecting a sub-station thereon. This Resolution will also be taken care of by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries. 4.55 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks in accordance with the provisions of the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951, the approval by the Legislature of the lease of a parcel of land of approximately 180 square feet at the Garrison, St. Michael, near Schmidt Gate, to the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited, for the purpose of erecting a sub-station.

It is proposed to lease the parcel of land at the rate of \$12.00 a year for a period of five years.

Those are the main terms of the lease, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is usual in leases of this kind to produce, for hon. members who do not know where the place is, a Plan for the benefit of such members. The Hon. Minister knows that that is the custom, but however this is a very small area and is aptly described as Schmidt Gate; so we do not press for the Plan though it is customary to pass a Plan around this Chamber to show the area that is to be cut off.

Mr. Speaker, as the law stands, the Governor-in-Executive Committee is not exempt from the Town and Country Planning Act, and the law says that no one can sell, lease or let any property or land in this country. Could the hon. member tell this House if all the requirements and ramifications have been gone through and if they are satisfied with the type of building, the distance in from the road and what not? I am not going to press for the plan although that is our right, but I am not going to sit here as a member of this Chamber and have the Town and Country Planning Officer saying that the Housing Authority can do this or the Government can do that, but the private citizen cannot do this. I am going to see that the law is carried out whether by Government, Housing Authority or any Board at all. That is what we are here for. Will the hon. member tell us about the type of building, how it is leased and what not?

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Minister replies, there may be some hon. member who would like to speak on this. It appears there is no hon. member who wishes to speak before the Hon. Minister replies.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this matter has been submitted to the Director of Public Works who has recom-

mended that the lease be granted for a sub-station to be constructed by the Company. The Town and Country Planning Officer has also granted the necessary planning permission for the erection of the proposed sub-station.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. senior member for Bridgetown cannot speak again even to express his gratitude.

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

THE DISPLACED WORKERS ALLOWANCES (BRIDGETOWN HARBOUR) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. senior member for St. Philip: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Displaced Workers Allowances (Bridgetown Harbour) Act, 1961.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple matter and therefore it should not occupy much time. Hon. members will recall that last year there was passed a Displaced Workers Allowances (Bridgetown Harbour) Act under the terms of which certain allowances were paid to specified categories of workers displaced as a result of the coming into operation of the Deep Water Harbour. Well now, this Bill seeks to amend that Act. The amendment, Sir, proposes to extend the scope of the Act to which I have referred so as to enable these allowances to be paid not only to the specified workers.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask hon. members, particularly those who are near the Reporters, to be very, very soft in their private conversations if they must talk at all. (A VOICE: Which Reporters?) I mean the Official Reporters; those are the only ones I see and know about.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I was saying, Sir, that the amendment is really for the purpose of extending the scope of the Act to which I referred to enable these allowances to be paid not only to the workers in the categories specified, but also to their dependants in certain circumstances. That is all this Bill seeks to do.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister said that this is a simple matter, but it is not. This is far from being a simple matter and it is going to be one of the biggest matters in Barbados if the hon. member does not make it simple before May Day. The amendment with which the hon. member is now dealing was placed before the Government since 27th August, 1961.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, when I said it was a simple Bill in purpose and effect, I explained what I meant by that. The original Bill permitted certain allowances to be paid to certain categories of displaced workers, and all this Bill seeks to do is to allow these allowances to be paid to the dependants of these displaced workers in special circumstances. If that is not simple, I do not know what is.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am going to get hot on this, but not now, and the hon. member has to get up a lot more because I have the facts to substantiate what I am saying. 5.05 p.m.

Since 27th August, 1961, these proposed amendments were put before the Government and the Hon. Minister says that he has nothing to do with it. It is true what he said. He could not be called upon to deal with something on 28th August because he was not in the Government then; but he can be called upon to deal with something since 6th December last and today is four months since then; therefore, there can be no excuse for the delay in this matter. Only

last Friday a displaced worker died and the amendment which we asked for should be on the Statute Book by now.

This is a simple matter. What is the cause of the delay? Five months with one Government and four months with another Government, which means that it has taken them nine months to consider. Where the Hon. Minister cannot shed his responsibility is that he gave the assurance to me — as well as the Hon. Premier — that these displaced workers would have been paid their money. Since 28th January there has been placed before the Government the total number of men; and yet up to today, not one single cent has been paid to them.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is perfectly correct to say that the hon. senior member for St. Peter was given the assurance by the Government that these allowances would be paid to these people, but it is also perfectly accurate to say that at the same time the Government was having the utmost difficulty to find where the money was to come from.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Government gets \$4.00 from every ton.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The business of paying lump sums to the displaced workers was discovered at a very early stage and appreciated by this Government. What the hon. senior member for St. Peter said was correct. The only reason why I have not disclosed the true state of the colony's finances is because I do not want the long, good standing credit of the island to be hurt, but the last Government has been running this Island into bankruptcy.

Only this afternoon the Financial Secretary and I discovered that the initial revenue necessary for the salaries increases which have not spread to the Transport Board but to the Local Government Councils is running to \$5 million.

We cannot print money. As a matter of fact, I will disclose something. We are now using a financial device which is unknown to Barbados and that is to increase the fiduciary issue. I am not saying anything more on that at this stage. Those who understand what I mean would understand what the situation is.

We would be glad to pay these people who were displaced the balance. The salaries increase for the Police is going to cost about half million dollars. In addition to all of that, the Government Savings Bank owes the Treasury money which up to now it has not been able to pay back and that is something which we inherited from the last Government. The hon. senior member for St. Peter never attacked the last Government for squandering away the money of this country.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, if I did not attack the last Government, the hon. member could not be there in that position. He had better not talk any nonsense. If I did not attack the last Government, he may have been outside or where the hon. senior member for the City is. I have no apologies to make.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What the Hon. Premier meant to say is this. There are five months which continued before the term of office of the last Government ended and the hon. senior member for St. Peter did not attack the last Government for detaining this matter for five months.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member can say that to hon. members on the other side. During the last five months that the last Government was in power, they were walking about the country talking about the displaced money which they were giving to the displaced workers: so you could not attack what they said. They had earmarked \$1 3/4 million for these people: so I had to attack them on another ground.

What I am dealing with now is this. When the question arose of making a lump sum available to these people, the last Government was not in power; so that question does not arise. I have Minutes here of a meeting of the Displaced Workers Board on 27th February, this year. This is what I said at the meeting according to the Minutes: "Mr. Walcott referred to paragraph three and the workers soon to be displaced and said that the fact that these workers did not yet receive their allowances in full had cost him embarrassment." That was as a result of the operation of the Deep Water Harbour which took place from the 4th January, 1962; therefore, I could not criticise a Government which had lost an election. Do you want me to criticise the last Government and say to those members that they are the Government now? Do you want me to talk about a Government which is dead — a duppy Government? You are telling me that I must attack a Government which does not exist. If I write a letter to the Government, to which Government have I written it? Certainly I could not write it to the Government which was defeated. You talk about existing Governments, not past Governments.

The Barbados Workers' Union had recommended that these workers should be paid in full but up to that date nothing had been done. "Mr. Walcott threatened to resign from the Board if the matter was not resolved earlier." Here it is: men are breathing down your neck. You get these people coming to you, and the Ministers know that too. The question which has now arisen did not arise as a result of the discussion with the last Government. The decision was being made by you yourself to pay these people in January 1962 and we said that inasmuch as these people were going off in different circles, they should be given the money in a lump sum.

I have enough information at my disposal to know that the amount of money which is standing to the credit of these men is less than what is paid to them already. The amount of \$900,000 has been paid out to the workers; therefore the amount which is remaining to them is a small portion as compared to what has been paid out.

We came to the conclusion at first that we should not pay out this money in a lump sum. I was the one who agreed to that to save this country from any embarrassment. The last Government said that it was going to earmark \$1 3/4 million for this purpose and when it came to the question of paying the workers a lump sum, I was the one who said: "Are you crazy? Do you know what it would mean to the economy of this country to take up \$1 3/4 million one morning and pay it out to those workers?" I said that it was better to spread the money over a period of time. I was not afraid of saying it and it was made an election issue. 5.15 p.m.

You get some peculiar revelations. Imagine that I could live four months after an Election to hear the Premier say that I did not attack the last Government.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member pointed out that he waited for five months on the last Government and for four months on this Government. I told the hon. member that he never attacked the last Government on this issue, but as soon as we came into office we gave authority for the new regulations with regard to the payment of a lump sum of money. The hon. member should know that we would give authority to pass money out in a lump sum; and the authority for such regulations would have to come from the Executive Committee. As far as dependants are concerned, the hon. member has only given one case of somebody who died and his dependants were in need of this money. I was only pointing out that it was not our fault that the money was not paid out, but that if his Board sent a requisition for the money, I could not print it, but I would find that money somewhere.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not the kind of person who looks for anybody to criticise. If I had my mind on anybody, I would say it; whether it is the last Government, this Government or a future Government, no matter what Government it is, I would say what I have to say. The hon.

member knows that we had a lot of bogus decisions from Crown Law Officers which would make a lot of people suffer. The former Minister came in here with this Bill which the hon. member is now amending and the Bill gave me to understand that there was an amendment in Clause 6 (4) of the Schedule which reads as follows:-

"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 full or in lieu of such weekly payments."

