
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16th July, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of the 9th July, 1963, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause*). Hearing no objection, I now declare those Minutes taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for three months ended 30th June, 1963.

An account of the Transaction in Rum in the Several Districts of the Island for the quarter ended 30th June, 1963.

Selected Monthly Indicators, February, 1963.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by various Post Offices to 30th April, 1963.

QUESTIONS

The following Notice of a Question was given:-

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

Is Government aware of the condition of the entrances to residences in the Braggs Hill-Alley Road districts since the repairing of the said roads by the Department of Highways and Transport?

2. If the answer to the above is in the (a) affirmative, will Government — in view of the fact that these entrances were removed by the said Department — take steps to have proper entrances placed in front of these residences to assure residents safety on entering and leaving?

3. If the answer is in the (b) negative, will Government take steps to investigate the matter, and make the necessary improvements?

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House whom I observe is not now in his seat.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Hon. Leader of the House is not now in his place, I am asking leave to move that Order No. 2 be taken as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to move that Order No. 2 be taken as the first Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. (*After a pause*). Hearing no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that Order No. 2 be taken as the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that Order No. 2 be taken as the first Order of the day. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", hon. members of a contrary opinion will please say "No", I think the "AYES" have it. May I remind hon. members that Parliamentary silence must not be taken to give consent?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to move this House into Committee of Supply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

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

12. 25 p.m.

HEAD 18 — POLICE

Head 18 — Police — was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 18 — Police — stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. members will see that this is a request for the sum of \$1,200 to replace a damaged motorcycle in the Police Department.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, \$1,200 is a big sum to pay for a motorcycle. I have never owned one, but it seems to be a grand sum. I would like to have some information on this matter. That is the only comment I would like to make. I know that it would be necessary to replace a motorcycle because it serves a very useful purpose — it can be used for quick dispatch and traffic control. I think that the Department will be able to get a motorcycle free of duty. If we were to add the duty to the \$1,200 the motorcycle would cost about \$1,400. I should like to have some information as to the type and cost of the motorcycle to be bought.

Mr. SMITH: I would also like to hear something about the matter. The explanatory note reads thus, "One of the motorcycles in the Police Department was damaged in an accident on the 25th October, 1962." If the motorcycle was damaged to the extent that it became a total loss, I would like to know what happened to the rider at the time of the accident? Did anything go wrong with him or with the motorcycle only? I take it that the motorcycle was insured. I would like to know what the insurance company has done about this matter. The Government is asking for \$1,200 to replace a motorcycle which was damaged, but we have not been told whether anybody was hurt. I would like the Minister to tell this House whether the motorcycle was insured, with whom it was insured, and what amount was paid by way of insurance. I would also like to know what has become of the rider. Was he hurt at the time of the accident?

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to know something about this motorcycle. One thousand two hundred dollars is a tidy sum to spend on a motorcycle. I would like to know what type of motorcycle it was. Was it a Harley Davidson, or some other expensive type of motorcycle? I would also like to know whether it was insured or whether it was a total loss to the Government.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to satisfy the requests made by hon. members, because they have all asked the same type of questions. First of all, Mr. Chairman, this motorcycle, at the time of the accident was four years and five months in service. It had done nearly 50,000 miles, 47,464 miles to be exact. It was insured, and the insurance value of \$490 was paid into General Revenue.

The people who know most about these things, in this case the mechanical staff of the Department of Highways and Transport, advised against repairing it since the cost would have been about \$365. They advised against it because of the age and the amount of work it had done, and the estimate for repairs should easily, when finished amount to \$100 or \$200 more. You can never tell what these things will cost until you have examined them thoroughly. For all of these good and sufficient reasons, it was recommended that the money to be paid into the Treasury and the additional sum of \$300 should be expended on a new motorcycle.

With respect to the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I am happy to tell him that there is no record of any injury to the rider of the motorcycle, and I am sure that he would be glad to hear that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Hon. Minister, but I would like him to investigate the case and let the House know whether anything went wrong with the rider. To begin with, I feel that it is impossible for a motorcycle to be

damaged to such an extent and yet nothing goes wrong with the rider. The Minister should have told us what caused the damage; he should have told us whether the motorcycle struck something, whether something struck the motorcycle and so on. The insurance company is paying out \$400, and this House is asked to vote \$1,200. The cost of this motorcycle would appear to be \$1,600. This seems to be a lot of money, and I do not know what type of motorcycle can be obtained for that amount.

From the time this Government took office, I have been asking the Ministers to let us know for what we are voting money. The explanation concerning this matter was rather vague. The information we received last should have been given to us in the first instance. We should have been told the cost of the motorcycle, the cost of repairing the damage, and what instructions had been given to the Government. We should have been told all of that instead of our having to ask for that information. When one is going to write a cheque for an amount of money, one should know how much money one is going to spend. We are writing a cheque here today and we should know everything about the matter. We should be told where the accident occurred, what caused the accident, and what happened to the rider. We should have been told whether the motorcycle smashed itself against something or something smashed the motorcycle.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has only told us that he wants \$1,200 to replace a motorcycle. After we posed certain questions to him, he gave us a reply but not a full one. I do not know how to believe that a man could ride a motorcycle and smash it completely without receiving injuries. Was it purposely done, or was he in the air when the accident occurred?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to enter this debate, but one cannot be facetious on a matter of this kind. I would not be a party to, nor would I associate myself with, anyone asking that an investigation be carried out in connection with this matter. If someone were damaged and we were trying to get compensation for that person, I would agree with it. I have heard a lot of unnecessary chatter in connection with this matter. The point is that we are asked to pay this money for a motorcycle which was damaged. The House is merely asked to pay the sum of \$1,200 to replace a motorcycle, and the Minister can say what type of motorcycle it will be.
12. 35 p.m.

Do not pre-suppose that there is no motorcycle which you can get for \$1,200. Therefore, Sir, my view of it is that the hon. member had explained and as regards this sort of analogy about insurance, anybody who has anything to do with business knows that if you have anything damaged which was insured, the insurance company is going to pay out to the value of one-third of what the new vehicle would cost. And that is nothing strange because the insurance company is going to pay you on the approved value of the article at the time it was damaged. We are not talking like ignorant people on the street who do not understand all the manipulations of an insurance company, that is to say, that if you had a motorcycle for \$1,200, and you had it for four years, and it had done 4,900 miles, that the insurance company's valuation for that is going to be the valuation of it prior to its damage, or notwithstanding that a new motorcycle of the same make is going to cost three times as much.

Now, Sir, this proposal is a very sensible one. If you have a motorcycle of the valuation of \$400, and it is going to cost \$300 for repairs after it had been damaged and that motorcycle had given you four years service and has done 4,900 miles, there is no point spending \$300 on that. You will proceed to buy a new one because there is a great difference in investing in the new one costing \$1,200 and an old one costing \$400.

I do not think it is unfair to give an explanation like that and you should not say that it is not a business transaction. When one says "where it happen?" and "how it happened?", that is the sort of thing which one would expect to be on a file but I do not think unless there is suspicion

about the type of accident and that it is not a true *bono fide* accident that you should pre-suppose that the accident was something manufactured or that there was some criminal intent about it. I do not think that the policemen in Barbados have any axe to grind with the Government or anybody. Therefore I cannot see that suggestion coming into anybody's mind. If the hon. member knows that something is wrong, come out and say so, but do not come with these vague sayings and throwing out suspicion. From what the hon. member has asked, it appears that he knows more than the Ministers know and that the Minister in charge is holding back something. If that is so, he should say so. If he knows some person should be compensated, let him say so, but the person is not involved in this matter with which we are dealing. I do not think the idea of how it happened, where it happened, should come into this debate. Do not ride a hobby horse on something like this.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the debate, but the last speaker said "if the accident was genuine". How are we to know if it were genuine? A motor-cycle is not a motor car that sometimes a motor car gets damaged and the driver is safe. Even on an ordinary bicycle and it comes into accident and throws its rider something goes wrong with the rider, even if it is only that his pants is ruined. A motor cycle seldom throws its rider without breaking his leg because it is heavy; it is something which is built of iron and other metal. Therefore, when that motorcycle was damaged as it was and the rider did not sustain any injuries, something must have been wrong. When something did not go wrong with the rider, that is the doubt which I have.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I really want to say that I never heard such confused arithmetic than what I heard today from the hon. member. The value of this motorcycle which we are going to buy is \$1,200, the depreciated value of the old motor cycle was \$490 and we are going to collect that from the insurance company. The hon. member is now saying that you arrived at the cost of the new motor cycle by adding the depreciated value of the damaged motor cycle and the money which we are going to ask today and therefore you get \$1,600. The hon. member is normally reasonably mentally alert, but it seems the opposite this morning.

The value paid for the insurance of the motor cycle has nothing to do with the cost of the new motor cycle. We are asking for \$1,200 which is the cost of the new motor cycle. The value of the old motor cycle was paid into the Treasury and that was the value of the damaged cycle after it was sold out by auction. Now, we are taking up \$1,200 to buy a new motor cycle.

Actually, the Police asked for a motor cycle equipped with wireless which would cost \$2,200. They asked for that because the motor cycle which was damaged was equipped with wireless, but the Government did not consider it necessary to buy a motor cycle for \$2,200 and we are only asking this House to give us one for \$1,200 not equipped with wireless.

As regards the other point which was answered by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, it does not necessarily follow that because a motor cyclist is involved in an accident that he is bound to suffer damage. There are numerous cases on record in which a bicycle and motor cycle were smashed to pieces and the riders escaped unhurt. I know of an accident in which a motor cycle was completely wrecked, the pillion rider killed and the rider unhurt. It appears as if the hon. member wanted something to happen to the rider but we are sorry we cannot oblige him with this accident. It appears that undertakers relish accidents where somebody gets killed but this accident happened so long ago that even if the hon. member relish accidents like that, he cannot benefit from it.

Sir, I do not think there is anything more which I can usefully add. I may say that we are actually making taxpayers spend less money for the new motor cycle than if we had agreed to the replacement of a motor cycle of the

type which was damaged. When it comes to our not giving information, let me tell the hon. member that when we were in the Opposition we begged for information and did not get it. Ministers from his Government sat down and absolutely refused to give any information.
12.45 p.m.

That has happened repeatedly in his time in here and the Hon. Minister of Education was at pains to give him all the information on the points which were raised; now the hon. member is saying that from the time we have been in office, he has been asking for information and we have not given it. Mr. Chairman, I know of no single instance in which a Minister of this Government has refused to give information to any questioner on any matter affecting the public interest. I therefore deprecate most emphatically any suggestion that we are guilty either of withholding information or refusing to give it when we have it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says that my arithmetic is confused. Here it is that the insurance company paid out \$400 odd and they are buying a motor cycle for \$1,200. They should only be asking us to vote \$800 at least. (Mr. WALCOTT: The money is in the Treasury.) Yes, but did the Minister say that at first? The hon. senior member for St. Peter is going to challenge me and protect the Minister but did the Minister say that at first? If he had said it at first I would not have said what I said.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has been a member of this House for so long that he ought to know that the Minister is not a man with a puzzling tin and you do not put money into the puzzling tin until you get back money. When money is paid out for damages, it is paid into the Treasury. If the Minister had come to this House and asked me to vote \$800 I would be asking him what has he done with the \$400? You cannot keep the money in your pocket and therefore you must come to the House for the total value of the article which you are buying. The hon. member does not know the very constitution of Barbados and the financial arrangement whereby no Government can sell an article and hold back the money and then come for the difference. We do not hold any differences in here, so that the hon. member has shown complete ignorance in this matter. I have not come out to the defence of the Minister, as the hon. member has said, but to the defence of commonsense and Parliamentary procedure which every hon. member is entitled to know.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member is Almighty God. He knows everything.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I object to those remarks, because in this Chamber you cannot bring in such phrases. It is for you, Mr. Chairman, to make the hon. member withdraw what I regard as unparliamentary remarks which are made in this Assembly. This is not the tamarind tree in St. Joseph. He cannot use those phrases in this House of Assembly and therefore he will have to withdraw those words. The use of those words are against the Rules of this House and May's Parliamentary Practice says that you cannot invoke the Deity in this Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am on my feet. I will withdraw the word "God".

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member has to withdraw all the words.

Mr. SMITH: I withdraw everything but the hon. member is almighty.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member cannot use that remark either. If he does not know what "Almighty" means....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to deal with the Resolution and not with any personality.

Mr. SMITH: When the Hon. Minister introduced this Resolution he said that he was asking for \$1,200. He never even mentioned the valuation until I asked the question.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member seems to forget that it was in response to his question that I rose to make the point that the insurance money had already been paid into the Treasury, because that is what he wanted to know.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it is not always that an insurance company pays out money at the same time. That is to say that you have a motor car damaged and you have to wait until the insurance company pays you; but at the same time you have to get a motor car. If you are buying a motor car for \$1,200 how am I to know that the insurance money has been paid in or anything of the sort? I would not know that; and the hon. member says that I have been in here long enough and I do not know the constitution. Well, the hon. member knows everything, and he likes to put things in his way. However, I still maintain that if we had been given the explanation in the first instance I would not have had to raise my voice for one moment in connection with this Resolution. I had to ask the necessary questions in order to get the information. I still maintain that something was wrong with the rider of the motor cycle.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to get into any combat with the hon. member because it is patent that the hon. member is just giving an ordinary, simple exhibition. We have many areas for this melodramatic exhibition which we get from the hon. member occasionally. Here this is a simple matter; there is no arithmetic in it. When I was a boy, it used to be said that easy lessons are good for dunces. If you are adding and then you are subtracting what you are adding, what are you going to do with the hon. member? If I know everything, I have no apology to make for paying strict attention to parliamentary procedure because I have been elected to come in here and to know things. All of the things I am going to endeavour to know. No Minister or Government official can be allowed to hold insurance money and pay out the difference. What is most uncharitable is that the Hon. Minister of Education is one of the Ministers who will always give full explanation of matters and he was very courteous to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. However, it seems that courtesy does not mean anything to the hon. member for St. Joseph. It would appear that the hon. member is suffering from a little bit of an obsession.

The question that Head 18 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
12.55 p.m.

Head 19 - Fire Service - was called.

HEAD 19 - FIRE SERVICE

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 19 - Fire Service - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 29 - TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

Head 29 - Town and Country Planning - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 29 - Town and Country Planning - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. GODDARD: This Department is becoming a most important Department of the Government of this Island. This is something that we have been clamouring for all along, and we have been trying to put things right so as to regularise the irregularities that Barbadians have been perpetuating for many years. Wherever you turn you can hear complaints of hold-ups of applications for new buildings, renovations, extensions and so on because the Town and Country Planning Office, apparently, is inundated with work. This

Department needs streamlining, and something should be done to speed up the applications now lying in that office. If the Department is allowed to remain as it is, from frustration alone, many persons, both Barbadians and visitors to this Island, will refrain from doing the things they want to do in the matter of building and renovating houses; either changing their homes or building new houses and especially business houses.

It is necessary to go through a rigmarole procedure in order to get things done in that Department, and one has to go there a number of times in order to get things straightened out. A lot of time is consumed travelling to and from that Department, and several people are not prepared to get things, which they consider minor, put right. I trust that this additional officer will be able to streamline and speed up the development in this Island. It often happens that when the size of a Department is increased, things become bogged down. I hope that will not happen in this instance. This officer, I understand from the Addendum, will be dealing with applications in a more direct way, and he will have to go through a lot of correspondence when one makes an application to that Department. It takes ten or twelve days to get an answer to a letter sent to that Department. You may get a notification that the application has been received, but that is not a reply.

If the appointment of this officer will result in the streamlining of this office so that people will be able to get their applications dealt with quicker, I will agree with it. However, I will not agree with it, if it means that after this officer has dealt with a matter it will have to be sent to someone else. This officer should be able to say "yes" or "no".

I have been negotiating for one application for about nine months and it has just been approved. Any person who has not the "knowhow," or is unable to employ an architect or a planner in order to submit the necessary application, will find it most difficult to get things done. I hope that the appointment of this officer will mean an improvement in the existing conditions. I also hope that this change will release the Town Planner and enable him to zone the Island in a way that people will know what to find in certain areas. They will be able to know that a certain street is a commercial area, another part of the colony is a residential area and that another part is for residences, hotels and so on. When that is done, people who are looking around for spots of land for developing business activities will know exactly where to go.

This office should be in a position to advise prospective developers as to the most suitable areas to go. I know that with the appointment of this officer it will be necessary to provide more room in the Department. It would be necessary to extend the building, because it is very congested at the moment. I believe that the Town Planner will have to move out of there and go to a more commodious office. This type of work involves a lot of paper work, so it will be necessary to make certain extensions to the existing building.

I commend the Government in doing something in this matter, and I hope that it will result in improvements between the public in general and the Town and Country Planning Office.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think I have had more to do, in my capacity in the municipal area, with the Town and Country Planning Office and the Officer in Chief than any other member in this House with the exception of the Minister concerned. At one time - I think the hon. members who were here at the time will remember that my strictures were rather severe upon this particular officer and the Department in general, but at all times, I made it clear that my party was insisting that the Town and Country Planning Department should remain. We advocated for it long before it was brought into operation. I have never been afraid to say what I feel and how I feel about anything. I said at that time that I found the officer in charge of the Department somewhat over-zealous like most architects and planners, but I could not say that I have found him in any way corrupt. Had I found that to be the case, I would have said it here and the Ministers would have had to get up and defend it. If I had said anything like that here, it would not have prevented my return to this House. I can

honestly say that he was merely over-zealous. Since then, with the experience he has gained in Barbados during the time he has been here, he has come around to the views of some of us. While we have not tried to slander him, he has come around to the way we have been thinking all along. Of course, from the time he started, he wanted to turn the whole place upside down. However, when he came up against a stone wall and met some of us who had to deal with the applications, he had to change his approach.

I am happy to see that the Government is now doing everything possible to expedite the matter of applications, because, from the statistics which we have had, it has been proved that the percentage of people employed by Government of big schemes is still much less than the combined percentage of those employed by private enterprise — I refer to artisans, carpenters, masons and helpers. You want to encourage people to invest money by building houses and improving conditions in keeping with the economy of the Island where people grow up and endeavour to enlarge their houses.

1.05 p.m.

These things have been held up for so long that they have aggravated the situation in Barbados. I am happy to think that the Government has come down with this Resolution for the purpose of expediting that matter, but the Hon. Minister in charge must answer me one or two questions. Since the inauguration of the Town and Country Planning Department, you have hired clerks for doing clerical work in that department and you also have inspectors for seeing that your instructions have been put into operation. Now, you say according to this Resolution: "In order to ensure an efficient and expanding development controlled service, it is considered necessary to engage the services of a Development Control Officer on the staff of the Town and Country Planning Office on a temporary basis in the salary scale \$4,728 — 8,040." I said that I had some knowledge and my colleague was singing no solo when he spoke of the things which happen at the Town and Country Planning Office. Let us bear in mind that the Town and Country Planning Act applied only to the municipal area at first. It is true that you have been only in power for 18 months but I think we all have agreed that the Town and Country Planning Department has come to stay.

Will the Hon. Minister in charge tell me if any steps have been taken to select such suitable qualified candidates for sending abroad for taking courses, or a course, of this nature? I ask that because we have reached the stage where this department has been in operation for the past five or six years, therefore it is about time if you are streamlining children in your secondary schools, that you should have boys who are naturally bent this way.

I know that opportunity was taken to send one man because I was instrumental in removing him from an office where he was used just for his academic ability but his best services were not given to the country. That youngster on his own went to England and qualified because he liked this type of work. He is back in the Island.

What I would like to know from the Hon. Minister in charge is this. You say that this Development Control Officer would be employed on a temporary basis in the salary scale of \$4,728 — 8,040 and that this officer will be responsible for dealing with all development applications, appeals and enquiries and also for advising local authorities and other bodies on all matters of development control while at the same time releasing the Town and Country Planning Officer and his assistant for more work on development planning.

I would like the Hon. Minister to explain what are the duties of Mr. Stevens' deputy. You say that it is necessary to have the services of a Development Control Officer who will be responsible for dealing with all development applications, and so on. You also have an assistant whom I understand is qualified. As I understand it, you do not have development and planning unless you have a government scheme and unless you have applications. I want this clarified. Development and planning as we have it here would

mean that you have it on a government basis and you are going to relieve the Planning Officer and his deputy to do these things. I wonder if it is that you are having all these applications and all the like matter of private individuals which really are matters of development and planning for this particular officer to deal with, and you are going to relieve the Town and Country Planning Officer and his deputy from looking into those matters. If that is so, let me make this abundantly clear. No one officer, no matter whom we appoint, can deal with those applications.

Sir, I should like to know if the Government, or the Minister in charge of this portfolio, thinks that it is proper and the time is ripe for you to make a selection from within the Service or from a secondary school of youngsters who are this way bent for taking out a course in this branch of work and coming back to fill this position. I notice that you have apprentices and the like. I wonder if some of these apprentices were sent out on courses. That is what Government must do in this respect.

Sir, I am supporting this Resolution but I do want some information on this part of it. I too believe that the office occupied by this department is terribly cramped. Only a few weeks ago we had a meeting there and I know of the circumstances and conditions with which that department is faced in this matter. I must confess that the officer, Mr. Stevens, is very courteous, but I think he is over zealous about town and country planning and his views are more in keeping with those of a big country where the householders or the freeholders can more than afford to do what he tells them to do than the people of Barbados. His courtesy is somewhat appreciated by us — and when I say us, I mean members of the City Council, because we have to meet him on occasions whenever the various applications for planning which come within the municipal area are being discussed.

May I say here, that while this is being done, I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me if there is any difference of opinion between the Town and Country Planning Officer, the Director of Medical Services, and the Adviser from World Health Organization relative to the planning units and the development in this respect. I would also like him to tell me what steps the Ministers of Government are taking to bring about some reconciliation or seeing to it that you get a compromise on the statistics which are put up by one body. I say that for one reason. In the absence of a compromise if you bring in this officer or any officer from any country, even a Solomon, you are still dealing with people who have sent in plans and there is a plan which has been sent out by you which has not yet become law but which is being adhered to and worked on. The City Council is doing everything to cooperate with this department relative to the water system and the building of houses within certain zones, but I say, if there is a difference of opinion among the specialists — and when I say specialists I mean the Director of Medical Services, the Director of World Health Organization, and the Director of Town and Country Planning — and because of that these applications are being held up, I say this quite advisedly because the Hon. Minister must have all the facts, get those specialists around a table and have that matter settled so as to avoid this delay because it is keeping artisans and such people out of work.

1.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, like my colleague, while I support this matter, I do hope that on the next occasion when we come here the Government will be coming down with a Resolution making provision for sending one or two or more young Barbadians with the necessary ability and the flair for planning, drafting and the like to some big country where they can be trained and then come back here to fill these jobs. I always feel that people from the metropolitan areas should come and help us with their knowledge in certain respects; but as long as you have the necessary ability here, it is best to draw upon that ability and use it. After a period of five years it is my opinion that we should not have before us a Resolution for appointing somebody on a temporary basis but that we should have somebody in training for the purpose of taking over in this respect. I hope that the Hon. Minister has noted everything that I have asked and that he will be able to say what the true position is.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should like to make a few remarks. This is more or less in the form of a query because I am somewhat unhappy since the note to this item does not fully explain the matter. The note says that it is considered necessary to engage the services of a Development Control Officer on the Staff of the Town and Country Planning Office on a temporary basis in the salary scale of \$4,728 — \$8,040. I have had quite a good deal to do with the creation of this Department, and when we started off to appoint the first officer we knew what it would entail. You can well agree with me that sooner or later, having regard to development in the north as well as in the south, we will know what we should have. We started with one officer and a typist and we were trying to put the whole island under the control of this Department but it entailed very much. If you were to examine what is set out here, do you think that one officer is capable of handling all of this? I believe that there are a number of applications reaching that office for development and if we are to carry this Department forward I would like the Hon. Minister to explain why he has elected to bring in this officer on a temporary basis.

It is clear from what has been said that the building which now accommodates this Department is too small and one can envisage a department which is attending to applications from the north as well as from the south, and it must entail quite a lot of travelling for one officer to cover the whole island. We could probably talk for hours on this matter but I do not intend to say more than what is absolutely necessary at this stage. I want to curtail the time now and I am merely asking the Hon. Minister to explain why it is that they are going to appoint this officer merely on a temporary basis. We are in Committee at the moment and I would not say anything more at this stage; I would merely enquire why it is that this officer is to be appointed on a temporary basis.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, the present staff of the Town and Country Planning Office consist of the Town and Country Planning Officer, the Assistant Town and Country Planning Officer, a Senior Inspector, four Inspectors, two Long Grade Clerks and two Stenographers. When this Office was started or from the time it was opened its operation covered a large area and from the figures you will see that there is the need where the Town and Country Planning Officer himself should concentrate more on office work as most of his time was being taken up in going outside. This Officer for whom we are now asking will relieve and help considerably in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a considerable increase in the number of planning applications reaching this office over the past three years. There were four hundred and ten applications received in 1960, 757 in 1961 and 794 in 1962. Development control is now the prime factor of the office and we are implementing a policy which will be of little value unless it is properly related to the plans for the future development of the island. The Town and Country Planning Officer has pointed out that it is absolutely essential to maintain and extend development control and in view of the fact that there is an increase of work in that office he has asked for the creation of this post of Development Control Officer on the Staff so as to relieve himself and his assistant for full time work in development planning in conjunction with the United Nations expert who will arrive soon in this island.

It is very essential to have the staff and quarters to suit the extension of the requirements of the island. We have just a few weeks ago, by means of a Bill, got extended for another year the period for temporary development planning in this island and within a few months we hope to come down with full legislation for the carrying out of the duties of the Town and Country Development Planning Office throughout the entire island. With regard to the question asked by the hon. senior member for the City about somebody leaving the island for study to become a Town and Country Planning Officer, I should like to inform the hon. member that the Town and Country Planning Officer himself gives lectures to some of the boys at Lodge School at the present time and training is being carried out at the planning Department with the Staff.

Mr. MILLER: Perhaps the Hon. Minister did not remember my question with regard to the temporary appointment of this Development Control Officer.
1.25 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, at present, we have no defined legislation; it is merely an interim control and it is for that purpose, I presume, it will remain temporary until legislation has been provided for the entire Island.

The question that Head 29 — Town and Country Planning — stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$10,860 do now pass.

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

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

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

AMENDMENTS FROM OTHER PLACE re TRADE UNION BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 under Government Business be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to consolidate and revise the law relating to Trade Unions.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave, at this stage, for the Hon. Premier to take charge of Order No. 1.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, perhaps, I should first clear up what may be considered as the constitutional priorities for dealing with this matter. As far as Your Honour is concerned, this may be an act of supererogation, but as far as the general public are concerned they may not be aware of the procedures which may ensue after an amendment has been returned to the Lower House by the Other Place.

The new Trade Union Bill was passed in this House, was duly sent to the Other Place, and was returned to this Honourable Chamber last week with certain amendments which the Government regard as fundamental to the principle of the exercise of trade union rights in a territory such as this. At the time of the introduction of the Bill the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour and the other members of the Government Party spoke expressing their views and making it clear that what this Government was doing was merely implementing a promise which was made to the electorate at the time of the General Election in 1961.

The members of the Other Place with all due respect, deference, and what may be regarded as a high regard for

their private capacities, have displayed a remarkable degree of ineptitude in dealing with this matter. I make no apology for saying that. If we accept that this is a democratic Assembly and should pass such laws as are necessary for the good government of the territory over which we have the honour to preside; if we were sent here by what can be considered as an overwhelming majority at the time of the General Elections as an endorsement of this policy; if the members of this Government have considered this Bill which was passed in this House and it is not something which was sprung on the people overnight, then it would be very difficult to understand the anti-Jacobean attitude of the people in the Other Place who seem to be in fear of the revolution taking place. They do not understand the revolution which is taking place among the people of these Islands.

In 1913, in England, we had the first Trade Union Act. In 1926 there was a general strike, when Mr. Winston Churchill, whom God preserves, or the Home Secretary, had a serious issue to deal with. We all know what happened on that occasion. We know how things turned out, and we know the high feeling which generated at the time of the general strike. We know that Sir John Simon had taken the principle of the opposite party to model himself, and one of the leaders in another party still rejoices in the sobriquet of Sir John Simon.
1.35 p.m.

As a result, an Act was passed by the Tory Government making peaceful picketing illegal.

The reason why I have gone into the history is this. Peaceful picketing has never in British Common Law in my considered opinion and the opinion of eminent jurists been considered illegal. There has not been a single decision of the British High Court in England, or any decision of the House of Lords or of Her Majesty's Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, declaring that peaceful picketing is illegal. In 1927 the Tory Government in England because of its fear of what I describe as the uncleanness of the masses and because they thought they would be overwhelmed, passed an Act repudiating the Trade Union Act. It took the Labour Party in England some twenty years before they could redress and set back the common law position which was the position that the law maintains today in Barbados.

Peaceful picketing outside a person's residence is not something which is going to be vouchsafed to Trade Unionists in this Island as a result of this Bill. This is a right which is enjoyed by Trade Unionists all over and enjoyed at the present moment by the people of this Island. What we are merely doing in section 39 of the Act is enshrining the right of the Trade Unionists to peacefully picket on the appointment of the Trade Union or the individual employer. We are merely making it abundantly clear for all workers as we made it abundantly clear to agricultural workers and to domestic workers who now enjoy this right.

It is therefore remarkable that so much confusion should have arisen, not only in the debate in this Chamber but by the pronouncements by members of the Other Place, and perhaps by the only trade union member in the Other Place. I should not be personal but surely it is a sad reflection on the standard of trade union education in this country that the only member in the Other Place should go against "peaceful picketing at or near a place where a person carries on business."

Sir, I made it clear on the motion for the adjournment last week that the Government was not prepared to accept the amendment which was sent by the Other Place, but I have consulted with my hon. colleagues and contrary to the popular protestations generated by the last Government which was in power when they wanted to kill a Bill and said that you had to wait until after prorogation, I am personally advised — and I am sure that Your Honour will rule me out of order if I am wrong — that the best procedure is to try to persuade the members of the Other Place that they should have a second look at the amendments which they have made.

Therefore, after consultation with the authorities which are well known to Your Honour I have come to the conclu-

sion in moving the consideration of the amendments to the Trade Union Bill by the Other Place that we should disagree with the members of the Other Place and ask them to agree with the Bill as it now stands. I am also further advised that if the Other Place declines or refuses to comply with us that we cannot raise the matter at this present session again and the only procedure we can follow is to ask for prorogation of the Legislature and bring back in the Bill after that with the minimum of delay.