That meant that the Board would have the authority to give a worker all or some of his allowance. We found that when that was worked out on weekly amounts, a man whom you hear is getting \$1,000, is getting it at the rate of \$6 a week. Some people were getting \$4.18 a week so as to get \$400. A man's average is divided by 52 and he is only working for ten weeks; you say that he must wait 100 weeks but would you ask any of these people to wait for 100 weeks to draw this money at \$4.18 a week? We decided that a man who is getting \$400 should be given the whole amount, all at the same time. A man tells you that a house is being sold somewhere, and I will say that we have put some of these people in houses, people who had no shelter. The Crown Law Officers said that we were breaking the law; the Labour Commissioner was a Civil Servant and he was afraid of these Civil Servants. What are you giving a man \$6 a week to do? The uncle of the Assistant General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union died and the parents could not get one cent. We paid out all the money. The Premier asked about a man going to England or to the United States of America and what will happen with the money if the man died. The Minister said that the lawyers told him that this Regulation would cover everything (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Which Minister?) The Hon. Minister heard me say that when this original Bill was introduced, the Minister in explaining this Clause in the Schedule gave us his explanation and now this Minister has all these papers from the Auditor General. I heard an hon. member talk about people carrying away money and these Civil Servants should look for the people who are carrying away the money; but whenever you are helping working-class people somebody gets vexed. We have given people money to buy houses. Somebody owed Mr. Tudor the sum of \$400 and we said: "Bring the bills and we will pay the money". We paid that money and the individual had more money to spend. The man said: "Skipper, that is all right, I can trust again". We did that so as to help the economy of this country. Some people borrow money and they will tell you: "Skipper, I cannot pass that man's house tomorrow: lend me some money".

I want the hon. member to bear in mind that there were issues which were looming high during the period of the Election and the Hon. Premier should know that this was one of the issues which were looming very high. It had its reflections on the Barbados Workers' Union and the Party felt that this was something which would be used as a steer. 5.25 p.m.

I want the hon. member to remember that I raised this particular issue of paying the dependants nine months ago, because it was submitted to the Ministry as far back as 27th August, 1961, and that is why I said that this issue is nine months old. I say that because the uncle of Mr. Greene, the Assistant General Secretary of the Union, died in March, 1961, and his relatives have not received a cent. Fortunately for them, they got displacement money so far as the produce porters are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier talked about printing money, but I will tell him that whether or not he prints money, if a man is starving and cannot get money, you cannot tell him about printing money. We passed a law in here to collect \$1.40 from the sugar industry, and you should collect that money and hold it in trust. We levy money on 150,000 tons of sugar from the sugar industry every year, and that money should be called in. If the last Government did not take in the money, you cannot blame the Union for these things; but I am only dealing.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, as this is the second reading of the Bill, I may not have an

opportunity to deal with all these points, but I would like to inform the hon. member that the last Government from 1956 had declined to collect the money from the Sugar Producers' Association, and I have given instructions that that dollar per ton must be collected forthwith.

Mr. WALCOTT: The amount must be about \$500,000.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The levy which the hon. member is talking about was not collected; I do not see any reason why it should not have been collected, and it should be in the vicinity perhaps now of \$3/4 million. I have given instructions for it to be collected; the hon. member knows that I have dealt with all these points, but I am aware that he is being besieged daily by the displaced workers for their money. I have explained the position to the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: I went to a funeral the other day when a man died, and I was nearly buried too. There were nearly two funerals, the man's and mine. He was one of the displaced men, but fortunately he was the best of them because he was a quiet, calm sort of person. Moreover I want to point out to the Premier that the Government of Barbados collects \$4 per ton of sugar sent through the bulk installation. During the election it was stated in Queens Park by a member of the last Government — and the men would feel it is true — that this money was like something you had in a paper bag in a corner put down. He gave the impression that they had this \$1 3/4 million for the displaced workers. When the Prime Minister came to open the Deep Water Harbour, he said that this \$1 3/4 million was there for those who would be displaced, and the workers are now asking where the money has gone.

The Hon. Premier says that he is in a difficult position and does not want from the point of view of confidence in the Island to portray to the outside world that Barbados is so empty of money that we are really running on a bare thread; but the hon. member must also bear in mind that charity begins at home, and one of the biggest things in your development is for those people who live within the territory to have that feeling, because when the news begins to percolate among the workers that the Government does not have money to pay them, when they start to work, they are working with the idea that they do not know if they are going to get paid tomorrow and therefore would not go too fast. That lowers productivity and the general morale of the whole community, because people begin to have an uneasy feeling about the future. I hope that the Hon. Minister will not believe that the criticism which I have made stems from any feeling of malice; it is a criticism that stems.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the statement he made just now deserves to be corrected at this stage. Now the hon. member has given any Government employee the impression that the salary he has worked for is in doubt. As a matter of fact, we came here with the beginning of the financial year, and allocated a certain amount of money for the services of the Government until 30th June with the understanding that after 30th June, we would come back with a budget for the remainder of the financial year. In other words, salaries or earnings of Government employees are safe; so this is an entirely different matter.

The hon. member knows, as he himself has said it, that in the beginning, the idea was to pay these allowances weekly. Now we are asking for them in a lump sum instead of spreading them over one hundred weeks. It is an entirely different affair.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that, Mr. Speaker, and I repeated the amount of money that has already been expended is over \$900,000. I pointed out to the hon. member what originated the idea of lump sum payments, because there were men going off on 4th January who had been there and it was agreed to get these men relieved and to assist everybody in the smooth running by granting them their lump sum payments so that you would not have another problem, because these were only 100 men. The problem of paying 100 men would not present the same difficulty as the problem of paying 1,000 men. I would like the hon. member to under-

stand, Mr. Speaker, that 1,400 people were displaced. Some of them got benefits, and there are some 400 people who were not eligible because they did not have in enough time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not here, because there are going to be thousands of people who will be unemployed, and whether or not you pay them — they are going to be mostly in the parish of St. Michael — one has to think of what is going to happen to the children. They have to be fed and you cannot find 1,000 jobs in Barbados easily. The hon. member must bear in mind that the request that was made for the payment of lump sums to those who went off in January and further to pay those who were remaining, was made after the major portion of the money had already been expended. It is not to say that you were going to pay out \$1 3/4 million; we were asking for something in the vicinity of \$200,000, and I am sure the figures have been submitted to the Minister. We asked the Chairman to submit to the Minister what would be required and this was done. For example, at 31st December, 1961, the amount expended was \$920,684.

5.35 p.m.

These were the allowances paid to 908 workers. We asked that all that information should be submitted to the Ministers. I have, Mr. Speaker, the statement which I have made about the amount and that statement was made on 24th April. After I had these assurances, I transmitted them to the workers. What do you expect from me when I come into the House of Assembly after I got those assurances from the Prime Minister and the Minister concerned that they are prepared to do this? Do you think I am dealing with University professors when I am dealing with workers? What kind of language do they use? They do not say that I am speaking inexactitudes; they tell me that I am a liar: I am trying to fool them.

What I would like to suggest is this. The Hon. Premier knows that there is a levy laid on sugar which is at the rate of \$4.00 a ton. The Port also imposes a levy on goods being landed. I am not suggesting any method by which you should make this payment but there are avenues which have direct bearing on this issue by which payment can be made until such time as money from the General Revenue can be collected. As I have said, there is a sugar levy of \$4.00 a ton and you have a levy of \$4.00 and \$6.00 per ton on goods landed at the Port. That levy has come as a result of the displacement of these men because prior to that, the Government was not imposing any levy for the landing of cargo.

I feel that the assurance which was given for the men to be paid the balance of their money in a lump sum is inescapable at this time and there is no point in your saying that I made an earlier decision that it should be spread over a period of time. I make no apology for saying that at that time because we spread the load from July last year until now: but there are cases in which people are getting \$10.00 and \$6.00 a week and that kind of money is only creating drunkards of those people. When you pay a man that kind of money, it only puts him in a worse position than he was before.

I hope the Hon. Minister would accept what I have said. The Hon. Minister lives in the rarified atmosphere of the Government Headquarters at Bay Street, but my office is in the heart of Bridgetown. If the workers went into the market and had even forgotten about this thing, when they pass back, they would see me in my office and they would say to themselves: "let me step in and see Mr. Walcott about this thing."

This amendment is what the Board asked for and it would give the relief to the people concerned; but at the same time I picked this opportunity to tell the Hon. Minister about this question of payment. We, the workers, celebrate May Day in a big way and I cannot see if the workers can have some of their money to celebrate on things which are unconnected with their movement, why they cannot stimulate a greater spending on things in their own setting. I hope the Hon. Minister and the Hon. Premier would accept this in the right spirit and will not tell me, why I did not criticise the last Government, as if there was some collusion between the last Government and myself.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin first of all by disillusioning the hon. senior member for St. Peter. He said that the Government Headquarters is in a more rarified atmosphere than his office. The Ministerial Building is only half mile from the City and none of these displaced workers are decrepit. He should have been there when they invaded us *en masse*. They breathed down my neck, the Hon. Premier's neck and almost all the other people's necks. We had them up there as if it was the Pope Hennessy riots and when they said that they were going to leave us and go and pop the hon. member's neck, I told them not to do it. (Laughter).

The hon. member knows exactly what has happened. It was originally decided to give these people who were displaced a lump sum payment and the able-bodied men would get weekly allowances. Then, men were going out in January, and in the meantime the Board was having so much trouble with the displaced workers saying that they wanted all their money at one time, that out of sheer desperation the members said, "Give the fellows all their money at one time". Some of them have been given \$700 and in some cases \$1,600 or \$1,800. They were not given all this money at one time because as hon. members know, these people would have nothing of that amount left; therefore, they had to graduate these payments over a period of weeks. When legislation was decided to give the 123 when they came out of employment their full allowances, it was felt quite justifiably that those who were getting weekly payments should also be paid the balance of their allowances in full. It was felt, quite justifiably, that if you pay to the men who came out last their allowances in full, you were discriminating when you continued to pay to those who came out first their allowances by the week. In order to save the headache, the Board decided to submit to the Government that you should pay the balance of the money owing to those who came out first in full at one time as those who came out last were being paid at one time.

The amount is over \$1 1/2 million and it is not an easy matter for the Government to find all this money one time. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that at the meeting of the Board on 27th January, he suggested lump sum payments. I can tell him now that on 2nd February, even before the Board's recommendations came to the Government, the Government met and decided, from the information it had, to do what the Board subsequently asked them to do.

5.45 p.m.

On February 2 the Cabinet decided, from the information which it had, to do what the Board subsequently asked it to do. Five days after the Board decided what it would do, the Cabinet met and decided this matter. (Sides) The hon. member says, and the public should judge, that this whole matter was very ill-considered. When the Deep Water Harbour came into operation the workers who had been employed and who were incapacitated should have been given a lump sum payment or a weekly payment, if they wanted it, but the Government of the day had no right to expend nearly half a million dollars by way of a free gift to able-bodied men. The Government should not have done that because in a few months' time the money would all have been gone and these people would still have no employment. The money should have been invested in a way in which employment would be provided in the years to come.

The hon. member says that these people are down in his neck now, but after that, they would have been down in our neck if they had no hope of allowances and no jobs to which to go. We know the headaches which the hon. member has and we know that, in many instances, these people are inclined to be unruly. (Mr. WALCOTT: And unreasonable). Nobody knows better than the hon. member whether they are unreasonable or not, and we do not propose to put either the hon. member or any other member of the Board in a position in which he is subjected to harsh treatment or unkind words through no fault of his own. We should have been glad to have this matter settled long ago; we ourselves have been faced with this matter and we have had to go through with it. We have had just as much trouble, worry, persecution and breathing down our necks as the hon. member has had. They have gone so far as to invade the Government Headquarters and we have informed them.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member say that those persons invaded the Government Headquarters?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Without arms. The hon. member has made his position quite clear. He has absolved himself from culpability in this matter, but we feel that we have to make our own position quite clear and leave the position beyond any shadow of doubt. As far as we are concerned, we have paid proper attention at every stage and at all levels to this matter; and if the Board's decisions have not been implemented before, it is merely because circumstances over which we have had no control have operated against the implementation of those decisions.

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

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

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

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called as follows:—

"The long title to the Displaced Workers Allowances (Bridgetown Harbour) Act, 1961, which Act is hereinafter referred to as the principal Act, is amended by inserting the words "and to their dependants in cases where such workers are " between the "workers" and the word "displaced".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Clause, there is a word which should be inserted in the penultimate line after the word "the". The word "word" should be inserted after the word "the". I am asking leave to make that amendment.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I now beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think that I should take this opportunity to thank the Hon. Minister for his reply to my statement. I must say that we all have to expect these things after an Election. Unfortunately, these issues come up at Election time and when one side makes its position clear as to where it stands, you have to abide by it. This is not an issue in which the hon. member's Party said that they would alter it; this is one of the decisions which we accepted and the hon. member would know, as a politician, that, in relation to workers, if you put forward a plan which is cut and dried and where severance pay is accepted as a regular function — he would know what the net result would be if he said: "I am not paying you any money". That would mean a lot in respect of the able-bodied people because the feeble and incapacitated do not affect the Election results since they do not go to the polls. I do not think that we who are able to make a contribution in a big way should be different from anybody else. I cannot say that I have an alternative plan to find work for all of these people today rather than give them severance pay, and I regret that this was the only means of satisfying a large number of people.

I cannot make Government do what they do not want to do; I could not make the other Government do what it did not want to do and I cannot make this Government do what it does not want to do. We have to accept the decisions of Government and abide by them unless we want to have anarchy.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question I should like to say this: I think that the hon. senior member for St. Peter would recall that this Party, before the Election and during the time when this matter was before the House, strenuously criticised the proposal to disburse these funds in this way.
5.55 p.m.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church, I recall, gave certain proposals at the time for investing the money to find employment for some of these people and rehabilitating them, and some of us at the time not only supported the proposals but said at that particular time that we did not feel ourselves obligated to tell the Government what to do, but would make it a campaign issue; so that my remarks today were similar to what I used on the occasion when the Bill was before the House and which almost all the members of our Party supported. We said we would not pick up in those circumstances sums of money to put them in the hands of able-bodied men who would be looking for work later on, and we are in a position to say that the money could have been invested and spent in such a manner as to provide continuous employment for large numbers of those people, if not all. The hon. member himself, I am sure, if he were in authority at the time, would not have committed the Government in which he had a part to an expenditure of this sort in this manner.

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

Clauses 3, 4 and 5 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE BANK HOLIDAYS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: The fourth and final Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. senior member for St. Philip: To move the second reading of a Bill further to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Bank Holidays Act, 1905 sets out the position with regard to the position of business places not on such occasions as are legal holidays. It is felt now, Sir, that provision should be made to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee the power whereby places of business as defined in Section 2 of the old Act shall cease to be under the operation of the Act either generally or for such special or limited purpose or time and subject to such terms and conditions as may appear expedient to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. In other words, Sir, although the Act lays down the occasions which shall be regarded as public holidays and how these holidays should be observed, this amendment seeks to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to make provision for exempting business places from having to observe the provisions of the Act in such times and on the occasions when the Governor-in-Executive Committee deems fit. It is merely a question of prohibiting the necessity for having an amendment to the Act each and every time when the Government may feel that business places should be allowed to remain open for special reasons on a Bank Holiday.

I may say, Sir, that the main reason giving rise to the Government seeking such powers for itself is merely to be able legally to permit business places to be opened under special conditions on the occasions when tourist ships come to the country. It is felt that in the interest of the country's economy a considerable portion of money which tourist passengers would leave here should not be allowed to slip away, and we should not miss an opportunity to get this money because it percolates at all levels of economic strata in the

country. It has happened on more than one occasion in recent months that large cruise ships with numbers of passengers have come to the country, and because the day is legally a Bank Holiday and business places are completely closed, appreciable sums of money which these passengers would leave in the country are denied the Island.
6.05 p.m.

Under the provisions of this amendment, the Governor-in-Executive Committee would have the power, in case this occurs or for any special reason, to say to business places: "Well, you can remain open".

On the last occasion when this was done, the Government made it plain that in so far as the clerks in these stores were concerned, they should be under no compulsion to work. If they wanted to work, they would work voluntarily and they would be rewarded appropriately with overtime rates of pay for their labour on the particular day.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Trade spoke like a Minister of Trade and not a Minister of Labour, and I am going to recommend strongly in Barbados you must divide the two portfolios because they are coming into conflict with each other. The Hon. Minister is talking like a Minister of Trade in 1905 when the Bank Holiday Act was put on the Statute Book and not like a Socialist Minister of Trade in 1962. Where did the Hon. Minister get his authority from in 1962 to do this when the large majority of workers in this country are organised? Sir, you are not dealing with any disorganised section of workers. What information had you to guide you in bringing down this Bill? Did you canvass the workers themselves and the Trade Union movement to know whether this attitude which you are adopting is agreeable to the feelings of the people who have to work on these days?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I distinctly said that they have not got to work. In other words, if the staff say that they are not working, the store would not open. I said it was a purely voluntary gesture and if they worked, they should be appropriately rewarded.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I do not believe the Hon. Minister ever worked for anybody in Bridgetown. I worked in Bridgetown as a clerk; so I know something of what I am saying. That is one of the biggest jokes which has even come from a human tongue. These clerks are some of the most exploited workers in Barbados and they are only working for a new "nay-nay" coppers. (A VOICE: You are wrong.) Let me tell you that every store in Swan Street is going to open as a result of this amendment and you cannot stop them from opening.