Sir, I do not think I should speak at any length on this matter because I have expressed my views on peaceful picketing and have given a full history of the legal recognition of a trade union and how from time to time attempts have been made to whittle down the common law.

Sir, the motion which I am going to make which I hope will be seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Peter is as follows:-

The House of Assembly
to
The Honourable the Legislative Council

The House of Assembly has the honour to inform the Honourable the Legislative Council that by a unanimous vote the House of Assembly disagrees with the amendment made to Section 39 of the Trade Union Bill by the Honourable the Legislative Council for the following reasons:

1. The amendment is illogical.

The Bill gives to domestic servants and agricultural workers the right to organize themselves in Trade Unions with full enjoyment of all the rights given to Trade Unions by the Bill. The effect of the amendment is to deprive these two classes of workers of the right of peaceful picketing which under the section is granted under specified conditions to all members of a trade union since the employer's place of business in relation to these classes of workers is also the employer's residence.

2. The right to picket peacefully is a common law right. If the amendment is not withdrawn the House of Assembly may decide to eliminate Section 39 altogether leaving the common law right intact without safeguards.

3. The Trade Union Bill was one of the issues specifically put to the electorate at the General Election in 1961 and embodies the clear decision of the electorate.

The House of Assembly respectfully invite the Honourable the Legislative Council to withdraw the amendment.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that and in doing so I would do it with a little more vehemence than the Hon. Premier. I would say that this is a classic example and it gives us the opportunity to state that the Other Place in the twentieth century context of political development is a twentieth century political anachronism. The time has come when we have to tell the people that the Other Place is not the place to run a country and when people of their thinking had control of this country we could not even get a Trade Union Bill on the Statute Book.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember that in 1938 when the Royal Commission presented its report that it could not be published even at that time owing to the crisis which the world was passing through. But if you were to look at page 198, paragraph 22 of the Report, you will see this written:-

"Successive Secretaries of State for the Colonies have spoken publicly of the need for the encouragement of trade unions in the Colonial Empire and from time to time over the last decade they have made representation to the Colonial Office in the West Indies drawing their attention to the desirability of facilitating the development of trade unions. Despite this and the repeated statements of the present

Secretary of State that Your Majesty's Government would welcome the establishment of trade unions, we were unable to discover that any real step had been made until quite recent times to assist their forms and development." 1.45 p.m.

In paragraph 23 it goes on to say this:-

"One explanation of this may be that the influence of powerful vested interests has stood in the way; whatever may have been the cause, the fact is that even today the obstacles to the successful working of Trade Unions have not been removed by legislation in most of the West Indian Colonies."

The members of the Other Place want to bring back the mentality of 25 years ago. They were outmoded by a Commission and regarded as not in consonance with what the country is still protecting. We have spies in a State, we have good people in a State, we have lepers in a State and we have mad men in a State. If you produce an idiot in a Trade Union that may be what can be regarded as being in the Trade Union and before the day of expulsion dawns you try to give a little death struggle. The hon. member must be aware that his contribution in the Other Place is drawing to an end. A member of a Trade Union would get more publicity from what he says than if an employer had said it. If, for instance, a dog bites a man, there is no news in that; but if a man were to bite a dog, the newspapers would say that a man bit a dog in Broad Street. (Laughter.) What is more serious is that the Members of the Other Place are amending the Bill to suit their own ideas of peaceful picketing. They have amended the Bill and they have used the words "Other than where he resides." We have passed this Bill with Section 39 reading as follows:-

"It shall be lawful for one or more persons, appointed by the trade union, the firm or the individual employer directly concerned in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose or peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

The Other Place have now come out with this classic; they have amended this Section to read as follows:-

"It shall be lawful for one or more persons, appointed by the trade union, the firm or the individual employer directly concerned in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person works or carries on business or happens to be other than where he resides, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

Do they understand what is the meaning of the words "Or happens to be"? When you say that, what do you mean? There is a whole law on that phrase; that phrase means that if a strike is on and I know that you frequent a place, I can go there and persuade you not to come out to work. These members want the privilege to dismiss a man without any just cause forgetting that the employer and the workmen are persons. An employer can dismiss a man who then cannot pay the house rent for himself and his family, and that employer can withdraw to his sanctuary; that employer does not want anybody to know that this employee is aggrieved by his dismissal. You do not pass a law saying that you cannot send and take out a man to his work. If you acknowledge the fact that there is a trade dispute you want to acknowledge all the requirements to make a strike effective if a trade dispute has taken place.

In my view, this amendment has no meaning today. You have this spectacle in Barbados where, 25 years ago, you had a total voting power for the whole island in small numbers. In the last Election, a member who lost his seat in the constituency of St. Michael received more votes than the total voting population in Barbados when the Report of the

Royal Commission was written in 1938. At that time you did not have 7,000 voters on the list for the whole island, but here a man received 7,000 votes in St. Michael and he lost his seat! There was a time when 6,000 people were on the voters list for the whole island.

The Other Place is a part of the old system and in 1963 they are trotting out these things as if they are still in power. I say that this is an anachronism today when we have Adult Suffrage. If we have to seek their suffrage to be returned here, what is the use of saying that we have politicians in one breath and now they are telling us what legislation we must pass? Mr. Speaker, it is time that that sort of thing must go, and this is an example to show why it must go. The Party in power told the people that they will pass this Bill if they get into power but the members of the Other Place are now saying: "We will show you that it will not be passed." I am submitting that this is now the time to stop them and we should not wait for a bigger crisis to take place. It is time that we abolish the Other Place; the smugness which the Barbadians have been carrying on has no meaning. Progress has not come about in this country because of the presence of the Other Place but because the broad masses of the people have declared that they would elect men who would come and report to them. Progress is not at all because of the presence of the Other Place, but the Other Place want to fight some rear guard battle and it has to become some sort of an anachronism. I am not allowing anybody to have the effrontery to turn down a Bill like this. We are amending the Trade Union Act as it stands in Barbados. Today the Other Place is saying in one breath that the Barbadian is more developed than other people in the area, but yet a developed Barbados is so undeveloped that it cannot enjoy a law which is enjoyed by our colleagues in other places. You say that Barbados is the salt of the earth and anything which is better than Barbados you can only find in Paradise. 1.55 p.m.

Why should we get this sort of treatment? The time has come when you must tell the Other Place and the public that nobody wants to put them out of power. If we were to hold a referendum, we will know whether or not the people want them to remain in power. If the Other Place do not want to be a rubber stamp we could utilise the building because there is a shortage of office accommodation in this Island. I am merely saying this in the context that they had the effrontery to turn down or amend a Bill which the elected Government has passed. This has never happened in Barbados during the last 25 or 30 years. It must be remembered that we are elected members and we have a Cabinet Government. The constitution under which we are operating is sending the members of the Other Place crazy -

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to refer the hon. senior member for St. Peter to Standing Order No. 26 (9):

"The conduct of Her Majesty, Members of the Royal Family, the Governor-General of the West Indies, the Governor, Members of either House of the Legislature, Judges, or the performance of judicial functions by other persons shall not be referred to except upon a substantive motion."

This is merely to warn the hon. senior member for St. Peter against making what may appear to be a personal attack during his exuberance.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am referring to political madness within the context of the constitutional development where you can have people in the Other Place doing a thing like this. At the moment they are signing their own death warrants. These are not the old days when there was no adult suffrage or Cabinet Government. I want to say that some people may want to preserve their seats in the Other Place. When they can no longer maintain the confidence of the people in this country, they still want to have the honour of dying with the name the Honourable So-and-So. Barbadians are not immuned to these honours. When you call a member of the Other Place the Honourable So-and-So, he likes it because some of us in here are referred to as Mister. Anyway, that is only a connotation. When you introduce a

member from the Other Place as the Honourable So-and-So, he believes he is something more than human.

We may have several changes in an independent territory, but I am satisfied in my mind that this amendment by the Other Place is not only an amendment to the Trade Union Bill but it shows definitely and positively that the members of the Other Place are not aware of the constitutional changes that have taken place in this Island, and they want to regard this as something great when they can pass it and amend it.

I have the greatest pleasure in supporting this Resolution. My only regret about this Resolution is that it has not positively stated that steps should be taken immediately to investigate the abolition of the Other Place.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being two o'clock, this Sitting stands suspended until 2.30 p.m.
2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that answers have been laid to certain questions of which the earliest is No. 50 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, whose vacant seat I observe.

No. 119 is in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael whose seat likewise, this afternoon, is unoccupied. I am further advised that the answer to No. 112 is ready and that is in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip — to enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, lands and Fisheries — this question is to be found on page nine in the middle of the left hand column of the Order Paper, but, inasmuch as the hon. senior member for St. Michael is now about to take his seat, I would mention to him that the answer to his question No. 119 to be found on page ten on the right hand side is ready. If the hon. member is ready to put his question, he may do so.

DISSATISFACTION IN POLICE FORCE

Mr. SEALEY: To enquire of the Hon. Premier:

Is the Minister aware that there is grave dissatisfaction among the members of the Police Force as to their general conditions of service, especially with regard to the method of promotion, and the standard of discipline required?

2. Will the Minister cause an investigation to be made into the general administration of the Force at his earliest convenience?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Hon. Leader of the House does not find it convenient.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I find it most convenient to reply. The Reply is as follows:-

"I am aware that there has been expressions of dissatisfaction with some matters affecting the conditions of service and some members of the Police Force. I would say, however, that promotion in the Force is governed by the Police (Promotion) Rules, 1954, which provide for a qualifying examination and a Police Selection Board consisting of certain gazetted officers. Before this Board submits any recommendations, all officers of the Force are consulted and the name of every member of the Force who has passed his qualifying examination who in his zone of selection is considered. The recommendation of the Selection Board in the case of members of the Force of the rank of Inspector and below are submitted to His Excellency the Governor for approval. In the case of personnel above the rank of Inspector, the recommendations of the Board go first to the Police Service Commission and finally to His Excellency the Governor for approval.

Discipline in the Force is controlled by the provision of the Police (Discipline) Regulations, 1961, and I am not aware that there is any dissatisfaction with "the standard of discipline required" in the Force.
2.40 p.m.

The answer to the second question with regard to the investigation is as follows:-

"I do not consider a formal investigation into the administration of the Force to be necessary, but alleged causes of dissatisfaction are being examined."

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Leader is aware of the fact that although certain members are selected and have to sit the examination that they are only certain names which go before the Commission.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister does not have to reply if he does not wish to do so.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am aware that every single member of the Police Force who passes the qualifying examination has his name submitted. As I have told the hon. member, the name of every member who passes and so long as it is his zone of selection, is submitted. There are two phases: (1) you have to pass the qualifying examination, and (2) you must be in the zone of selection. Those things having been effected, then your name is sent up for promotion.

Mr. BOXILL: I would like to know from the Hon. Minister if he is aware that there are certain policemen, because they did not comply with an order for selling tickets for raffles of cars and other functions, who have been victimised. I would also like to know something more of this promotional system.

Mr. SEALEY: I would also like to know if the Hon. Minister is aware that certain members of the Barbados Police Force have been told by the head of the department that if they have been in the Force for ten years and have got no promotion that their names for promotion are as good as if they were in the wastepaper basket.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: So far as I know, the selling of tickets have no qualification to anybody for promotion in the Police Force. By no stretch of the imagination is that connected with Police duties. If the hon. senior member for St. Thomas can bring in a case in which a policeman has been debarred from promotion because he refused to sell tickets — and I do not know for what purpose, if the hon. member means selling sweepstake tickets —

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Hon. Leader of the House would give way, I suppose the hon. senior member for St. Thomas can qualify that.

Mr. BOXILL: I mean tickets for the raffling of the police car.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It would be a very extraordinary situation, if I can assist in this respect, for the simple reason that in no way under the rules governing the organization of the Police Force is the selling of tickets for the raffling of cars by the Police a qualification, and certainly not a reason for promotion.

If the hon. member has an instance where a policeman has been debarred purely because he refused to sell raffle tickets, we should be very pleased to investigate it and bring the information to the House. If he has this specialised knowledge at his disposal, make it available to the Minister who is in charge of Police. If the hon. member wants these facts investigated and redressed, he should be courageous enough, and the policeman involved should be loyal to the Force, to provide all the documentary evidence and information to enable us to investigate the case and see that it does not occur again because the Police Force can be brought to a very low level if promotion is conditioned by the selling of raffle tickets.

The hon. member is aware that we are encouraging qualifications of the candidates for entry into the Police

Force, and therefore, Government would not condone any situation in which officers in responsible positions in the Force victimize a policeman because he refused to sell raffle tickets. I am insisting, if the hon. member is not repeating wild, irresponsible rumours, that he should make all the information and evidence he has available to us.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that no hon. member would merely repeat what the Hon. Minister calls wild, irresponsible rumours.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I assume nothing like that but I am merely presuming that so long as this information is available, it would be given to the Minister in charge. I go further and say that if it is not given, we are justified in calculating the hon. member's statements as wild, irresponsible rumours.
2.50 p.m.

Mr. SEALEY: Is the Hon. Leader of the House aware of the fact that certain policemen have been transferred all over the country because they made cases where certain members of the Police Force did not approve?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to the category of cases or to the category of persons?

Mr. SEALEY: I am referring to the cases for prosecution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I am not aware of any such cases. The position is this. The Minister in charge of the Police is the Hon. Premier, and the Hon. Premier may not be in a position in which he may have heard the report which the hon. member has heard. I want to say that the mere hearing of reports is not enough. If the hon. senior member for St. Michael, in what he regards is the proper discharge of his duties to his constituents, would give us chapter and verse of what he is saying, he can rest assured that the information will be treated as confidential, that nobody would be victimised and we would pursue all the investigation which is necessary in order to discover whether the allegations are justified or not, and in order to ensure that similar cases will not occur again, if they have occurred.

Mr. SEALEY: I thank the Hon. Minister very much.

LOANS FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS EMPLOYED AT DODDS PLANTATION

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question to which the Reply has been laid is question No. 112/1963 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip, and it is enquired of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:

Is the Minister aware of the fact that agricultural labourers employed at Dodds Plantation, St. Philip, do not enjoy the facility of being granted small loans at Christmas-tide, as are granted to agricultural labourers employed on privately owned plantation?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister take appropriate action to make such loans available at Christmas-tide to agricultural labourers employed on the said plantation, to be repaid not later than the end of March in the following year, from the sale of their canes, or by deduction in instalments, from their weekly wages?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. The Attorney of Dodds Plantation has now been authorised to make loans to employees on the plantation on the same basis as the Government makes to casual employees at Christmas time.

Mr. WEEKES: I thank the hon. member for the Reply which he has given.

DISSATISFACTION AMONG MEMBERS OF THE POLICE FORCE BECAUSE OF WORKING CONDITIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question to which the Reply has been laid stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the growing dissatisfaction among members of the Police Force because of working conditions, and the attitude of certain officers towards the constables?

2. Will Government enquire why it is that the Bridge, Hastings, Brittons Hill, Worthing and Oistins Stations have not got a constable of 20 years' standing?

3. Will Government please set up a commission to investigate and recommend better conditions for this most important segment of the Island?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

1. I am aware that there has been some dissatisfaction. I am not aware that the attitude of certain officers towards the constables has been called in question.

It is not the practice to ensure that any particular Police Station has a constable for twenty years' standing on the staff.

After full discussion with the Police Association, I do not consider the setting up of a Commission necessary but attention is being given to the source of dissatisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to add a further statement at this stage, I should like to say that the Hon. Premier, who is in charge of the Police, actually met a delegation from the Police Association early in March. I think it was on the fourth of March when the Hon. Premier met the delegation and a record of the meeting between the Premier and this delegation from the Police Association has been sent to the Police Commissioner for his comments. Also, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas might be good enough to make us a little more readily aware of what is meant by the second part of his question, that is, "Will Government enquire why it is that the Bridge, Hastings, Brittons Hill, Worthing and Oistins Stations have not got a constable of 20 years' standing. As I told the hon. member in the Reply to the Question, it is not the practice to ensure that any particular Police Station has a constable of 20 years' standing. The Government does not quite understand what is the reason for this part of the question.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, May I reply to the Hon. Minister?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must ask a question, is the Hon. Minister aware that so and so.

Mr. BOXILL: Very well, Sir. Is the hon. member aware that this question was asked on the 29th May, 1962? Is he also aware of the fact that at the time when I asked the question, I made one mistake and that is by including Oistins Police Station when it should have been the Black Rock Police Station? When I mentioned a constable of 20 years' standing, I mean a constable who was in the Police Force for 20 years at a particular station and that was not the case with the exception of one Police Station.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, what I do not understand is the reason why there should be a constable of 20 years' standing at any Police Station.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas would care to ask if the Hon. Minister appre-

ciates the necessity for a constable of 20 years' standing because of so and so. *(After a pause)*. Apparently, there are no more supplementary questions to be asked nor are there any other answers to Questions laid, so that we will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business.

3.00 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution to approve the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance.

When this matter was last discussed, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking. I do not know whether that hon. member has concluded his speech.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not think Your Honour is correct.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry, this file is rather difficult. The Hon. Leader of the House seconded by the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing moved that further consideration be postponed. The Hon. Leader of the House may now resume. I apologise for my error.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: My recollection is that the Hon. Minister of Education was actually speaking at the time when we moved the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was on the 11th June, but on the 25th June the Hon. Leader of the House moved that consideration be postponed. In view of the fact that the Hon. Minister of Education was absent from the Island, he may now resume. The adjournment was agreed to because the Hon. Minister of Education was out of the Island on business.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, when I left off speaking on this motion, I was on the point of developing my theme to show that the criticisms made of the Government in general and of the Minister of Finance in particular on these matters have rather less substance than they appear to at first sight. The criticisms such as we have heard from certain members of this House and which we have heard in the last few weeks broadly boil down to the charge that the imposition of taxation by the Minister of Finance was unnecessary and unwarranted. This charge, ironical enough, was made with the greatest vehemence from the inception of our political life by people who have been in a position to know more clearly than anybody else whether the imposition of taxation is in these circumstances justified or unjustified.

I refer, of course, to those members of this House who are members of the defeated political party as well as their supporters and colleagues outside of this House. If proof were needed not only of the shallowness of the criticism but of the rightness of the stand taken by the Minister of Finance, that proof, strangely enough, is to be found in the words of the last Premier of the Island in 1961 when he stood on the floor of this House and introduced what he then briefly referred to as his Budget Speech. Although I pause, Mr. Speaker, to say in doing justice to the last Premier that he never pretended to make a Budget Speech. His very words in his introductory remarks on an occasion two or three years ago was that he was no economist; he could only add and subtract. Although certain members in the House now were not in the House then, there are still a few members present who heard when he said those words and commended himself most generously for not being able to do more than add and subtract. *(Laughter)*. But even with that narrow competence of being able to add and subtract, he was still gifted enough to be able to outline to the House what his fears were for the then financial year. He painted a very sorrowful picture indeed.

I am saying all this doubly to emphasise on hon. members that when this Government said that it found an empty treasury it was not trying to frighten people or trying to

create a bogey man; the Government was merely describing literally the truth as members of the Government saw it. We now have justification for saying certain things in the light of the words and actions of those who occupied the seats of Government before us.

Dr. Cummins in 1961, started off by making three or four very significant pronouncements in this country. The first thing he drew the attention of the Government to was that after the two preceding years, that was the two years preceding 1961 and 1962, there has been below average groups and in consequence of that fact, the then Premier of the Island was forecasting a drop in revenue.

The second blood-curdling announcement which the then Premier made to the House is that he foresaw that by 31st March, 1962, all of the general revenue balance would have been spent. Mark carefully, Dr. Cummins could not at that time foresee that by 31st March, 1962, he would no longer have been the Premier of the Island because he was speaking in the year before March, 1962. Although he boasted of his competence only to add and subtract, he could not in March, 1961, be aware of the dwindling support which his party had been experiencing. Apparently, his ability to add and subtract did not extend to the harsh realities of political life. However, he was honest enough to say in March, 1961, that by March, 1962, all the general revenue balance would have been spent.

When the present Minister of Finance tells you that the general revenue balance had been spent not before 31st March, 1962, but before December, 1961, there is no reason to doubt him because the former Premier and Minister of Finance at the time had predicted that by the 31st March of the following year there would have been no money left in the general revenue balance. For once, we can take Dr. Cummins' prediction as being accurate except that the general revenue balance disappeared not in March, 1962, but before December, 1961.

3.10 p.m.

The third startling pronouncement which the then Premier made was this. In projecting his deficit which he knew the country would certainly enjoy, he said that he did not take into account any money which would be required to pay salary increases. In other words, what Dr. Cummins was saying in March, 1961, was; if I am telling you here and now that the General Revenue Balance would be all spent next year and if I am telling you that I foresee that we are having a deficit, I am still further telling you that instead of the normal deficit, there is another deficit because I have not taken into account the salary increases to Civil Servants.

The fourth startling pronouncement which he told you was this. I have the record of his speech before me, but I am not wasting the time of the House by reading it because I remember the incidents so vividly.

Dr. Cummins also reminded the House that there was the likelihood that later in that year the Public Treasury would be called upon to bear the expenditure of compensating displaced workers at the Port. Bear in mind that he was speaking in March, 1961. The Port had not been handed over to the Governor-in-Executive Committee yet. Mr. Costain, or whoever it was, was still in control yet in March 1961 Dr. Cummins said that there would bound to be some inroad in the Treasury, possibly to pay compensation to displaced workers at the Port.

Now, Sir, you would have thought that if the Minister of Finance, or the member of the Government introducing financial matters, could be bold first of all to predict a deficit and secondly to say in addition to that they would be further inroads made into the Treasury for various services and thirdly to say as he says in this debate of March 14th, 1961, and this is where I quote him:-

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member speaks of not quoting what was said in a previous debate which took place in March, 1961, does he want hon. members of this House who would not have been here then to know exactly what it was?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I did not remember that the broom had swept so thoroughly. There are definitely more new hon. members in the House now.

As I was saying, I was going to quote from Dr. Cummins' speech of March 14th, 1961. If Your Honour would look on page 305 of the Official Debates of 1961, you will see it stated:-

"Further to the financing policy it is estimated that the whole General Revenue balance will have been spent by the 31st March, 1962."

He went on to say further:-

"As the amounts required for compensation to Port Workers and for increases in salaries of civil servants have not yet been determined, these are not yet included in the Estimates."

And further he stated:-

"I repeat that as it is desirable that the economy should be allowed to catch its breath, I do not propose any new taxation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are all in politics and I suppose that we should not allow our actions to bear too hard against our political opponents if through incompetence they refused to face up to facts which are inescapable but it makes me wonder how despite the fact that 1961 was the election year, it could have been feasible for some person in charge of the finance of a country to predict a level of a deficit which would run into \$4 million or \$5 million and at the same time saying that he was allowing the economy to catch its breath, therefore he does not propose any new taxation.

They are trying to make capital out of the fact that we have had to apply the remedies which they were too cowardly to apply in their last year of office. It is just as in the Middle Ages when there were certain soldiers who cut their thumbs off so as to prevent themselves holding a rifle and so as to escape going into battle. So too we have had these political poltroons. Had they imposed the taxation which was necessary, they felt that they would have lost the Government. Future events have proved that argument to be fallacious. They did not impose the necessary taxation and yet they have lost the Government, therefore it would have been better if they were so alive to the needs of their country to rescue their country from the blot by imposing the taxation which was necessary and to let the elections have their course. If they had made provision to put the country on a better footing, they themselves, if they were re-elected to the Government, would have been able to resume the Government with ease. They are attempting to make the people of this country believe that we are somehow or the other, making impositions on them which have no right to be.

I for one have said to the Hon. Premier that he had two choices both last year and this year, either to impose the taxation as he has done with the consequences which would flow from that, or to refrain from imposing it and let the country follow what consequences it might. It was not a hard choice for the Hon. Premier to make, because no man with a sense of responsibility would shrink from temporary unpopularity in order to push forward and unite his country. Therefore, if the Hon. Premier has taken that choice of imposing the necessary taxation even to the point of suffering temporary unpopularity, he has taken the only honourable choice which a responsible Minister of the Crown would take. Therefore, we reject this unwarranted, unskilled manoeuvre which is being entertained by some of our political opponents in their attempt to prove that what has happened since they have gone out of power is not the consequences of their own actions. All that we have done, Mr. Speaker, is to take the country from out of the morass which they have left it. I cannot speak for the Hon. Minister of Finance except to say this. I am sure that if the circumstances warranted it in the future and if the conditions of the country were such that it could only be rescued by an

appeal to its citizens to make further contribution, I think he is courageous enough not to shrink from that consequence however temporary he may be unpopular.
3.20 p.m.

As I say in politics you always have to make the choice between cowardice and forthrightness. A man who cuts off his thumb because he does not want to hold a weapon is nothing more than a poltroon. The man who prophesied that the revenue balance would be spent before the end of the financial year and said that he would not lay on taxation because he could not offend the electorate, is a poltroon and he has not done you any good. The argument that they could have laid on taxation and close the gap but they would have lost the Government is a useless argument, because they have lost the Government anyhow. Moreover they are telling us now that they will cut taxation when they get back into power. Now they did not impose taxation in 1961. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that the words which I could easily use would be banned by parliamentary usage because I have a good description for them but the words would be unparliamentary, unfortunately. You have people who tell you that they cannot lay on taxation because the economy must catch its breath. Imagine, Sir, that a doctor is called to a patient who has little or no heart beat and when the doctor is asked: "What will you prescribe for the patient?" he says: "Nothing, I am allowing the patient to catch his breath." That is exactly what that doctor has done and I would not be so impudent as to infer that that was an experience which was taken from another country and applied to this country, but it was futile and callous in the extreme.

Mr. Speaker, no economy can catch its breath unless somebody pumps something into it. No economy can rectify itself unless dynamic measures are taken to rectify it. A man who says he is not going to do anything is as much responsible for checking the economy as if he is taking measures so to do; but now they are promising that it is their desire to lower taxation. In 1961, Your Honour, the Hon. Premier, the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the hon. senior member for St. Philip and I, pressed upon the then Premier, Dr. Cummins, the necessity for increasing the amount of the Old Age Pension and he answered us in his Budget Speech by saying that to ask him to increase the old age pension would show that we had no conscience; because for him to increase the Old Age Pension with a deficit budget, with all the trouble that the economy was going through, he would have to cut out certain services and it would be for him the choice of increasing the Old Age Pension or curtailing essential services, and he emphasised his reply by saying that all those who asked for an increase in the Old Age Pension did not have any conscience. Yet that was a time when he did not see his way to increase taxation although the state of the economy required it. You have the same people, who, because they know that they will not be called upon to govern the people again, through the comparative security of that knowledge they are being reckless enough as to suggest that they will lower taxation if and when they get back into power. The people will not take them seriously but some people do not understand that this phase through which the country is going is as a result of the country's finances controlled by them. There are those who do not understand that when we said we found an empty Treasury we were not telling any nancy story. Dr. Cummins would have discovered that if the people of this country had called him back to power. Just as you had the locusts crawling in times gone by, you have the locusts crawling in the country now trying to persuade people that things could have been better.

For the past ten years you will notice it was said that the economy of the colony was buoyant. It was only in the last year before they went out of power that they changed their tune, and the slogan was: "Steady as you go." But all the time the economy was floating up and down like a cork. It was only when Nemesis was upon them and they could not get themselves disentangled from the net into which they had been entangled that they changed their tune. They had a surplus of over \$2 million. The year 1952-53 was an important year. I was not then a member of this House, but that was the year when they introduced the Revenue Equalisation concept sending half of the revenue

balance every year out of the colony for investment in foreign parts. The sending out of that money out of the colony was the breaking up of the relationship between myself and them, as they will tell you. I regarded it then as an unwise and extremely silly conception and policy, but nothing that we told them then bore any effect on them because the one who has been resurrected from obscurity and who is going up and down the country holding public meetings, was in charge of finance then and he told us that the Officer who was administering the Government at that time, Sir Alfred Savage, wanted to have things like that. Since he wanted to have them so and since Sir Alfred Savage wanted to have things so, the 14 or 15 of us wanted them otherwise, Sir Alfred Savage was right.
3.30 p.m.

All of us who knew anything about public affairs and the management of public finance warned him solemnly. I took the trouble of preparing an article which I sent to the *Beacon* entitled "Take the cash; let the crop go," warning the then Government that ten years from that time they would be running this country into the mess as they have done by their stupid policy.

Mr. Mapp, who comes in here from time to time to pilfer and derange the records of the House, instead of publishing the article as he had a right to do since I was a member of that party seeking an expression of my views of the party as it was then, in an effort to suppress it, showed it to Sir Grantley Adams and asked him whether it should be published. Sir Grantley Adams said that he should not publish it, but it was subsequently published in the Recorder which was then existing.

I challenge anyone to go into the Public Library and read that article again and see whether what I had written has not come true, alas, to the detriment of the people of this Island. Let us look at the amount of money they have filched from the people of this Island in this 10-year period:

In 1952-53, \$2.3 million; 1953-54, \$2.6 million; 1954-55, \$3.6 million; 1955-56, \$3.1 million; 1956-57, \$2.9 million; 1957-58, \$1.4 million; 1958-59, \$3.38 million, 1959-60, there was a surplus of \$9,000; 1960-61, \$3.35 million. All of this adds up to \$22,776,444. You do not have to be a financial expert to calculate the damage which these figures represent. The damage to the economy of this Island which these figures represent is very great. The moment you look at this \$23 million, you will realise how much money has been spent. A dollar in circulation can serve as many purposes as you want it to serve. Let us for argument sake say that every dollar could be used for five different purposes. When they spoke about unemployment - I will talk about that in a moment or two. Let us assume that instead of extracting this overtaxation from the people - you have to call it over taxation because Dr. Cummins in 1961 admitted that the gross national income of the country was declining, yet, at the time that the overall economy showed a change, the Government of the country could say that it was overtaxing the people.

The people who now talk about the misery in which the country finds itself and who want to push the blame on us are only wasting their breath. This party can prove that it is not in any way responsible for what has taken place, and every conceivable measure it takes is designed to remedy something which need not have taken place.