If I may show you how these people exploit these workers, when a tourist boat comes in on a Saturday, some of these stores which close on Saturday for half-holiday put an advertisement in the newspaper and say that they will be closing on Thursday and opening on the Saturday to accommodate the tourists. Now, these stores do not have any tourist goods to offer tourists: but because the Act says that they have to close their stores on Saturdays for half-holiday and give their half-holiday on Thursdays, because they want to open on Saturday, you will see a big advertisement in the newspaper signifying that they are going to open on Saturday and close on Thursday in order to accommodate these tourists. You have Bashart Ali's store situated in Swan Street where tourists do not even pass to take a photograph: but the owner of that store is saying that he is opening on the Saturday so as to accommodate the tourists. These people are not opening for the purpose of catching any tourist trade, but they are glad for the opportunity to open on a Saturday so as to cater to the people from the country districts.

What I would like the Hon. Minister to bear in mind is this. A matter as fundamental as this is one on which I think you should canvass the different opinions of the public and in

order to do so now you should send this Bill to a Select Committee. As I have said earlier, the working class people must begin to exercise their thinking and demonstrate their views. A Bank-Holiday is a day given to the working class people to get a day off from work. What the Hon. Minister must avoid is giving the impression that this idea of giving a holiday is becoming too prevalent nowadays. Even the national newspaper in this Island in order to play up that the number of bank-holidays which we have in this Island is too many, had the bank-holidays wrong. It had the 24th May as a bank-holiday. Can you imagine that mistake coming from the national newspaper of this Island? And they had the temerity to put it on the front page in a sort of a way to play it up to the people.

I am getting a little afraid that Barbados society is getting a little too sophisticated for me. Sir, you want to stop funeral processions now. Because the people were not accustomed to any motor car and they are getting in motor cars now, that appears too much for you to see and you say that you should not have any funeral processions. Those people who rent motor cars want to drive the living life out of it. They want to get the longest ride for their money. You want to shorten that now. You want to spoil that now. What else do you want to take away from the people? You are telling us today that on those bank-holidays which tourists come here, you should work.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has said in a general way, as I understand him, that there is a projected suggestion of stopping people from partaking in funeral processions. I want to get it from him clearly.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that there is a suggestion when it comes to funeral processions that they should cease.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to a suggestion mooted by a high ranking set of people in that business?

Mr. WALCOTT: The whole tendency of that suggestion is that too many people are going to funerals and funeral processions are getting too large. They are saying that when these funeral processions pass along Baxters Road, they block the road.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise again on a point of order. What I am trying to get clear is whether these suggestions occurred in any of the manifestos of the Opposition Parties.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I did not see anything of this amendment to the Bank Holiday Act in anybody's manifesto.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the Independents have a manifesto?

Mr. WALCOTT: I did not see it in the manifesto of the Independents either, if any of them had any. Of course, the Independents would not have put it in their manifesto because they do not want to depart from the indigenous habits of the people; they would want to nourish the good ones.
6.15 p.m.

This Bank Holiday Amendment Bill would be all right if you were dealing with trade and if the hon. member was not in a Government like that in which he is. The hon. member is in a Government which is made up by clerks and working-class people. In the City of Bridgetown today members hold seats, and I do not know if any of the members or if the hon. senior member for the City were here — I would like to know if they had a mandate from the people to the effect that they regard working on a Bank Holiday as something which the clerks and the workers are suggesting because a tourist boat happens to come in. We are not serfs and the next thing we will hear is that we will have to dance up and give these people fun. They will say that there is not enough fun, and therefore let us get these people to perform these exotic dances in order to satisfy their idiosyncrasies. They have a schedule for Bank Holidays and why do they not have more Bank Holidays in some other places too? If these people went to Trinidad on Corpus Christi Day, that would

not be any Bank Holiday. We have to preserve these age-old customs. As to this tourist business, I have something to say about that; however, I hope the Hon. Minister will examine the position and see the amounts of money which have been spent. I want to know if the expenditure of this money is justified in the erection of these hotels and if we are getting adequate returns for these expensive hotels which have been erected. We want to see a different spirit exhibited in those who have to be the salt of the earth.

I do not consider that it is necessary to amend the Bank Holidays Act in order to allow a trader in Bridgetown to open his store when a tourist boat is coming in. My first beginning in public life was to challenge the then Attorney General of this Island, Mr. E. K. Walcott. I was working in a store and he made a statement saying that there was nothing to prevent people from looking into the employers' books. If the manager of a store says that he is going to open his store and he tells his staff: "I am going to open my store and I want your co-operation today", the one who says that he is not giving that co-operation has to look for a job next week.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is not true.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, the hon. member had a dream.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I said that what the hon. member says is not true because I know of specific instances of clerks in Bridgetown who did not go out to work on such days and there was nothing done against such persons.

Mr. WALCOTT: The fact that this matter has been brought to the attention of the Hon. Minister shows that attention has been brought to the employee's refusal. If the clerks bring the matter to the attention of the Minister, they do that because they want him to step in and they want to use him as a Trade Unionist and not as a Minister. I am saying that there is no justification for this amendment. The tourists today come between the 15th December and the 15th April. If a tourist boat comes in on Christmas Day, are you telling somebody that he must open his store on that day? When you go to New York, can you tell a Jew to open his store on Yom. Kippur day? He would tell you "No; you cannot get anything here today".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member is being facetious now. Christmas Day is not a Bank Holiday and in the amendment, the Government would not permit a store to be opened on Christmas Day, because that day is not a Bank Holiday.

Mr. WALCOTT: My argument has always been that Christmas Day is Christmas Day. If Christmas Day falls on a Monday, that day is not a Monday; it is Christmas Day. In that week you will not have a Monday. These people are asking the Government to help them when a tourist ship comes here; but why should the Act be changed because one section of the community has asked that that should be done and nothing has been done to give the other sections of the community the opportunity of expressing their view? If it were a matter affecting the Trade Union specifically in which you came up against the Trade Union as such, you could not pass this amendment. This is what the clerks are getting for not being organized. If they were organised, the Government could not have a bill like this passed without their consultation. We do not consider that it is fair to pass an amendment like this in which you are giving an advantage to an employer, because the overtime rates are negligible. A worker is being paid \$12 a week and you give him \$1.00 or \$1.50 for working on that day. I am saying that that does not compensate that worker for the time during which he is working. If the owners of these stores want to get this tourist trade, well, let them and their families come down and serve people in the stores. This is a matter as if you have self-employed people. In Geneva and in Europe you find this sort of thing but you do not find any big departmental store being opened! This is all done where you find that people are in need of help or in the case where a man gets wounded and he wants to help himself.

6.25 p.m.

Why should we pass this to accommodate the tourist trade? The hotels are open or they cango to the beach. We have nice beaches where they cango and bathe; or they can go and buy some rum punch or dance at a hotel. If the stores in Bridgetown are closed, Mr. Speaker, on Bank Holidays, let the hotels organise their business to cater for tourists. At the Aquatic Club there is a place where they can buy goods, and they can also buy things from the Hotel Royal, or at the Airport; so let them go to these places and shop for what they want. How many tourists do you think are coming here to buy half a yard of calico or a pair of shoes? What is the type of goods that tourists buy? A tourist may forget his handkerchief and would go in a store and buy one.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an assessment of the quantity of goods which tourists buy. All the goods which tourists buy can be bought from Rosie and Bantam who sell hats or conch shells on the Pier Head. Nobody is going to stop them from selling conch shells and curios, but we must open Broad Street and Swan Street because certain people tell you that you must open. What discrimination are you going to make? Will you tell Messrs. Cave Shepherd that they can open and tell Mr. Surti in Swan Street that he cannot open? Will you allow other jewelry stores to open and tell Holder Bros. that they cannot open?

Mr. Speaker, I feel this is a measure which has been pressed, and I feel that wherever you have these pressures, the Government should undertake to have a broad canvass of opinion. The Government has no particular Department. I am glad to see that the hon. senior member for the City has come back in, and he has come in changed too.

Mr. SPEAKER: He is still the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am very glad to see him back here apart from his being the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition in Barbados, because I know he represents the City of Bridgetown, and when it comes to Bank Holiday business, he has more to talk about than I have. The workers in the City voted for him; the people in the City did not vote for me, because I am all the way out in St. Peter; but I want to make it clear that he is one of the representatives in this House for St. Michael, along with the hon. junior member for the City, the hon. senior member for St. Michael and the hon. junior member for St. Michael, the Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism, who are not here. Those four members would have to know from their constituents if this is something that they have a mandate to do. Those are the four members who would be able to speak, because so far as I am concerned, this does not affect me, but it is their constituents that are affected. These should be the members to say that representation has been made to them and that the clerks in town feel that they can work on Bank Holidays. How much are you going to pay them?