In the years when the national income was declining and the economic position of the country was deteriorating, that irresponsible Government took upon itself to bleed the people of this country white. The Government did not extract this \$23 million over-taxation in order to plow it back into the economy. It did not extract this money in order to extend the social services even in the year 1960-61 when it had \$3.3 million surplus. That was the year when Your Honour will recall that you spoke for nearly two hours in an effort to get Mr. Cox to see that the woman who scrubbed the court house at District "E" should be given four cents more. You had to spend about three hours trying to convince him when they had \$3 million. They said that unless they

found oil, they could not increase her stipend. They could not increase old age pension but over a ten-year period they could filch from the pockets of the people of this Island \$23 million in extracting taxation and they sent nearly all of it abroad. They have brought the finances of this country to the most perilous condition. They were lucky to escape with their merry lives without having an angry mob of disgruntled citizens chasing them, and they still have the effrontery and impudence to stand up on platforms and say that when they get back into power they will lower taxation.

I do not hold that against them because you can whistle in order to gain courage in the dark. There is no chance of their coming back into power. There is nothing to stop Sir Grantley Adams and Mr. Cox from thinking up about ten different things all at once - all sorts of things fall into empty heads. But this Government must keep a sober and intelligent outlook in order to remedy certain evils, and we will not be brow-beaten merely because some disgruntled politicians out of office want to make political capital of a situation which they themselves have created. They are not now only pressing their attacks against us but on our financial policy. Their attacks range far and wide and they pretend that had they been in power, they would have done differently.

3.40 p.m.

What the trouble is with them, Mr. Speaker, is this. They are so astonished to find that all the things which they said they could not do are now being done, that they have to fall back even on the more dishonourable argument that we have no right to do them.

I understand that some of them are saying that I should go back to school. As I have said before, that is a handsome compliment. I have been taught; I have taught and I am always willing to learn. Some of them have neither the inclination nor the ability to learn or to go to school the second time. I can go back to school and profit by it. Other people cannot.

Sir, there is something sinister to all of this and the sinister part is that there exists amongst the people of this Island an unawareness of their status as citizens and the only reason why you hear all of this criticism is because the people of this country believe that the country belongs to somebody else and not to them. One day it will get around to the people of this Island that this is their country and they can play a positive part in it and the day that happens, nobody will be able to bring to them any nonsense about they should not pay for this or that. If it calls for a certain amount of sacrifice from the citizens of the island to keep the economy of the island going and to push it forward, then everyone should realise that he has a contribution to make to that and once you get the citizens of a country realising that somebody must impose the taxation on them and that you should pay your just dues so that the economy of the country would go forward, then you will get rid of the unscrupulous and ignorant politician.

Therefore, Sir, it is not that this Government is in trouble because of the criticism. This Government is in no trouble at all. While I do not know what other or further taxation measures may come from the Minister of Finance this is what I can say for him. He would not shrink from applying the remedies where they are called for if the situation requires it and he would hide behind no fear that he would lose an election by more or less doing his duty. You win an election when the steps you have taken are in the country's interests and by bringing your energies into the hearts of the people and so making them see that co-operation between the Government and the governors is the thing which helps the economy of the country to go further. You do not hide behind making cheap and dishonourable capital and at the same time expect that you can bluff them of the part you have taken in the disgraceful affairs which they are experiencing. It needs no Solomon to tell you that such and such is the case and that if you have a deficit of \$10 million or whatever it is that you will have to make that up by calling on the people to contribute a little more.

They say on the one hand that the Hon. Minister of Finance should not have done this but they would be the first people to criticise him if he had done nothing at all to strengthen the economy of the country. They would be the first people, if the Civil Service did not get back pay in December, 1961 and if he did none of the things to which he committed the country, to be loudest in agitation against us.

Every financial commitment which this Government has to honour has been a commitment by them and a heritage. They cannot have it both ways. They should be glad that they are succeeded by a government which is not vindictive and spiteful and which is prepared to leave the unpleasantness with them even although their opinions differ from ours. They tried our patience and knowing what damage they inflicted on the country, they still want to hold us up to political ridicule as having done some things which are operating against the interest of the people. They are stamped not only now but forever as damagers of the economy of the country. They cannot escape the just retribution which would fall on them and which people in future will make on them for doing nothing to push forward the economy of the country.

They have taken money from the people of this island to the tune of \$22 1/2 million in extra taxation, in surpluses which they have not spent back or reinvested on the people of this country but the greater part of which they have sent abroad to bolster up the economy of other countries. Can anybody honestly imagine that if the Hon. Minister of Finance could get even as much as half of what they invested outside, even a quarter of it, that things would be as bad as they are? When last year we were forced with a section of our commitments which was taken over by them of not knowing what to do because of the lack of funds, we did not wring our hands or throw them up in the air and ask what to do. Nobody knows the headaches which not only the Hon. Minister of Finance but certainly every member of the Cabinet has in honouring commitments which have been taken over by the other Government. This House may even be asked to honour a commitment which was not a Government commitment at all. These are things which we have to keep among ourselves because being Ministers of the Crown we are under the Official Secrets Act. When the workers from the Transport Board were threatening strike action if they did not get backpay, although the \$45,000 which the Transport Board needed was nothing at all to do with us, as a government we had to honour the commitments of the Transport Board and the trouble is that without knowing from where to get it, we had to raise that \$45,000 by the next Monday morning so that the conductors and drivers could get their backpay. It is laughable that Government should have trouble in finding \$45,000. Mr. Emptage or Mr. Leacock would laugh at that, but it did happen to this Government.

Sir, those who criticise us do not have to worry themselves. When the Hon. Minister without portfolio, the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing and myself that weekend realised that if we do not get that \$45,000 by the next Monday morning something serious would have happened, Mr. Cox was still playing quarry in his house. He did not have to worry at all about it but we had to and that is the sort of experience we have been through.

I would like the people of this Island to understand, whether or not they want it, that one day we are going out of power. That is natural in a democratic age, but whenever that day comes anybody can come after us and examine our record and they would be amazed at the trouble we have gone through in this Island in not only caring the finances, but in seemingly conjuring money up from places and sources whose existence the last Government did not know, merely to save the good name of the government of Barbados but always almost in consequence of a debt which the last Government undertook, but did not honour.
3.50 p.m.

I want to say quite simply that there is no reason for the Government of Barbados at present to regret having laid on this taxation. The Minister of Finance was again well

justified last year in imposing this taxation as events have shown. We have a greater confidence that we will receive even greater justification at the end of this financial year. But, Mr. Speaker, suppose it were even to happen that having brought the economy of this island up to a more viable level, having strengthened it, having done all that it was necessary to do in order to bring about a more advantageous expansion of our trade and our industries, let us say that having done all of these things the Electorate still felt that they wanted another Party or another Government to administer its affairs! In that case, Mr. Speaker, we should still have left office with the proper knowledge that we have not squandered either the time or the money of the people of this island and also with the proper knowledge that any Government would say in another ten years from now, or whatever the period may be, that they have found enshrined something which is more lasting than the sinking sands which had been bequeathed to us by the past Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", hon. members of a contrary opinion will please say "No". I declare that the "Ayes" have it. This Resolution has now been passed.

RESOLUTION re ERECTION OF DISPENSARY IN ST. THOMAS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas:- To move the passing of a Resolution re the erection of a Dispensary in the parish of St. Thomas.

Mr. BOXHILL: Mr. Speaker, the consideration of this Resolution will not take very long. This Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the parish of St. Thomas has been without a dispensary for a very long time;

AND WHEREAS that such a dispensary would be of great benefit to the said parish;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Government make representation to the Northern District Council to find out the feasibility of erecting such a service to the community.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that about 50 years ago it was common knowledge to see a doctor in his buggy with round hat and handbag travelling on the highway and one had to wait for nearly two or three days in order to get that doctor to come to one of us when we happened to have fallen ill. Nevertheless, we were thankful for that, but today modern science has placed antibiotics and other things which we may have in the lines of medicine in close proximity to each one of us. I do believe, speaking under correction, that almost every parish, with the exception of the parish of St. Thomas and I think St. James, has a dispensary which is either located at the Almshouse or it is pretty close to the Institution. I would not say that it is economical for a person to set up a dispensary or a drugstore in these rural parishes because people like to come to town for their medical supplies, even if it is only for the drive. But if you were to erect a dispensary in a parish like St. Thomas, that would facilitate the neighbouring parishes like St. James.....

Mr. GODDARD: On a point of order. I would like to inform the hon. member that the parish of St. James has a dispensary.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order, that the hon. member wants me to hear?

Mr. GODDARD: The hon. member has said that the parish of St. James has not got a dispensary, but there is a dispensary there.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has been corrected.

Mr. BOXHILL: I said, Sir, that I was speaking under correction. However, there is some land in the vicinity of

the St. Thomas Almshouse and the erection of a dispensary there would facilitate not only the people of St. Thomas but those of neighbouring parishes or districts. Although the parish of St. James may have a dispensary, people may find it more convenient to go to Rock Hall than to go to St. James. Similarly, people in St. Andrew might find it convenient to come to St. Thomas and enjoy the facilities of the dispensary there.

A dispensary is as much needed as any service. It is not always necessary to have a doctor to prescribe certain medicines for people. If they get headaches they know that they can use Phensic or Whizz and the dispensary will facilitate many people who live in this area if they happen to fall short of these things. It would save people the trouble of having to go to Bridgetown by bus with all the it entails to get there, and by the time they get back home the person who was ill might be dead. If a doctor prescribes medicine for a person in St. Thomas that person has to go down to St. James for it and he may end up in Bridgetown. By the time that that is done you may have to bring along the undertaker. It is not that the erection of a dispensary would save anybody's life, but when anybody dies that person would like to die with the feeling that everything was done to help him to feel happy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to expound any more theories in connection with this matter. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution, I would say that this Resolution has been long overdue. It is surprising that in this year of grace the parish of St. Thomas, although for so many years it has been represented not only by a Premier of this country but also by a Minister, the people of St. Thomas have been deprived of a facility which other people have enjoyed.
4.00 p.m.

It is disgraceful that for so many years these people have been subjected to this disadvantage. I hope in the not too distant future they will be relieved of this inconvenience and that the Government will see fit to establish a dispensary in the parish. Land is available as the hon. junior member for St. Thomas mentioned in his remarks just now. There is land available obliquely opposite the almshouse. I think it is about one acre and it is owned by Government. There will be no difficulty whatsoever in the Government finding a site for this dispensary.

St. Thomas is the most central parish in the Island, and it would be good if this facility could be established there in order that the other parishes may be able to look upon it as a pattern or example. People in that area and in the parish as a whole will be able to go to this dispensary and purchase drugs as the people do in St. John.

There is a dispensary in St. John obliquely opposite the almshouse and people go there and purchase their drugs. We are merely asking this Government to remedy the situation in St. Thomas immediately as it is a burning shame to deprive the parish of this facility. The fact that there is land available should go a long way towards expediting this matter.

I beg to second this Resolution.

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

DOMESTIC SCIENCE CLASS AT ST. JOHN'S MIXED SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER: We will now proceed to the next Order of the Day standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John: To move the passing of a Resolution *re* the Domestic Science Class at St. John's Mixed Schools.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, it reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the Domestic Science Class at St. John's Mixed School has been closed;

AND WHEREAS because of the cessation of such classes young women in the parish of St. John have no opportunity to avail themselves of the training necessary to qualify for the scheme of emigration as domestics to Canada sponsored by the Government through the agency of the Labour Department;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government recommence such Domestic Science Classes as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, in 1961, this class at the St. John's Mixed School was discontinued. The reason given by the Department for discontinuing this class is that the applications received were not sufficient to permit the class to be continued. But if one were to examine the reason why the applications were insufficient an investigation would show the true position. This Class was operated for a few years. It was operated during the time of the last Government. The reason why, in my humble opinion, these applications were not sufficient is that the young women who availed themselves of the necessary qualifications had to remain at home while other people outside of the domestic science class were chosen and sent away. Unqualified people were sent away while the ones who had attended the domestic science class and qualified themselves had to remain at home.

Quite recently, several young women in St. John applied to join the domestic science class, and they were told that if they could find it possible to go to St. George they would receive the necessary training. If the Government had a school equipped with the necessary instruments, I see no reason why people from St. John should travel down to St. George where there are no transport facilities to take them home after the class is concluded. I believe that the place from which most of the people are carried away after training is the St. George's domestic room, so people like to attend that school.

4.10 p.m.

Even in my parish I am sure that one girl from my parish went to St. George and because she had the necessary qualifications she got a chance to go to Canada, but I do know that there is something wrong with that department. It is against the parish of St. John and the people there and that is why, in my opinion, none of the girls have had the opportunity to go to Canada. As I have said, in three years, they sent one girl although most of them had the necessary qualifications. Therefore, Sir, what I am really asking Government to do is to investigate thoroughly the reason why these classes have been closed and to try and get the classes recommenced.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this Resolution....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the passing of the Resolution?

Mr. LOWE: Yes, Sir. Speaking on this Resolution, it is a most surprising thing that within the Island of Barbados after the Government has found it fit to take the taxpayers' money and invest it in doing something for the people that out of the clear blue sky, there appear wreckers to close it down. I look at the whole matter of the closing of the Science Room at St. John as nothing else as a vicious attitude towards the community. I do not think in terms of emigration to Canada, America or any place as a salvation to the people of this country, but I feel that if the people of the Island pay their taxes and they have their children, it is but requisite and right that any government should see fit to see that those science classes are kept a-going so that the children of the various parishes would be able to equip themselves with the knowledge of preparing the necessary meals, even if it meant preparing them for their own homes whereby they could entertain people when they come from abroad.

Sir, I do not look at this matter only from the emigration standpoint. I feel this Government should do its best to revive these classes so that the children of St. John would have the same facility as the children of St. George

or St. Michael or any other parish where there is a science room. I go further. The Government should think it fit to establish a science room in every parish in which there is not one now in order to assist all the children of this community. It is but requisite that each and everyone of the coming generation should know how to prepare all the delicacies in the local art of cooking.

Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that I am supporting this Resolution. I hope that the science classes in St. John would be reopened at the earliest opportunity and also that science classes would be opened in other schools in parishes where there are no science rooms. Every girl should learn to cook and if you start while the bud is young, when it becomes ripe, it will be qualified in every possible aspect of the art of cooking. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding this Resolution and I am hoping that the Government would see fit to institute in every parish a science room in order to assist the children of this community.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have some strong views about these matters and I am going to express them. This Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the Domestic Science Class at St. John's Mixed School has been closed;

AND WHEREAS because of the cessation of such classes young women in the parish of St. John have no opportunity to avail themselves of the training necessary to qualify for the scheme of emigration as domestics to Canada sponsored by the Government through the agency of the Labour Department;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government recommence such Domestic Science Classes as soon as possible.

This is the General Assembly and what I am a bit concerned about with these Resolutions is that they are merely parochial Resolutions. Without dealing with the merits or demerits of whether these classes should be closed, do you mean to tell me that I as a member of the General Assembly should sit in and vote on the issue for the parish of St. John asking the Government to institute something in St. John when there are no facts before me to guide me?

I think hon. members should be aware that there are certain matters which are more appropriate for questions and certain matters which are more appropriate for Resolutions. A Resolution of the whole House should be in character something which reflects the island as a whole so that you can say that the House is voting on a matter which involves the island as a whole, for example, anything to do with the water services of the island. The Government controls the water services, so when you are voting on anything concerning the water services you are voting on something which concerns the water supply of the whole island. The same can be said of anything which affects education, but when you are bringing in a Resolution so that science classes in St. John should be recommenced, St. John's Mixed School is not more important than one in St. Silas, St. Simons or St. Christopher Boys' and I purposely say St. Christopher Boys' because you can teach domestic science to boys as well as to girls. In Ghana it is just as common to find a man cooking as it is to find a woman. 4.20 p.m.