The hon. senior member for the City was not here, and I will repeat for his benefit that when tourist boats come, the tourists can go to Paradise Beach Club or Sandy Lane and bathe. If they want to buy things, there are stores down there, and they can also get their hair done; so they can get what they want. I cannot see the necessity for these stores opening, and it is only encouraging some store owners who want to open. Soon after we have given them the opportunity of opening on Bank Holidays, they will come and ask for Sundays, and next they will ask you to give them Christmas Day. Let the cruise ships divert themselves to other places and come to Barbados on the days when we are open.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel it is fair to this community with our age old customs to have this, and I would say that before a measure like this is passed, the opinions of the people should be canvassed, and this should go to a Select Committee in order that these people should be able to say something. The Minister said that people cannot fire them. Do not tell me that nobody can fire them. I am a Trade Unionist and I know the stores around Bridgetown, and I want to say from the floor of this House that an employer does not have to give a reason for dismissing a person. How long since does an employer have to give a reason? Some-

times when he gives you a reason, you get into trouble. All an employer has to say is "O.K. brother, I think the days have come; this is the end of the rope", and he shakes hands and says goodbye. There are enough lawyers in here, and they know that an employer does not have to give a reason for dismissing anybody. They can easily say that they are sorry they cannot employ a person any longer.

I started life as a clerk in Bridgetown, Mr. Speaker, and I would have to defend the clerks, though they might not feel I am defending them; and if there is going to be a lone voice in here sticking out for them, I have to stick out for them in the measure because I see no justification whatsoever for passing this Bill. If the Hon. Minister wants to test it, let him carry this to Select Committee, and I am sure that from the opinions which he will get from the clerks in town and from people who are given an opportunity to express their views, the answer will be "no".

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, my colleague has been rather long on this as I would have expected, but while at the same time I may be able to appreciate in some measure the reasons why Government has agreed to bring down such an amendment, because I believe that it has been impressed upon them that such an amendment would in some way make things easier for the accommodation of tourists, and that coming, I believe, as a suggestion from the mercantile community, any Government would feel that if the tourist industry is to be encouraged, such an amendment might be of some benefit to the Island. As I have heard my colleague say, and as I see in the Objects and Reasons of the Bill, I have no reason to believe that the workers' view points have been put to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I see nowhere in the Objects and Reasons that any workers' delegation or representative body has been consulted before this amendment has come down to us. Like my colleague, I am very interested that the interests of any section of working class people should be defended. I agree with my colleague and I am totally in disagreement with the Minister, because I do not think that the Minister is serious when he wants to make us believe that clerks might not be penalised. It is so easy to happen, and what is worse, there are very few of these clerks organised as workers in Broad Street and Bridgetown. The percentage is extremely low. They are the most defenceless workers to be found anywhere in Barbados, as far as their interests being represented are concerned as against their employers.

I see nothing whatever in any section that presupposes that if a worker refuses to work when called upon to do so on these particular occasions, that worker may not be faced with dismissal, and I have every reason to believe that these gentlemen would not want it to be said about them that they are not going to defend the interests of workers who are involved if this amendment is passed here today.
6.35 p.m.

There is something which rather perplexes me and it is the wording of this section which is to be amended. I will read it. It is found in Clause 2, paragraph (b) which says:-

by adding immediately after subsection (4) the following new subsection numbered (5):-

"(5) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this section, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may, whenever it shall appear to be expedient, declare by notice or other publication, in such manner and in such form as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may think fit, that any place of business shall cease to be under the operation of this Act either generally or for such special or limited purpose or time and subject to such terms and conditions as may appear expedient, and thereupon this Act shall cease to operate upon such place of business."

To begin, this Act refers to any specified place of business. In other words, one single business firm may be bounded. That does not seem to me so nice. I cannot conceive of any business in Bridgetown which should have this special privilege on any one particular occasion.

Again I see higher up in the Section: "and in such form as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may think fit that any place of business shall cease to be under the operation of this Act either generally or for such special or limited purpose or time." I would like to know what that means. Does it mean that the whole business may, not a part? I think it might mean that. I do not know what it is construed to mean.

Although I am in general agreement with any practice that might mean that the tourist industry will benefit directly and indirectly the whole island, yet I will never give my assent to any body of legislation like this which involves workers and which makes no provisions for those workers in case they are threatened with dismissal. The few additional pennies which go for overtime to people who are not covered by protective legislation in agreement with trade union rules are not sufficient to induce those workers to forego a day's rest or pleasure like that which a bank-holiday gives.

I have been reading in one of the newspapers by somebody who was boosting this piece of legislation an article setting out the number of bank-holidays which we have in Barbados. But it must be borne in mind that we have got so many bank-holidays for reason of diversion from work. The people were so poorly paid that you had to give them these days off to rest. The clerks who work in Broad Street, even Swan Street and Roebuck Street during the busy times of the year, I am perfectly sure, can appreciate these bank-holidays which they get during the year and I am very doubtful that if a particular business firm in the City wanted these workers to turn out on a bank-holiday to serve tourists and the great majority agreed to turn out and one or two disagreed to turn out, these few would not be victimised. I am sure that if there was anything relating to any of these workers - let us say that any of these was put in the bad books of the employer - that it would be found possible that advantage would be taken of such workers because they did not run out to work on the bank-holiday. A worker is not necessarily dismissed for an immediate fault. I speak as an experienced trade unionist having been in the business for more than thirteen years. For the benefit of hon. members of the Cabinet, who might not know the details, very often, an employee is marked out for dismissal a long time before he or she is dismissed and just a little thing happens, and that is found to be an immediate fault and that worker finds himself or herself wanting a job.

The inclusion of this bit of legislation without making proper provision to safeguard the interest of the worker may give another opportunity to certain employers for dismissing workers. A worker may be deemed to be rude. His employer has not got a good chance at him and he tells his workers to turn out next Monday which is a Bank-holiday. One worker who may not be in the best books with the employer fails to turn out and that worker is dismissed.

Sir, I counsel hon. members to agree to the postponement of this Bill or referring it to Select Committee before we hastily pass this bit of legislation because there is absolutely nothing in it, good as may be the intention of the Government, which appears to be in the interest of the workers involved. I am giving that observation and I would like the hon. introducer of the Bill to explain to me these words: "either generally or for such special or limited purpose or time and subject to such terms and conditions as may appear expedient."

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, we have heard today from the lips of the Hon. Premier that the finances of this Island are not as happy as they should be. We also know that we in this area want to be independent and we have been moving forward to that, in view of the fact some date in the near future we will have to stand on our own feet and pay our own way. We are paying our own way now; but we are paying it with the help of a subsidy on our sugar. Some day - and I do not wish to say conclusively - we would have to earn our way like any other nation.

In Barbados today, we have been dependent on sugar, rum and tourism. Tourism is still in its infancy. It has been developing not as fast as some of us would like but it has moved forward in large proportions over the last ten years. Today, it is worth the Island \$14 million or \$15 million from money spent in one way or the other by visitors from overseas in Barbados.

6.45 p.m.

It does not mean money which is spent in hotels only; this is money which is spent in the island either in businesses in Bridgetown, taxes, hotels or by other means. Whatever that sum is, it is something to help us to pay our way. This is money from outside which we are earning. We have also been told about these tourist boats which come here — and you will know that in the last three years the number has gone from 20 tourist boats a year to about 60 tourist boats a year. The tourists have been encouraged to come here because of the Cuban situation. They have been encouraged to come here; we have taken the Manager of our Tourist Board along with a Committee and sent him up to New York so as to encourage these tourists to come here. When they set out on their itinerary and the Manager is faced with occasions where you have closed your shops when the tourists come here, that is something which he has to argue against. We want the U. S. dollars to come here. I am speaking for tourism now; I remember the long hours which the clerks used to put in, I used to work seven days a week as a clerk. I do not wish to have to return to those days. (Mr. WALCOTT: What was the name of the firm with which you used to work?) The firm is still there in Broad Street; it is J. N. Goddard & Sons. (Laughter)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that I have not got to remind hon. members of Standing Order No. 28 which reads as follows:—

"No Member shall interrupt another Member except—

- (a) by rising to a point of order, when the Member speaking shall resume his seat and the Member interrupting shall simply direct attention to the point which he desires to bring to notice and submit it to the Speaker or Chairman for decision;
- (b) to elucidate some matter raised by that Member in the course of his speech, provided that the Member speaking is willing to give way and resume his seat and that the Member wishing to interrupt is called by the Chair.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter is reminded of that Standing Order.

Mr. WALCOTT: That was an undertone. (Laughter.)

Mr. GODDARD: By the regulations, things are easy for the clerk. Working 42 hours a week for a clerk today is easy working. They are out by 4 o'clock although the law provides for 5 o'clock, they have an hour for lunch and they have half a day per week. When the hon. member talks about not opening stores on these days for which the Bill seeks that stores should be opened, let him go to Miami and Jamaica. There is a place in Miami which operates for 24 hours; it is a big department store and, of course, these stores carry shifts. I have been there. When we say that we are giving the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to legislate for a bank-holiday, that is, for two hours in the morning or evening which period should be exempted for the purpose of catering to visitors, personally, I see nothing wrong with that. I am speaking from an employer's point of view and I am also speaking from a clerk's point of view. In Christ Church I represent more clerks than my colleague who is in the City next to me. I am as much concerned about the welfare of the clerks as any other member in here, but let us be dispassionate about this matter. Everyone's point of view should be respected. We are saying that a Bill of this nature should be sent to a Select Committee (Hear! Hear!) We wish to hear very point of view and we will bring to that Committee the opinion of everyone because the Government today, or we as a nation, cannot afford to ignore business in which we are having a share.

Let us look at the matter in this way. The Government is a silent partner in every business in Bridgetown; if the businesses make profits, the Government gets 40%. We know, and the Northern and Southern District Councils will know, what they have to call upon householders to pay by way of local rates as a result of trade being depressed last year. This is a serious position and members of this Assembly should be so responsible as to try to assist the Government out of its dilemma. We heard about the financial position of this island a few hours ago and the only way in which we can get out of it is by doing work. Let us have all Bank Holidays and we will see what will happen to this island. I am happy to be in a position to be able to provide work for a number of people who do not work harder than other people. As a matter of fact, Messrs. C. F. Harrison & Co.

is not one of those firms which open for tourists but it is one firm today which is spending a quarter million dollars in expansion, something which many other businesses would be withholding at this stage. It is faith in the island. (Mr. WALCOTT: Faith in profits.) How can we argue, Mr. Speaker, with people like that?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ignore those asides.

Mr. GODDARD: Members of this House should be more responsible people; it is true that this is political dynamite for some people; but if you are afraid of your electorate, in time they will catch up with you. Hon. members should let the electorate know that this island cannot survive if we do not take every opportunity of bringing money into the island, whether it is by means of tourism, rum, sugar or whatever it is, because that is the only way in which we can live. We have no industries in this island. 6.55 p.m.

Here is the Minister of Industry trying to attract industries into this Island. Let him tell us with what success he has met. We have a big job to find work for people, and those of us whose responsibility it is can only give them work if there is something for them to do. This is an opportunity. I have seen tourist boats come here, and on several occasions the places were closed. People who would buy have to wander around and go off to the beaches. Some of them buy rum punches and then leave with the money in their pockets, whereas if they had the opportunity to spend \$2,000 or \$3,000 U.S. at Cave Shepherd, Fogarty's or Da-Costa's, that money would have been left in the Island and the Government would have been sharing in 40% of that profit. That is how we have to look at it today.

Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this among our Party, and we are going to suggest to the Government that this Bill be sent to Select Committee. They have nothing to be afraid of. Let the clerks, workers and those who have the responsibility of opening their stores come and tell us their story. That is all we have to say. We can answer anyone, and today we need courage to tell people the true facts. I hate to have to hear the Premier say what he said today, and I hate to think that Trinidad and the other places will be reading in our papers in a short time that money has been wasted, squandered or misspent. When we thought we had reserves, we have not got them and people today are suffering for the lack of money like many other places. We have never found ourselves in that plight before, and we have to work ourselves out. (Cheers.)

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, hon. members can cheer but I have been listening to what I call the statesman-like speech of my Minister of Trade.... (Mr. WALCOTT: When? In 1982?) Little did they know that the present Minister would be Minister of Trade. You have listened to that speech which is a statesman-like speech, and now you will listen to the speech of a politician whose eye is always on the ballot box. Now as far as I am concerned, there is one thing which I should draw to Your Honour's attention first.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the Rules, it now being 7 o'clock p.m., automatically there is a suspension until 7.45 p.m. This Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 o'clock p.m.

On Resumption.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact 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: When the Sitting was suspended, the hon. senior member for the City was addressing the Chair. Does the hon. member wish to proceed?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I think all sides will agree that the member who spoke for my Party made a statesman-like speech. I think this is one of those Bills which I consider must be given consideration and the opinions of all sides must be taken. Without wasting much time, and since my colleague the hon. junior member for Christ Church made our point of view quite clear, I would like to suggest that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee. Whatever the opinions of the Parties might be, I think it is similar to when we passed the Half-Holiday Act in this country and had all sides represented and got their opinions. In this case I am going to make my position abundantly clear.

As far as I am concerned, I am fully conscious that we are very much in need of the dollars which tourists bring. I agree with some of the sentiments expressed by the Trade Unionists that we need not bend ourselves backwards to do everything and anything; but if we are spending \$ 1/2 million a year for the purpose of advertising and bringing in from 20 to 60 boats a year, then we should do everything in our power to see that we offer facilities to tourists to spend money in Barbados. I am therefore moving right away that this Bill be sent to Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: It will have to pass the second reading first.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to suggest when this Bill passes the second reading that it be sent to Select Committee for the simple reason that all sides must be represented in this, and I am going to let it be known now where I stand in the matter. You have heard the statesman-like speech of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and now you will hear the speech of the Leader of the Party whose eye is always on the ballot box. There is something in what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said as a Trade Unionist, and if this House agrees, we should go into Select Committee if there is any fear at all that people would be victimised because they refused to work. I have been reliably informed that if this Bill is amended, only those who want to work will do so if a boat comes in on Easter Monday, the day after Christmas or Peacemaker's Day or any other holiday which is internationally known. In other words, there are some holidays that are internationally known; but the Trade Unionist's fear is that the Governor-in-Executive Committee should ensure that a person should not be victimised, and only those persons who want to work might do so.

I want to see it made abundantly clear in some Act if we go to Select Committee, Mr. Speaker, that there should be a penalty for the dismissal of any employee who did not want to work on a legal holiday if the Governor-in-Executive Committee declares it to be a working day even though they were going to be paid. There are some people who do not want to be paid. There was a time when I would go to work whether or not it was a Bank Holiday, and I have just discussed that with a man outside. Time was when I would have a car and would work on Good Friday, Sunday, or Monday, but I have reached the stage where I can tell the tourist that he can go and have a fling; but there are a lot of people who would work for time and a half. I would like to see enacted and put in this Bill — and that is the only way I am going to support it — a penalty which lays the onus on the employer to prove that he has not dismissed a person by way of victimisation because he refused to come out to work.
7.50 p.m.

I am sure that I have discussed this with the Clerk of the House and he has said that this can be done. I ask hon. members to let us pass the second reading of the Bill. It is just as the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said; either you want the dollars or you do not want the dollars. If you are depending on sugar, rum and tourism, if the figures mentioned by the Government are correct, then I say that it behoves all of us to preserve tourism. We need not bend over backwards, of course. I am the last person in the City of Bridgetown who would vote for any legislation which would hamper the average worker. Of course, I do not believe the Government as it stands would bring down any legislation to hamper the average clerk, but there is a tremendous lot in what the hon. senior member for St. Peter said. There are a lot of employers who would want their workers to come out on bank-holidays and if they do not come out to work, they would find ways and means to get rid of them. I say, put it into the Act that not only would there be a severe penalty on the employer if he dismisses a worker who said that he did not feel like working on that bank-holiday because he had it all arranged already what he was going to do on that day, but also put in in the Act that the onus would be on the employer to prove that he did not dismiss the worker for that and not on the employee to prove that he was dismissed because he did not come out.

I think that is the farthest which we can go. The truth must be told. We either want the dollars or we do not want them.

I am sure that this amendment is going to apply to the big stores in Broad Street and most of these are limited liability companies and, according to the law, the Government which is the silent partner, stands by and collects 40% of the profits. The Government is going to receive its share of the amount of money which is made from tourism. As I have said, I am going to support the second reading of the Bill and I am going to suggest to hon. members that we pass the second reading and then move that it be sent to Select Committee so that we will have the opportunity of getting the clerks around a table and giving them the opportunity to submit their views. (Mr. WALCOTT: Who are the clerks you are going to get?) I can tell you that the clerks are like me. I do not know if the hon. member means a clerk with a face looking like his but if he means a clerk of his pigment, I will say 'yes', there are clerks like him who are directors of business.

Sir, I do not want to waste the time of this House. That is my contribution. I counsel hon. members to vote for the second reading of this Bill and at the most to let it go to Select Committee. I will suggest to the Hon. Minister in charge to agree to it going to Select Committee and then let it be publicly known that we want the clerks to state their views on it. There is no Clerks' Union now. There is a tremendous number of clerks in the City of Bridgetown. We have not had the time to discuss this Bill with them and they should be made aware of the situation and should be allowed to send representatives to the meeting of the Select Committee so as to express their views on the matter. They should be able to say whether they should get double time or time and a half for working on a bank-holiday.

I am going to insist, as far as I am concerned, whether an employer supports me or not, if he is the type who is going to victimise a clerk because he did not come out, that the law should be so drafted to put the onus on him to prove that he did not dismiss the clerk because of that.

Mr. LYNCH: Sir, despite the fact that my colleague seems to have crossed the floor during my absence, I would like to speak in support of the second reading of this Bill. I do so with a full awareness of the fact that I represent a large number of clerks whose future would be bound up with the passing of this Bill.

I am not quite convinced in my mind that there can be any hundred per cent protection for those clerks who are liable to be victimized or dismissed if they refuse to work when called upon to do so, because with the compass of human ingenuity so great, it would be almost impossible to prevent an employer from victimising a worker. If you want to get rid of a man, you can mention a lot of things to show why you had dispensed with his services. You can mention retrenchment, and so on.