What I would like to say is this; I do not think we should pass a Resolution of the whole House dealing with a matter for which the Minister of Education should be asked a question as to whether he is aware of the fact that the class at this School has been closed down and if he proposes to recommence the class at this School as soon as possible. A Resolution which is passed by the House in these days pre-figures that the Government is not in favour of it and you want to use the whole pressure of the House upon the Government. If this is a matter of parish pump politics which you would expect a new member to play, you can do so, but I think the time of the House — I say this without offence — should rather be used in passing a Resolution which should be of a

serious character to the whole island. I do not say that as to the parish which the Premier represents there would be a precedent for passing a Resolution for St. James' Mixed School against passing one for St. Silas School. I would not ask the Government to erect a school in Indian Ground or in Boscobelle; I would ask the Minister of Education a question about that. Hon. members should ask questions which are specific as to a need like this and not expect me to vote for a Resolution which calls on the Government to do something in St. John. I should not be expected to be asked to vote for such a Resolution because I do not know anything about it, and therefore I cannot debate the merits or the demerits of recommencing these classes at this School in St. John. I hope that the hon. member would not take this as any offence.

This is a matter which he can decide for himself, but I think that we are dealing with too many Resolutions now and they are, in character, parish pump Resolutions which have nothing to do with the General Assembly of Barbados but which are something to do with the particular member. I would not begin to ask a question about erecting baths and latrines in St. Thomas. Some hon. members have this sort of parliamentary indecency whereby they will go into other people's constituency and pretend that they are representing that constituency better than those who are the representatives. Why should I ask about the American bases in St. Lucy unless that matter affects the whole character of Barbados? I know that Your Honour and the Hon. Minister of Education would have this matter rectified. If you are not in the happy position where you are a Minister — well, I do not think we should have a Minister dealing with the erection of a bath, a standpipe or a post-box. I feel that these things should be dealt with by way of questions. If you are passing a Resolution in connection with a local issue you would be reducing this House to the status of a County Council. A Resolution passed by this House should be in character something which represents a national matter and not anything of local significance.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the hon. member who has introduced this Resolution has any reason to feel abashed in his action, although it is true that it refers to a particular parish. The Resolution itself has greater significance than that which is connected with the parish of St. John. Let me deal with the specific point first. It is true that the Ministry of Education under my direction now, has inherited this problem. This centre was closed towards the end of 1961 because it had lost its popularity, or so it was said, with the people in St. John. What was interesting to me is this: The lack of popularity which the Centre enjoyed had nothing to do with the instruction which was given at the Centre but it had to do with something which was ancillary to that. It appears that in 1961 there was some decision taken on the part of the students attending the Centre who felt that after having attended the courses, sat examinations and having passed them creditably, they were still pushed back in their selection for places on the emigration scheme to Canada. That, of course, had nothing to do with the Ministry of Education; but if you have a service being rendered in any part of the island and people feel that if they make use of it the consequences would not be advantageous to them, they may not be too much in favour of it.

Before this point was raised by the hon. member, my idea was, and I gave instructions, to have an advertisement go out again for students to attend this Centre. In answer to that advertisement, only six people applied for the course. When we put out the advertisement again this year, nobody at all applied. I have since taken the decision and given instructions that an advertisement must go out again, and as long as teachers are there whoever applies for this course should be taught and instructed, because it is not the fault of the people who are willing to learn, if other people are not willing to avail themselves of that opportunity. I have always given instructions to the effect that the widest publicity should be given to this matter to remind young people that they can go and make use of this Centre.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that it is now 4.30 p.m., of the clock, the time when the consideration of Private Members' Business automatically expires.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if it is the wish of the House perhaps Your Honour could allow me a few more minutes and we could dispose of this item. (ASIDES) Very well, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour pleases.
4.30 p.m.

REVERSION TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: We will now revert to Government Business. When the sitting was suspended at two o'clock this afternoon, there was under discussion Order No. 1 under Government Business in the name of the Honourable Leader of the House. The Honourable Premier had spoken, the honourable senior member for St. Peter had concluded his address, and the honourable junior member for St. George was about to rise.

Mr. MILLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We have listened with some concern and anxiety to the speeches of the Mover and Seconder of this Resolution, and I think that the members on this side of the Table have a contribution to make. I would like to begin by prefacing my remarks by saying what I think is still important, and it is to remind the House that on the occasion when the Bill was debated in this House I had supported it with my vote.

I should like to say that I was not at all happy when the Other Place elected to return this Bill to this House with an amendment. I am referring to the Trade Union Bill. With the modern outlook on trade union matters, I can see no earthly reason, at this stage of our parliamentary development, why this august Body, the Other Place, should elect to send this Bill back to us with an amendment.

However, there are other important factors to be considered. This is a matter of approach. When I use the term matter of approach, I am thinking of the attitude of the Assembly on an occasion like this. What we have to remember is that some of the members of the Other Place are probably living and thinking in terms of two decades ago, and the majority of them are people who have always resisted any movement for the betterment of the working class — especially trade unionism. They have persisted in this attitude up to the burning end, even when there was legislation permitting such an organisation. They have continued the fight relentlessly against the struggles of the socialist philosophy that is found in trade unionism where some measure of justice is provided for those who are employed and need some form of protection.

We also have to remember that the Other Place has been functioning for a number of years. The members of the Other Place also have their rights. If you elect to change the two-Chamber system, you must say so and work towards bringing that about. It is not only for traditional or conventional reasons that this second Chamber is with us today. We have to be honest and frank about our deliberations on this matter. We have accepted the Other Place for over 89 years. The history of this Council goes back to the struggles of Mr. Willoughby the then Governor. He surrendered when he was shot by the troops sent here by Oliver Cromwell. He surrendered on certain grounds. He felt that the old system of Government should be abolished, that the Governor should be the President of the Legislative Chamber and the Chamber should be elected every year.

We must remember that the first meeting of the Elected House of Assembly took place 311 years ago. These are things that are factual and cannot be easily changed. The first meeting of the Legislative Council was held in 1874, 89 years ago. We have been operating on a twin-Chamber concept of government probably 100 years old. If you want to convert the Other Place and make it a rubber stamp that is an entirely different matter, but the members of the Other Place are entitled to certain rights. If you rob them of certain powers, you will be making them a rubber stamp and you may not be able to attract anyone to serve in that Chamber. We must examine these things and discuss them

properly. It must be remembered that Pope Hennessey was responsible for bringing this Chamber into existence.

We know all of these things and we have accepted them. It is known that several Governments are now operating under the system of internal self-government, but they still elect to continue with the twin-Chamber system. This is a concept of a form of Government that has survived in the Caribbean. We must give these people certain rights. I do not feel that you should come here and threaten them in this manner. There is a procedure whereby you can remove them if you do not want them. I do not agree with what they have done in the light of modern thinking and the functions and purpose of a Trade Union in a society such as ours. You may have 100% of any population in a society such as ours who are church-goers and believers, but that does not mean that you must not have prisons because justice must be maintained. You must provide safeguards against these things.

To come here and present a document like this really shows that an ugly feeling exists. If this is passed and the people are chickenhearted they should resign *en bloc*. It is stated in the Resolution that if the amendment is not withdrawn the House of Assembly may decide to eliminate Section 39 altogether leaving the common law right intact without safeguards. This will only incite violence in a community that is developing and struggling towards independence. It is regrettable, that at this stage of our parliamentary development, these things should occur.
4.40 p.m.

Now, Sir, I would like to go further. There is precedent for it and I think, Sir, that you are familiar with it. Twenty-two years ago the House of Assembly passed a Bill which was rejected by the Other Place. Thereupon, the Government promptly prorogued the General Assembly for one week and brought back the Bill immediately after the re-opening and it was passed. The same thing occurred in the House of Lords in England. Of course, they can only delay legislation for one Session. I think you will remember that.

This is a cruel form of consulting the Other Place. These are things which I want to understand. Why should you violate the sound principles of democracy? This can only appear as uncouth because it is drawn up in a form of dictatorship. You can write anything in your Manifesto but it does not mean that the Other Place is bound to accept it. We were told that the bringing in of this amendment was put to the people and was in your Manifesto. You can put in your Manifesto that you are going to permit any airline company to land in Barbados but are you willing to open your Airport? Does it mean that the Other Place is going to accept it?

Sir, I sat and listened to the Hon. Premier attentively. He can say anything he likes. The members of the Other Place have certain rights. We know that they can delay legislation and we know that on prorogation you can bring your Bill back in. We must follow accepted practice. Where can we look other than to the relationship between the House of Commons and the House of Lords? Do we not accept May's which is the bible of the British Parliament? What have you done? You come in here and write a letter threatening the Other Place. I am not agreeing with that. I have voted for the Bill; I agreed with the Bill which you brought to this House and I still think that the Other Place should have examined the spirit and feeling of the people of the country before they amended the Bill but you cannot give them a right and then wring it out of their hands. Sir, the Other Place is going to ignore this Resolution which we are sending to them and that will be a great slap to Parliament. I am saying that it is improper. How can you have them if they are only to be a rubber stamp? You know that you can prorogue the Legislature until next Tuesday and come back in here with a similar Bill and have it passed. As I see it, notice of prorogation should have been given since last Tuesday. The Governor would be in duty bound to prorogue the Legislature and by your action, you would have been ascribing to the Other Place some elementary right.

Sir, the Hon. Premier has come in here today and has said "I, — I, — I." Nobody would want to go about it in this

way. This would not attract any responsible person. We know that they cannot throw out a money Resolution but this measure with which they have dealt is a matter which they have some right and you should respect their right. It is only in a dictatorship that you get this argument which we have heard today. Why not tear up the Constitution which we have had for 300 years and then look for some stupid thing? Abolish the Other Place. You can do that; but since they are here, my God, simple childish dignity would tell you that you cannot flout them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is using that phrase with due reverence.

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir, in all reverence. You come in here and say that you have it in your Manifesto, therefore you mean to say that the Other Place must rubber stamp it without comment. I am saying that there is a better way of going about it. You have precedent for it. Twenty-two years ago a Bill was passed in this House and the Other Place rejected it. The Governor prorogued the Legislature for one week and a week later when the House brought back the Bill, it was passed.

You can abolish the other Chamber. Do that, but do not come in here and write them a letter like this, and threaten that you are going to use the dogs. That is not the sort of thing which you would expect in a striving and emergent society. There is no substitute for right. Right has a power and force of its own and it is as stubborn as its record.

Sir, You have accepted the Other Place as a part of your Constitution. You had an opportunity to change your Constitution and abolish that Chamber but you did not abolish it. All through the hundreds of years of our constitution, we have been having this sort of trouble. You know that they are entitled to reject or amend but you also have precedent to prorogue and bring back.

Sir, I am not agreeing with the decision taken by the Other Place but that is the sort of reaction which you would expect from a rational political mind. But you are sending them a letter telling them that they must withdraw, as if they are boys in the yard. If they resign *en bloc* you cannot pass a statute. If they resign *en bloc*, nothing can be done until a new Council is appointed. They are part of our Constitution.

This House reeks with a type of dictatorship which is unknown to our people. You threaten; you tell them that if they do not agree you are going to do this. They have done a good job and they have done it for nothing. For the last 89 years they have been doing it. Nobody objected. Elementary decency tells us that owing to their position, they are entitled to certain rights and the only answer to what they have done and for which we have precedent 22 years ago, is to prorogue the Legislature. At that time the Legislature was prorogued for a week and as soon as the re-opening of Parliament, the Bill was brought back and passed automatically, the Other Place concurred, and the Governor gave his assent.
4.50 p.m.

You can go and request an amendment to the constitution and abolish the Chamber. You invite gentlemen to come and give up their time to serve the country and because they do not agree with you on the falsehood of your having something in your Manifesto....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, it is incorrect for the hon. member to say that it is a falsehood that you had this thing in your Manifesto. It is not a falsehood, it is a fact that this thing was in the Manifesto of the Government; the Government was elected with that in their Manifesto and the people knew about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Some time ago the Manifesto was made a document of this House and it may be referred to.

Mr. MILLER: I was thinking of that Mr. Speaker, but we have the hon. member like Jack and the bean stalk story....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, apart from the diatribe in which the hon. member is indulging and his reference to Jack and the bean stalk, it is a positive falsehood for the hon. member to say in this Chamber that it is a falsehood, that this Measure was not in the Government's Manifesto. It is a fact.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am still awaiting the point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am saying that this proposal was in the Manifesto of the Party which is the Government today, and the hon. member is saying that that is a falsehood; but I am saying that this statement which was made by him is the falsehood. The electorate knew about this proposal.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that that was not in the Manifesto of the Government; I said that because it was in the Manifesto, it was not automatic to the other Chamber. The hon. member is enamoured with the story of Jack and the bean stalk. I say that I believe that this proposal is in the Government's Manifesto, but because that is so, it does not mean that the other Chamber becomes a rubber stamp to anything which they put in the Manifesto. Earlier I gave you the same reason. We have agreed to continue with a bi-cameral system of Government and this could be changed. You could amend this system with the help of the Colonial Office. You can abolish that Chamber by means of your constitutional methods. We accept the conventions of the House of Lords but this is a matter of time and we have precedent for it. Twenty-two years ago a Bill was passed and it was rejected or amended by the other Chamber, the Governor prorogued the Legislature and then the Bill was passed and assented to by the Other Place and came into law in the new Session. I am simply asking that this procedure should be observed and respected. We understand the delaying tactics of the other Chamber.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member has said that all that is necessary to be done is to prorogue the House, pass the Bill again and return it to the Other Place and they are compelled to pass it. (*ASIDES*). The hon. member repeated that about five or six times during the course of his speech and it is not correct to say that. There is nothing in the law to compel the Other Place to pass legislation which has already been passed by the lower House, if we were to prorogue the Legislature one hundred times.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I happened to be present with the Premier at the Colonial Office when we amended the constitution to full constitutional development.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I have never been at the Colonial Office with the hon. member.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, that is where the Premier conforms to this type of thing. I am referring to the last Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us revert to the high level of debate.

Mr. MILLER: We discussed the matter at length whether we expected a fully written constitution or not. This particular point was discussed and we were told by the Secretary of State for the Colonies who was in the Chair at the meeting where we also had the Attorney General and it was made clear, that it was an accepted convention of the House of Commons and the House of Lords that in a broken session you could not reject the Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is the Parliament Bill of 1911.

Mr. MILLER: We wanted to persuade the Colonial Office against the time when we would revert to what was obtaining in other Crown colonies. We were advised that it was a question of conventions and that it would take bales of paper to spread out what was accepted as conventions. That is the position. You must accept that the members of the Other Place are entitled to certain rights. I am not in agreement with them that they should have amended the

Trade Union Bill but if they elect to do that, we must be satisfied that there are constitutional methods by which you can change this system. If you feel that the Other Place is a dying ember or that it has outlived its usefulness and it should pass on, there is an authority by which you can remove that organization or that Chamber. However, if they are nominated and they are expected to serve, then you must give them certain rights. They will lose their sense of respect if they are expected to act as a rubber stamp. You can abolish the Other Place and I repeat that there are constitutional methods by which we can get things done. I do not at all agree with the methods by which we are dealing with this matter today; and if you have 23 seats out of 24 seats it does not matter. I feel that this is not right; I disagree with the members of the Other Place in rejecting this Bill. They have changed it but because that is so they still have certain rights. I know that there are constitutional methods which should be applied.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the hon. member is so certain that the members of the Other Place have certain rights why did he reject the decision of the majority party which made its nomination in respect of Local Government in 1959? (ASIDES).