However, for that reason, I would like to support the hon. senior member for the City that we pass the second reading of this Bill and then send it to Select Committee. I have seen, myself, in many countries that stores were open not only on bank-holidays but on Sundays. In Chicago, many sales are held on Sundays. Any person who has passed through England and spent a little time knows that the shops are opened on Sundays and bank-holidays. In Trinidad, even on Corpus Christi Day, you find that although that is a bank-holiday, the front part of the stores are closed but you can get in by way of the back and buy all you need. We all know that there are means of combatting legislation. However, I would like if possible that this Bill be sent to Select Committee so that we can consult those of our constituents who are clerks and hear their views on this matter.

Mr. SEALY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on the motion which is now before the House. I feel that it is incumbent on the Government to do all in their power and to bring in laws which would encourage tourism in

this Island and find the necessary means to carry it further. The Island, as it stands, is saddled with so many different affairs that I find myself not in agreement with what some hon. members have said on this Bill.

I would like to remind hon. members that during the earlier part of this tourist trade, there were only three hotels in this Island at which tourists were not encouraged to go, and those hotels were the Colony Club, Sam Lord's Hote and Sandy Lane Hotel. It is a fact that when the tourists went there, they found that those hotels were roped off and they were denied entrance. The people in the tourist industry are getting half-million dollars from the Government in order to advertise the country and get tourists to come here. Therefore, when those tourists came and went to those hotels and found that they were roped off and were without the assistance of any person to tell them that they could go to the St. Lawrence Hotel, the Crane Hotel or the White House Inn, then they were bound to return home dissatisfied that they came to Barbados.

We must also bear in mind that the taxi drivers and small taxi owners are also helped as a result of tourists coming here. I am sure that a lot of them do not pay their licences or insurance until the tourist boats arrive here.

I am therefore asking hon. members to agree to the second reading of this Bill and then let it be sent to Select Committee so that the Committee can inquire from the shop attendants their views on it. I think it would bring about better relationship between employer and employee. I also definitely feel that reward sweetens a man's labour and I am sure that if people in Barbados have to work on a bank holiday and know that they would get time and a half for it, they would gladly work.
8.00 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my reply by quoting the hon. senior member for the City when he said that it is their feeling and he is sure that this Government would be the last persons to do anything which would militate against the interests of the working classes in this island. That is almost word for word with what I intended to say myself. I am sure that even the hon. senior member for St. Peter and his colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Peter, will fully realise that power such as this Bill calls for to be placed in our hands will not be used to the disadvantage of the clerks in Bridgetown. The incident which was the precursor to this amending legislation, was the arrival on 23rd February of two tourist boats — the "Ariadne" and the "Independence". They had a total of approximately 350 passengers each — 700 in all — and it is estimated that by the opening of the stores in Bridgetown on that day, these tourists left \$23,520 in the stores which were opened. The Government was very, very careful in deciding to take this step which it has taken, first and foremost to restrict the type of stores which would be given permission to open on that day. The Government notice appearing in the Press drawing attention to the fact that business places would be opened on that day reads as follows:—

"Owing to the expected arrival of the two tourist ships "Ariadne" and "Independence" tomorrow, 23rd February, 1962, the Cabinet has decided that shops engaged in the sale of liquor, dry goods and jewellery should be permitted to open between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. in order to accommodate passengers on those ships.

This decision has been taken in the interest of the economy of the Island and the Cabinet requests that all employers pay to their employees appropriate over-time rates for such period and that no employee who is unwilling to work on this day should be compelled to do so."

In other words, in taking this step, the Government anticipated every single objection which would have been raised by the working classes. We did not give *carte blanche* to every business place to open and we were not unmindful of the fact that the rights of the workers should be protected in the sense that you would work if you wanted to work, and if you did work, you would be paid at the appropriate rate. The hon. senior member for St. Peter would

concede that with a Trade Union such as his operating in this country, it would not be easy for any employer to dismiss an employee for failing to work on a day like this without bringing down the fury, power and wrath of the Barbados Workers' Union on that employer. While it is true that the interests of the Union would say that the representatives of the Union might have been consulted by the Government at the time when we took this step, yet I am disclosing no secret when I say that this matter was brought to the attention of the Government within hours of the arrival of these ships, and we therefore feel more than justified in bringing down an amendment to the Act in order to give ourselves the power, at any time when we desire and in the circumstances mentioned, which would permit of certain business houses in the City of Bridgetown to be opened. The people of this island can rest assured that this power will not be abused so long as it rests in our hands. It is highly possible that the time may come in the ordinary course of events when this power can be abused and we would take justifiable objection if it is being abused; but at this time there is no cause for fear of the abuse of this amendment to the Act and we will exercise every possible care of the amendment if and when the occasion requires it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. We are lending people money to erect big hotels and when strangers come you say that they cannot go into these hotels.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am only saying that the hon. member would not be the kind of Minister who would not answer a question. He was not answering the question raised by the hon. senior member for St. Michael and that is why I rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister would not be dealing with matters which have no connection with the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, No, Sir!

Mr. SPEAKER: That is my opinion and my opinion counts.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I bow to Your Honour's ruling, but the Hon. Minister should reply to the point mentioned by the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I want the hon. senior member for St. Peter to bear in mind that the position of the Government is such that we have got to get money from whatever source we can get it. If we estimate that there will be a deficit of \$3 1/2 million at the end of this year, it means that next year, in the normal course of events, that deficit will be about \$4 million. We cannot remain in the red forever and the only way in which to get out of it is by the expansion of the national income. If we have a deficit of \$4 million, we have to increase our gross domestic product by about \$20 million a year in order to get out of the red, and at least, this country should obtain another \$3 million or \$4 million a year from tourism by the Government's attempt to expand the trade and bring more people and money here.
8.10 p.m.

What is the point of spending money to expand trade and providing more accommodation, and what is the point in trying to bring people here if when they come you are letting them leave with the money they brought here? We therefore have no other recourse than at least now that we are faced with these stringent difficulties to adopt stringent measures in order to cope with the situation. It appears to me, Sir, that the opinion of the House is that the Bill should be sent for further consideration to a Select Committee not necessarily to oppose its principle, but to ensure that enshrined in its provisions are the possibilities which prevent any misuse of this power or any abuse of the people who may be called upon to work on the days to which it refers.

We do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to resist these opinions, because we are just as concerned as the hon. members for St. Peter are in placing it beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt that we want just as they do to protect the interests of every person affected by this amendment.

We therefore do not propose to oppose the proposal to send this measure to a Select Committee. As a matter of fact, Sir, running through my mind at the time the hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke was the belief that he would be more concerned, because the Union had not been consulted in this matter, than anything else, because he knows as well as anybody else that in the operation of this Bill when it becomes law, neither his organisation nor any organisation would be more concerned to see to it that the interests of the clerks in Bridgetown were protected as we would be, and therefore since in his opinion he regards our non-consultation with the Union as an oversight, and the sending of the Bill to a Select Committee would afford the Union another opportunity of presenting their opinion on the matter, the Government proposes to agree to the sending of the Bill to a Select Committee for further consideration.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now sent to Select Committee.

Mr. SEALY: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to make it clear to the Hon. Leader of the House that I appreciate the remarks he made, but what was operating in my mind was not because the Union was not consulted. My Organisation represents the whole staff at Bata Shoe Company. None of the other members in here represent any interests of workers and they do not know the mechanics of dealing with these matters.

So far as the tourist trade is concerned, when we come to Committee I will tell the hon. member something and he may have a shock in his hands next year. Eastry House is one of the hotels which borrowed a lot of money from the Government, and they have refused to pay even the rates they borrowed at, and they will not be able to operate next year unless they come to terms with us. The Caribbee Hotel also will be affected. I am going to say what I used to hear the Premier say, I give to the hotel people and the Government early notice. There are some aspects of trade operating in this Island which believe that for some time the Trade Union has been working well with them, but I have given early notice to hotel people that unless they are going to straighten up, they are going to find themselves in a situation where they would not be able to operate, and no laws can make them operate because laws cannot make people work, and it is a matter of what people have in mind to do. I say that because too many people are running away with this hotel industry.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see any innocence in what the hon. junior member for Christ Church trotted out about the \$16 million to know how it percolates. I want to make it clear to the Minister that it is not a question of the Union not being consulted, but there is no justification brought forward to show that the trade in this Island is such that you have to open on Bank Holidays for these people to trade. It is only a matter of bringing people to Barbados and making them believe that you are at their whims and fancies. This is being done because the workers are not organised. If they were organised, you could pass all the laws you like in the sugar industry and in the Port, and if we said we were not going to work, no matter what laws you passed, we would not work. You could pass all the laws you like, but if we agreed not to cut canes, we would see how they would be reaped. I say that about the hotel industry because of the bogey which is being spread about here, but I am going to say more about that in other places to show the economy of the hotel industry. It is no wonder they roped off some of the people, and it is only when hotels rope off some members that they will realise the problems which they have to face.

The question that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House, I am asking the following hon. members to serve on this Select Committee:-

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown; the hon. junior member for Bridgetown; the hon. senior member for St. Peter; the hon. junior member for St. Joseph; the hon. senior member for St. Thomas; the hon. senior member for St. James, His Honour the Deputy Speaker; the hon. senior member for St. Philip, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, and the hon. senior member for St. George.