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, that is just drawing a red herring — a red herring without a tail.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. MILLER: There are proper constitutional methods by which you can abolish the Other Chamber if you want to do so.
5.00 p.m.

I need not say any more on this matter, because I have already put forward my views.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, - - -

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. junior member for St. George completed his address?

Mr. MILLER: I could speak on this matter all day.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you want to continue, you may do so. It is immaterial to me how long a member wants to speak. It appeared to me that you concluded your speech, when I saw the hon. junior member for St. Peter on his feet.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the members who have already spoken have done so with a very serious urge to defend the rights of this House against any intrusions that may be offered by the Other Place, especially when such intrusions are in defiance to the wishes of the members of this Chamber. This matter hinges on the proposed amendment by the Other Place in relation to the Trade Union Bill. In a wider sense, members of the House feel that members of the Other Place should not flout the desires of the people as expressed in the Bill which was passed in this Chamber.

I am not going to wax warm and generate any extraordinary amount of heat on this particular occasion. I think that I should rather put myself in a position where I can urge my colleagues in this House to act in as constitutional a manner as possible in dealing with this matter. Before I go so far, Mr. Speaker, there is something that strikes me very forcefully in this Resolution. I listened to the Hon. Premier as he approached a certain part of this Resolution. I heard him say that the word "unanimous" was being used by him categorically. In the circumstances, I feel that if this Resolution were to be passed with a single dissentient voice it would have to be amended almost instantly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Otherwise, I could not sign it.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Now that I have drawn that to the attention of Your Honour and my honourable colleagues in this House, I will proceed. I have no quarrel at all with the substance of what appears in paragraph one. As far as paragraph two is concerned, the Hon. Premier has described it in this manner: "The right to picket peacefully is a common

law right." As an experienced barrister, I will have to bow to him on that. I have nothing to say regarding paragraph three. I heard the hon. member, who has just sat down, say that the party now in power had canvassed on the strength of such a Bill prospectively, and now they are in power, they have the right to introduce this type of legislation.

However, there are certain alternatives for action by this Legislature on occasions of this sort. I do not see any mention about it in the present Rules of this House, but there was a time, at any rate, when in the case of an impasse between the two Houses of the Legislature a joint conference may be called. Provision was specifically made for that in the Rules of this Chamber. I have made a cursory glance at the Rules, but I do not know if that particular Rule has found its way into the present Rules of this Chamber. I stand second to none in defending the rights of the Upper Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the Hon. Mover of this motion is proceeding under Standing Order No. 49 (3).

Mr. ACTING CLERK handed the hon. junior member for St. Peter a copy of the Standing Orders.)

Mr. HUSBANDS: It has been brought to my attention that there is a certain procedure laid down in the Standing Orders.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have proceeded under Standing Order No. 49 which states:

"(1) When a Bill has been returned from the Council with a list of the Council's amendments, the Member in charge of the Bill may move for the consideration of the said amendments forthwith or on a future date; and such a motion shall be decided without amendment or debate."

"(2) Upon consideration of the amendments, the House may agree, disagree or make amendments thereto, or may propose amendments in lieu thereof."

"(3) Unless all of the Council's amendments are agreed to, the Bill shall be returned to the Council by the Clerk with a list of the further amendments and, if any amendments have been disagreed with, a list of reasons for such disagreement, and a Message desiring the concurrence of the Council."

I have cited parliamentary procedure on the usage and practice of the House of Commons in the United Kingdom. I cannot understand the behaviour of the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. junior member for St. George. It is in contradiction to the Rules of this House as laid down in the Standing Orders. We have adopted the procedure laid down, that is, to return the Bill to the Other Place and state the reasons why the amendments cannot be accepted. I am sure the hon. member will now dot the "i's" and cross the "t's".
5.10 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I was making some reference to past usage and the Hon. Premier just now has really raised the issue quite a bit. It is only left to us upon examination of the Resolution to see if it conforms to the principle set out in section three of Standing Order 49 of this House.

Sir, I am not going to be over critical but I take slight objection to the word "invite". I rather like the word "desire", because it strikes me that if we begin this debate severely criticising the Other Place for its off-handed manner, how can we then politely invite them to accept the Resolution? It must still be remembered that there is another alternative — an alternative in the form of a conference. No provision is made for a conference but we are inviting them to re-consider their decision and withdraw the amendment.

Now, you do not invite them to reconsider and at the same time ask them to withdraw the amendment. The moment you do that, you acknowledge their strength. You do not unnecessarily show your strength underlying from se-

rious threats and then hope to meet with favourable results. That is not acting intelligently. The Hon. Premier has a right to prorogue. Unlike the hon. junior member for St. George who spoke, if the Hon. Premier prorogues that is another alternative. We can come back in here and early in the next session put a similar Bill on the Order Paper and then have it passed.

Of course, Sir, it is nothing to prevent the Other Place from throwing it out again. In Jamaica there is a limited time that the Senate, as it is called, can override legislation passed by the House of Representatives. In Barbados, there is no Parliament Bill but in Barbados there has not only been one occasion, but on more than one occasion, that the Other Place yielded to the re-entry of a Bill sent to them from this place and passed it on the second occasion, but hon. members must remember that the Other Place has its powers.

Actually, there is nothing to prevent the Other Place from initiating legislation. The House of Lords can do it. They cannot pass a money Resolution, but legislation can be initiated in the Other Place. Sir, we have got to remember that the Legislature of Barbados is still comprised of the Lower House which is the House of Assembly, the Other Place and His Excellency the Governor. Time and time again in the past I have been in this Chamber and I have heard members threatening and fulminating. I do not know what will happen in this case, but I can tell you that all members of this House did before was to threaten and fulminate and nothing has happened. The Other Place has continued to flout the wishes of this House.

Sir, all this talk is a waste of time. Let us proceed constitutionally. I still think that we are stepping down when we present them with this Resolution. I do not think we are showing pride. I would prefer to reject the Bill entirely. Honestly, unless it was possible to convene a joint conference where I would not have to sink my pride, I would prefer to do that than pass this Resolution. I do think that in passing this measure, I am sinking my pride as a joint member of this Legislature. What is the use of making a parade of strength and then respectfully inviting somebody to agree. Members of this Chamber must bear in mind that they are in 1963 and it is just a question of time. A few months delay would not hurt. The Hon. Premier has called his bluff. Let us have a Bill to curtail their powers.

Sir, how does the Hon. Premier know that this will not repeat itself the next three months? He does not know nor can he give us any assurance that it would not repeat itself again, therefore let us proceed as firmly as possible. That is why I think we are slipping up on our pride and on our real strength as members of this Chamber when we couch this Resolution in these words. It is true that we are expressing a desire to get their concurrence. Sir, although I am as polite as somebody else sometimes, I can be as firm as somebody else. On this occasion I would like to be firm. The Resolution does not really suit me and I would prefer a rejection of the amendment from the Other Place entirely. I would prefer that we tell them that we do not want this. But I would do it constitutionally. I would not attempt to fool people that the Other Place does not exist. It exists under Letters Patent and its members are part of the Legislature of Barbados, I am not one of those politicians who do not believe in a bi-cameral legislature. I have said on more than one occasion that I believe in a bi-cameral legislature. Although we have the vote of the people, sometimes we make legislation hastily and we need a check. The members of the Other Place do not have to cast their eyes on the electorate. (A VOICE: New Zealand has a uni-cameral legislature.) I do not believe in a uni-cameral legislature. Let us take the present British Colonies. They have retained their bi-cameral Houses of Legislature. You will find that old constitutional Governments have retained their bi-cameral Houses of Legislature and even new emergent ones. Because New Zealand has a uni-cameral Legislature, that does not mean that all are like that. One swallow does not make a summer.

5.20 p.m.

We have had Parliament for three hundred years; some of these democracies have only had Parliament for 20 years and on sober reflection they have decided to have a bi-cameral Legislature. People may not always think in the right way but you can pass a Bill to control them. On these matters I do not like to generate any heat because the more heat you generate, the more nonsense you talk. I bend the knee to no one of my colleagues in my respect for the privileges of this House. That is why I say that my pride is a bit shaken when I read this final paragraph of this Message which it is proposed to send to the members of the Other Place. This particular paragraph reads as follows:-

"The House of Assembly respectfully invite the Honourable the Legislative Council to withdraw the amendment."

Mr. Speaker, can we hope for much more than this amendment? Should we depend upon how the Members of the Other Place react to our invitation? No hon. member can say that the gist of my contribution is one of seeing the need of the Other Place. I would go point blank and say this: "You offer this amendment and I reject it." It is true that the hon. member may be more appeased than I am but I repeat that I respect the present constitution. A thing is what it is and until it is amended it is what it is. Therefore knowing what it is, we have to proceed with this matter in a constitutional manner and in the manner in which we would act towards it. There is no face saving.

My manner of proceeding to deal with this matter would be quite simple and quite respectful. I would reject the amendment. I would consider proroguing the House and bringing back this Bill and if again I became defeated it would be a case of an appeal being made to the country, then I would think of the introduction of a Parliament Bill. I think that for too many years we have listened to too many threats from politicians who were in power saying that the Other Place is no good and that it has been flouting the wishes of the people of this island; but when they allow the Other Place to continue to do so without any real legislative action being taken. What it is proposed to do here does not stop the members of the Other Place; it still allows them to continue because we in this Message are inviting them to withdraw this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, if a joint Conference had come about from this state of affairs, we would be sitting around a table and nobody would have any face to save. It is up to us now, being fully aware of their strength and of our position, to act accordingly. I was very glad to see that in some measure Standing Order 49 (3) bears out the procedure by means of which the Hon. Premier has acted in this matter. I must say, however, that this form of procedure is not to my liking. I do hope that this will be the last occasion on which hon. members of this House will have to listen to threats which may only prove to be futile. I hope that the occasion will soon arise when the House with all of its indignation on an occasion of this sort, will begin to act very constitutionally and firmly in matters of this kind. I believe in acting firmly in these matters; I do not mind being polite, but I also believe in being firm.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I take it that what we have before us now is a Message from this House to the Other Place. I have not heard Your Honour make any ruling to the effect that this is out of order, and therefore I take it that it is in order. I have been wondering about this matter myself and I have made enquiries from those who I think would know about such a matter better than I would know about it. This is not a Resolution and it can only be considered as a Message from this House. Had this been out of order, this Hon. Chamber would expect Your Honour to guide us by ruling immediately that it was out of order in your impartial capacity as Speaker of this House. Having listened to the debate on this Message and Your Honour has not ruled that it is out of order, we have come to the conclusion that it is in order.

Mr. Speaker, nobody could say that the Members of this Party of which I happen to be the Leader, are hypocrites

in this matter. On the principles of this Bill which deals with peaceful picketing at people's homes, it is universally known that I led the opposition to this principle 17 years ago. In those days, the members of my Party were attacked but eventually the Bill was passed by this House. But by what politicians usually call a natural death the Bill died; it was not passed by the Other Place and it was never resurrected because the Party in power did not seem to want it. Eventually the present party in power, while they were in the Opposition, brought back to this House a Bill of a similar nature providing for peaceful picketing at private homes. We opposed it then, we oppose it now and we will always oppose it. I have said that publicly. However, that is not the issue before the Chamber today. The members of my Party stand foursquare in their opposition to peaceful picketing at people's homes, but we have to admit that the present Government in power, just as they promised the people of this country that they would have a General Election in three years or that they would be providing free secondary education, they made it a promise that they would amend the Trade Union Act to provide for peaceful picketing at people's homes if and when they got into power. 5.30 p.m.

When this Bill came to this House my colleagues and I offered opposition to it, but our opposition was ignominiously defeated. It means that the present Government Party together with independent members and the members of the last Government Party who had just a few months ago opposed the passing of the Bill had eventually turned coat and voted for the Bill, hence the elected representatives of this Chamber passed the Bill by an overwhelming majority. What do they seek to do in the question as to whether there should be peaceful picketing at a House where a man lives? The trouble is that my colleagues who are elected members of this House want to maintain the rights and privileges of elected representatives as against the rights of nominated representatives.

Let me say here and now that I disagree with my hon. friend the member for St. Peter in his suggestions about the Other Place and double Chambers. But that has always been his view and if a man holds a view about the type of Legislature we should have, that is no reason why you should be unnecessarily rude or offensive to him. He has his view, but I have a different view on this matter. I have always been in favour and I am more fortified in my views since I have noticed that almost all of the emerging countries have agreed to have the two-Chamber system. Even if you were to look at the agreement by the Leaders of the Little Seven, you will see that they have unanimously agreed to have a double-Chamber system.

In other words, when Barbados and the other two B's had this system of Government, Jamaica, Trinidad and other places did not have it, but people with brains like Dr. Eric Williams have decided to have this form of Government. Therefore, it is an established fact that the Legislature of this Colony is not only made up of members of this House but of members of the Other Place. Therefore, when we come here today, in the absence of any ruling from you, Sir, that this method of approach is out of order, we have to assume that it is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me re-assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that it is my ruling that this message is in conformity with Standing Order No. 49 (3) of the Standing Orders of this Chamber.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank Your Honour very much, because you have now made it abundantly clear to everybody. I have heard the ex-Speaker's statement on constitutional methods, I have heard Your Honour's ruling, and I have heard the Honourable Premier. I have come to the conclusion that if you were to bring the Bill back to this House tomorrow certain members on this side of the Table would vote against the Section which allowed peaceful picketing at private homes. However, what is before the House at the moment is an absolutely different matter.

I agree that the Other Place forms part of the Legislature of this Colony and, therefore, the members of the

Other Place have a right to express their views. Nevertheless, as an elected member of this Chamber, I could never agree that they would have the right, so to speak, to forever flout the wishes of the elected members of this Chamber.

Since I have been in this House for a long time — I am sorry the hon. member for St. Peter has left his seat, because he has been here a year before me — and I can only remember three occasions when the Other Place sent back, rejected, or in some way failed to pass legislation of importance such as this. I am talking about a period of over 17 years. That in itself does not merit the undue criticism which we have heard here today about the Other Place.

As a matter of fact, when the Hon. Premier was speaking, I turned to the hon. member for Christ Church and said that it seemed to me as though the Hon. Premier had already had consultations with members of the Other Place and this seemed to be a foregone conclusion because of the mild way in which this particular message was put. My colleague can support me on that. We are elected members of this chamber and we must uphold the principles of democracy. What are the principles of democracy here? If there had been an even vote, or a casting vote by Your Honour, then we could possibly have come here today and say that as far as we are concerned that Other Place was perfectly right to do what they had done. That has happened on more occasions than one before my time in this House and by an overwhelming majority.

I think only four of us voted against the passing of this particular Section to the Bill. From what I have read and heard a matter of this sort came before this Chamber when Mr. Hugh Springer was a member, and I heard similar mouthings to what I heard here today from the then Premier Sir Grantley Adams. The view was taken that it was no sense in wasting time, because the Other Place was a part of the Legislature of this Colony — you either rejected it, or supported what they did. If you care to you can pass a Parliamentary Bill. There is no Parliamentary Bill in this Colony, I am reminded since the passing of the 1911 Parliament Bill which provided that if a Bill had passed the House a certain number of times in two sessions it became law automatically although the Other Place had rejected it. 5.30 - 5.40 p.m.