8.20 p.m.

REPLY TO QUESTION NO. 1

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give the reply to Oral Question No. 1 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is the reply to the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. George:-

The Premier is not aware of any widespread reports, neither have such alleged losses been reported to the Premier or the Financial Departments concerned.

STATEMENT re BILL TO MAKE PROVISION FOR IMPOSITION OF DUTIES ON SALES OF LAND

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to make a statement arising out of the introduction and first reading of a Bill introduced today to make provision for the imposition of duties on sales of land in areas where the Government undertakes or proposes to undertake substantial expenditure from public funds, to impose betterment charges on development of lands in such areas and to provide for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Notice of this Bill was given by the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour on my behalf today.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I wish to inform the Honourable House that it is considered contrary to the principles of the Land Development Duty Bill as contained in Clause 3 to apply it to the Deep Water Harbour area as the expenditure has already been incurred. This Bill will not therefore apply to the Deep Water Harbour but it may apply to any other area where the Government undertakes or proposes to undertake substantial development expenditure.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Now, Sir, I would like to address Your Honour on a question of privilege. You will remember, Sir, earlier today Standing Order No. 5 which deals with the adjournment and suspension of the sittings of this House, was not invoked. Now, Rule 3 of that Standing Order reads as follows:-

At 2.00 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall suspend the sitting until 2.30 p.m., and at 7 p.m., he shall again suspend the sitting until 7.45 p.m. provided that if, in his opinion, the business of the House could be concluded by a short extension of the sitting, he may suspend the sitting at 2.10 p.m., or 7.10 p.m. respectively."

Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to any ruling to which you may subsequently make, I would like to draw certain aspects of the Standing Orders to your attention because it may be desirable to go on for a short time beyond the ten minutes allocated in this rule in view of the fact that some hon. members live considerable distances away from this Chamber, and when there are any prospects of finishing the business of the day within, say, a reasonable time, let us say a half hour after, then it is highly desirable that the sitting of the House should continue.

I will draw to your attention three Standing Orders dealing with this. I have just read Standing Order No. 5, rule 3 and if you turn to Standing Order No. 19, you will see there "Notice of Motions" which reads as follows:

"Unless the Standing Orders otherwise direct, notice shall be given of any motion which it is proposed to move with the exception of the following:-"

Then they tabulate ten motions of which you do not need to give notice and under No. 9, you will see that there is an exception which says:-

"a motion in respect of which notice has been dispensed with under Standing Order No. 25 (Dispensing with Notice)".

Then, if Your Honour turns to No. 10 of the same Standing Order No. 19, you will see that a motion for the suspension of a Standing Order put with leave of the Speaker is among the exceptions. And if you turn to Standing Order No. 62 — Suspension of Standing Orders — you will see that it is stated:

"A question the object or effect of which may be to suspend any Standing Order of the House shall be proposed only with the consent of the Speaker, either after notice given or after the expression of the general assent of the House."

Those are all the relative Standing Orders.

What I want to draw to the attention of hon. members is that the Standing Orders were made by the House for the governance of the proceedings of the House. In the same way that the Standing Orders were made by the House, I know that they can be broken. Certainly, they can be suspended at any time by the House.

The rule dealing with giving notice at the beginning of the day does not apply at all in any way to the suspension of a Standing Order but deals with the business which can be exempted from the provision of Standing Order No. 5 which can be entered upon at any hour and can be dealt with after the moment of interruption at 8.30 p.m.; but for the Suspension of the Standing Order, it is clear from the Rules that at 7.00 p.m., any member without notice, as long as the Speaker agrees and it is the general opinion of the House, can move the suspension of Standing Order No. 5 which means that the House may proceed after 7.00 p.m.

I consider this a question of privilege in so far as the transaction and expedition of Government Business is concerned. If Your Honour looks back to Standing Order No. 5, Rule 8, you will see this:-

"A motion may be made by a Minister, after notice, at the commencement of public business, to the effect that the proceedings on any specified business be exempted from the provisions of this Order, and if such motion is agreed to, the business so specified shall not be interrupted at 8.30 p.m. and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed.

That has nothing in my respectful submission to do with the Standing Order which deals with the hour of suspension. I only mentioned this because under the new conditions which are obtaining, a Minister can move the suspension of this Standing Order at 7.00 p.m. because the Speaker has authority to go on until 7.10 p.m. I am merely pointing out that it is not necessary to move the suspension of the Standing Order at the commencement of the business of the House at the beginning of the day, because that would make nonsense of the Standing Order. You are tied down by rules which give you the opportunity to indulge in a certain amount of flexibility. 8.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is entirely within the competence of the House to change the Standing Orders which the House has made. However, my interpretation of this matter is that if at any time before 7 p.m. of the clock, a motion is made for the suspension of any Standing Order, I would entertain that motion, but I could not entertain it after 7 p.m. of the clock has struck because between 7 p.m. and 7.10 p.m. there is the period provided only for such business which, in the opinion of the Speaker, could be concluded by a short ex-

tension of the sitting. There would be a continuation of business for ten minutes after 7 o'clock if, in the opinion of myself, such business may be concluded. However, after 7 o'clock has struck, it would not be a continuation or conclusion of such business by making a motion for the suspension.

I have already earlier in the session accepted a motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders before 7 o'clock but today 7 o'clock has struck. We were all oblivious of the fleeting passage of time; 7 o'clock had struck and that being so, I did not feel that I would be justified in allowing a motion to be made after 7 o'clock for the suspension of the Standing Orders.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I agree with Your Honour's ruling, but the impression which was being mooted around today was that at the beginning of the day's sitting notice of the suspension of Standing Orders would have to be given. If a Minister starts to make a motion before 7 o'clock and 7 o'clock strikes that, in my opinion, would be business which would be continuing.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City was addressing the House then.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand what happened.

LEAVE TO LAY REPLY TO QUESTION

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to lay the Reply to Question No. 22 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is entirely up to the House to agree or disagree to that at this stage. There is apparently no objection and therefore the Hon. Minister may proceed to lay the reply to the question.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 22 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in connection with the services rendered by the Choir for the Animation of the Sick.

Mr. SPEAKER: We met at 3 o'clock p.m. today but in future when we do meet, at the normal Question Time which is 2.30 p.m. of the clock, I hope hon. members will be ready to lay their replies.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw that reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister who asked leave to lay that reply is now seeking leave to withdraw the reply which he has laid; and unless there be any objection leave will be granted the Hon. Minister. (After a pause) Apparently there is no objection and leave is accordingly granted the Hon. Minister to withdraw the reply.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I take it that the Reply will be expunged from the record.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I now beg to withdraw the reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The reply is withdrawn.

The Order Paper having been fixed;

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, I would like to say that I am afraid that hon. members will have to come back here on Wednesday next. The Government desires next week to deal with the question of the increased remuneration of the Police and therefore we are requesting a sitting of the House on Wednesday next. I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that Thursday would be a more appropriate day for our meeting.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That day may be appropriate for the hon. member but it is not appropriate for us because there is a Cabinet meeting on Thursday.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition and some of the members of this House will be out of the island shortly afterwards and therefore we want to get this matter finalised.

I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, next, 2nd May, 1962, at 2.30 p.m. of the clock, 8.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the Hon. Leader of the House concluded his address to the Chair?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I also want to notify hon. members that we are going to move the Suspension of the appropriate Orders in order to give Government the right to conduct Government Business alone on that day. It is a special meeting for Government Business alone, because we want to finalise Government Business on the Order Paper on that day.

With regard to the police proposals, we will endeavour to get them in the hands of hon. members as early as possible, if not in the ordinary manner, by special courier at the latest on Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the Hon. Leader of the House to try and get them in the hands of hon. members by the week-end to give them an opportunity to absorb them. Tuesday is a Bank Holiday and members may be doing their duty on behalf of the workers of this Island on that day, and I hope you can have them in the hands of hon. members on Friday and Saturday. We can see that the expediting is done.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is very kind of Your Honour, and we will do what we can.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, the Hon. Leader of the House anticipated the next sitting of the House and said that he is going to suspend the Standing Orders. I think what he means is that the next time we meet he is going to inform the House that he wants to do all Government Business, and would like private members to forego dealing with their private business. I would like to know, if that is the intention of the Government, if the Government can state when they propose to debate the question of the Federation. The Hon. Premier said that he was not going to enter into any commitments on this question until such time as we had debated this matter in the House of Assembly, and I want to give notice that it is my intention at the next meeting of the House to move the passing of a Resolution dealing with this imminent question of Barbados' entry into Federation. I feel this is a very current matter and is very important; it has been discussed in Dominica, and I do not see why Barbados should not discuss it. In view of the fact that Ministers are going to London, I feel that this Assembly should at least be aware of some of the broad tenets that are going to be discussed, because it is no longer a secret matter; it is a matter that should be discussed. I think it is an important matter to the Island and I am giving notice of my intention to move the passing of a Resolution at the next meeting of the House to deal with this question.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, 2nd May, 1962, at 2.30 p.m. o'clock, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.47 p.m.