In 1949, the law was amended in England giving further power to the House of Commons, thus showing that they rely more on the principles of democracy, so they gave more power to those who were elected by the people.

I know that I am accused for expressing the views of some people in this country. I know that there are some people who say that I express the views of the employers. However, there are people from all sections of the community who feel that you should not picket at the private homes of employers. We, the members of the Opposition, still share those views but we say that if such an overwhelming majority of this House passed the Bill, then we feel ourselves bound to support the principle and in supporting the principle of the Bill, it is that we agree to peaceful picketing at people's homes.

Having made myself clear on that, there are one or two things which I want to know as a layman and which I want the Hon. Premier to explain. Paragraph 2 sets out what I consider to be the preamble about bringing in domestic workers and giving them the right. We can all understand that, because that is in the Bill, but there is something which I believe only you, Mr. Speaker, and the Hon. Premier who are the two legal people in this Chamber at the moment can enlighten us and the public on and it is this. You say in paragraph 2 of this Resolution that the right to picket peacefully is a common law right. I am asking the Hon. Premier to explain that for me. It goes on to say: "If the amendment is not withdrawn the House of Assembly may decide to eliminate Section 39 altogether leaving the common law right intact without safeguards."

We supported the whole idea of the Government's Bill of peaceful picketing. The Government agreed to peaceful

picketing but they said it was to be on the consent of the Union or an organization, and it should not be just a person going on a wild cat scheme of peaceful picketing. If peaceful picketing is a common law right whereby we may say that a man can walk down Broad Street without assaulting anybody as long as he is doing nothing wrong, well then I am asking this: I am pleading guilty to this. If a thing is a man's common law right and it is my right to walk up and down Broad Street or up and down Roebuck Street why then is it right to enact legislation giving me that right? That is the question which is worrying me. You say in paragraph 2 that the right to picket peacefully is a common law right. If the amendment is not withdrawn the House of Assembly may decide to eliminate section 39 altogether leaving the common law right intact without safeguards. I understand the end of that sentence "without safeguards". That means that no one would be allowed unless it is agreed by a Union or an organization to allow you to go picketing at or near a home or any place of business, but I would prefer to have it explained to me and I am sure my hon. colleagues would also like you to explain it for them. Why have you put it in the Act if it is a right for the people to do it without having it in?

My party still feels that there should be no peaceful picketing or any kind of picketing at private homes. We said it years ago; we said it when the last Government turned coat and agreed with us. We said it when the present Government pressed for it and that was one of the occasions when we voted against you when we were in Opposition together. You have brought it back since you are in power, but I would vote against it tomorrow. However the principle at stake is, although the nominated chamber forms part of the Legislature of this country, whether they should flout the wishes of the people because this is nothing we can say that the present Government brought down by surprise. I purposely left here and went home and looked at your Manifesto and in it I have seen that you did promise the people that you would bring this measure forward. You were elected to power and this measure was passed by this House by an overwhelming majority. What position would I find myself in if fate was unkind to me to be running a government and when I was in the Opposition I promised to do something for the people and after I came to power I tell them that because the Other Place was saying no to it I will not bring it forward.

Would the Hon. Premier tell us if there were another measure advocated at the time? A Parliament Bill is one way of dealing with it or you can bring the session to an end by proroguing the Legislature and bringing the matter up again. The hon. junior member for St. Peter says that there is no limit to the Other Place dealing with a measure. The Hon. Premier may say that the division in the Other Place on this matter was 6 - 4 so maybe the Hon. Premier may consider it so important that he can say to his Excellency the Governor that there is no limit to members of the Other Place and he can suggest to His Excellency to nominate four, five, or six members more to the Other Place for the purpose of having this thing passed, and let the Other Place see that the part of the Legislature which runs this country are those persons who are elected by popular vote. That was a suggestion before. That was emphasized by Mr. H. W. Springer but perhaps the Hon. Premier feels that this is the mildest way to handle it. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that he would not be as mild as the Hon. Premier and you can well understand why he said so. Everybody knows that this Bill is very dear to him. I think it was on his motion that it was brought back in here.

Sir, I feel today on the principle of it, that this being the elected chamber, we cannot do otherwise than let it be known that if the Bill came before this Chamber again, no can do, because we cannot flout the wishes of the people. I do not agree that the members of the Other Place are rubber stamps. I have seen in my time that they are not pigeon-holing legislation as happened formerly, but that they are passing legislation from this House and the country has benefitted tremendously from it.

In this case, if the Government feel strongly on this matter and Your Honour rules that this Message should go to the Council, I feel that I should vote for it. You are ask-

ing the Other Place to reconsider the matter. I cannot see how I can vote against it particularly bearing in mind what happened in 1959 when I had to fight to preserve the right of the people who elected my party in the majority at the Local Government Elections and members of the former Government like a lot of dishonest rogues, decided that although I had the majority that they were the persons to say who should be elected as aldermen.
5.50 p.m.

I apologise to no man in Barbados, no matter how wealthy he is, for that reason. I really get no fun out of the other Chamber.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I really did not intend to speak on this matter, but I will say a few words on it. This Message reads as follows:

The House of Assembly

To

The Honourable the Legislative Council

The House of Assembly has the honour to inform the Honourable the Legislative Council that by a unanimous vote the House of Assembly disagrees with the amendment made to Section 39 of the Trade Union Bill by the Honourable the Legislative Council for the following reasons:

1. The amendment is illogical.

The Bill gives to domestic servants and agricultural workers the right to organize themselves in Trade Unions with full enjoyment of all the rights given to Trade Unions by the Bill. The effect of the amendment is to deprive these two classes of workers of the right of peaceful picketing which under the section is granted under specified conditions to all members of a trade union since the employer's place of business in relation to these classes of workers is also the employer's residence.

2. The right to picket peacefully is a common law right. If the amendment is not withdrawn the House of Assembly may decide to eliminate Section 39 altogether leaving the common law right intact without safeguards.

3. The Trade Union Bill was one of the issues specifically put to the electorate at the General Election in 1961 and embodies the clear decision of the electorate.

The House of Assembly respectfully invite the Honourable the Legislative Council to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I sat here and I heard the majority of hon. members agree in principle to this Bill. (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: I can hardly hear the hon. member who is addressing me because of the Asides which are taking place.

Mr. CORBIN: Yes, Sir. When those hon. members were speaking I sat and listened to all of them. However, Sir, I was saying that the majority of the members of this House have agreed in principle with this Bill and I understand that throughout the Commonwealth, wherever a Bill of this nature is passed, there is provision made for peaceful picketing at the place where people work, at the residence of the employer or anywhere else. I would like to know the meaning of the words "Peaceful picketing": It does not say that people are going to riot or to kill or to commit manslaughter but they are going to reason. Sometimes an employer may have his home in the yard of a factory and where must the employees go in order to carry out peaceful picketing? The employees want to reason with the employer and if they cannot reason with him to whom must they go to reason? Must they not go to the home of the employer to reason? Peaceful picketing is a part of this legislation in all the Commonwealth. The employer may leave his place of business and remain at his home for some time because he has all the facilities which he requires at his home. We do not desire to have a situation where people have worked hard

and caused the employer to be in his magnificent building with all his luxuries where he can remain, and then these poor people cannot go to him. Let me say that Pharaoh was one of the greatest men in the world and when God sent Moses to picket peacefully with him, Moses went to him and persuaded him to allow the children of Israel to go from under the bondage under which they were suffering, but he refused to let them go. What happened? The Almighty God eventually overthrew Pharaoh and his hosts because he refused to listen to reason.

Mr. Speaker, there is a Bill called a Labour Relations Bill in British Guiana and we all know what has happened there. We do not want that state of affairs to obtain here. If the Other Place have rejected Clause 39 of the Trade Union Bill which we have passed, we are now asking them to adopt the Bill in principle. Why is it that some hon. members of this House of Assembly and some people of this Island do not want to have peaceful picketing to take place at the homes of employers in the case of a trade dispute? What do they want? Do they want a riot, a war or a strike like the one which took place in British Guiana? There is provision in this same Bill whereby, if people in peaceful picketing fail to obey the laws of the country, they can be prosecuted. As I said before, I can take 100 men with me tonight and have peaceful picketing with an employer, but I must control my people. It does not mean that the whole number of 100 men will talk with the employer; it means that one or two people will talk and relate our grievances to the employer. Come, let us reason together! We may agree with something over which we have a dispute and so be able to go back to work.

6.00 p.m.

This is the only privilege given to the poor people. I would certainly like to know why some people are trying to resist peaceful picketing. Some say that people will be shot, and others say that there will be a fight if peaceful picketing is permitted. I do not believe that anything of that sort will ever take place in Barbados, because Barbadians are sensible and educated people and they can reason together. I am sure that Barbadians will reason together and have their troubles sorted out. Similar legislation can be found in the United States, Canada, Australia, Jamaica and Trinidad. Why can't we have a similar Bill here? I have no objection to this Bill whatsoever.

I know that some members agreed in principle to this Bill on the last occasion when it was discussed in this Chamber. It is now merely a question of reasoning together. I feel that peaceful picketing can be done next door to Heaven, because peaceful picketing is good. If a man is giving you trouble, you will have to get rid of him. You should transfer him to some other place in order that things may continue smoothly. You must get rid of the man who is doing evil. If a man causes a disturbance in a company, he should be transferred to some other place so that things can be carried on peacefully.

If I owned half of the world, I would be glad to see my employees coming to me with their grievances. I would ask them to tell me their grievances so that I could have my work done properly and smoothly. If they demanded a penny a day more and I found it difficult to give them, then I would negotiate with them and see what could be done. Why should some people be permitted to sit in their houses comfortably, while the poor workers are in distress? Perhaps the cries of the poor would disturb them from eating and drinking and they do not want to hear them. I remember the cries of the poor went to Heaven and God had to come down to relieve the people. When people are crying, you must hear them and find out for what they are crying. When a man is not justified with what the manager has done, he should be given an opportunity to see the owner of the estate.

I feel that peaceful picketing is good so long as people go about it in the right way. They must picket peacefully, they must not fight, and they must reason together. My conscience would not permit me to go home tonight without saying something on this Resolution, and I am saying that if peaceful picketing is done in the right way, I will vote for it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before this House, as has been pointed out is in conform-

ity with the Rules of this House in matters of this sort. There are, of course, several methods of dealing with amendments by the Other Place and Bills sent there from the Elected Chamber, but we elected to utilise the method now before the House provided on the basis of the Standing Orders in order to draw to the attention of the Other Place the stupidity and illogicality of the amendments which they have made to the Bill.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter stated that in his time in this House he had heard a lot of fulminations against the assumption of certain powers by the Other Place; that other Premiers had stated that they were prepared to define by law the rights of the Other Place, and that nothing has been done in the matter. The honourable member must be aware, as every individual person in the Island should be aware, that this Government is at the moment actively engaged in discussions with the British Colonial Office in order to define beyond the slightest shadow of doubt the powers of the Other Place and also to ratify its decisions. The hon. junior member for St. Peter should have known that, since the Hon. Minister without Portfolio and the Acting Attorney General are both in England at the moment engaged in constitutional talks specifically with this question in mind, it is incorrect to state, as he has stated today, that no Government has ever taken steps to define by law the powers of the Other Place.

I think the most significant point that has emerged from the debate today is the remark made by the hon. junior member for St. George who, I regret, is not in his seat at the moment. I doubt whether members really understood what he was saying because it was so shrouded in stupidity that it was difficult for anybody to understand what was sense or what was nonsense. He said that we should have prorogued the House, returned the Bill to the Other Place, and they would have been compelled to pass it. But when it was pointed out to him that we had no legislation approximating to the British Parliament Act, 1911 which would compel the Other Place to pass legislation submitted to them twice, he said that he went to the Colonial Office with a former Premier discussing constitutional changes and he was made to understand by the Secretary of State for the Colonies that in the constitutional changes agreed to for Barbados there would be some specific definition in law to make sure that the provisions of the Parliamentary Act would operate in Barbados as if we had such an Act.

6.10 p.m.

This is what he said and it is very significant because I remember the Opposition in this Chamber on every occasion insisted that if we were to have any constitutional changes, they should be written and not based on conventions for the simple reason that you have a self-governing country and you are imposing a new constitution. It would be all right as in the case of Great Britain to base its constitution purely on conventions but in the case of a colonial country moving on from colonialism to self-government, it is highly necessary for any advancement of the constitution to be written. The most significant thing is that the British Constitution which is largely unwritten and based on conventions does not regulate the powers of the two Houses by any convention; it is done by statute law. The British Parliament Act of 1911 clearly defines the power of the House of Lords.

The Party to which the junior member for St. George belongs was simple enough to go to London and agree to an advance in our constitution and even to a definition of the Other Place to be based on conventions, therefore, it is possible for us to be working on an illusion that there is nothing to define the powers of the Other Place. While a hon. member says, he was in London when they agreed to confine the powers of the Other Place. That is one of the most significant sayings which I have heard from today's debate. That is definitely what he said and apparently he and his Party are labouring under the impression that that is the position in Barbados today. We on our side have no such knowledge, therefore we feel justified in assuming that the powers of the Other Place are not yet defined and we are taking active steps at the moment to have these powers emphasized and clearly defined and at the same time to reform its composition.

Sir, with regard to the Resolution itself, as I have stated, we could have prorogued the General Assembly and re-send the Bill to the Other Place and then sit and wait and see what will happen but it seems as if we are taking a sledge hammer to kill an ant. Our submitting a matter like this to the sensible members of the Other Place is on this ground. We say that for the stupidity of what they have done, we should point it out to them and we know that commonsense must prevail. We claim that the amendment from the Other Place is illogical because the Bill gives to domestic workers and agricultural workers the right to organise themselves in trade unions with the full enjoyment of the rights given to trade unionists by the Bill.

Now, Sir, if we give domestic servants and agricultural workers the common law right to engage themselves into trade unions and the right peacefully to picket, automatically they have the right to picket at the residence of their employees for the simple reason that the place of business of a domestic servant is at the house or residence of his or her employer and the place of business of the agricultural worker is at the plantation house. The moment that they have the right to organise and they have the right to picket, it means that they can picket the residence of their employers because the residence is the employer's place of business. How can you agree to give these common law rights to these two types of workers and then say, "well you cannot do it at the residence of the employer." That is why we say if they do not withdraw their amendment we can withdraw section 39 of the Bill altogether. Section 39, as you know, gives the workers, authorised by the trade union, the right to peacefully picket. If we withdraw this section altogether these workers would still have the right to picket at the residence of their employer.

The hon. junior member for St. George characterises this as inciting the Other Place to violence. God alone knows what he means by that. Even apart from the fact that we have a mandate from the people of this country to pass this particular type of legislation, we feel that when it is drawn clearly, as is proposed to be done in this Resolution to members of the Other Place, that they have no rational ground on which to stand that commonsense would prevail and they would finally agree to the passing of a Bill in the manner in which we sent it down. If foolhardiness and stupidity prevail to the extent that they cannot see the wisdom of adopting this course, then we will adopt other measures, but this is so clear cut that we feel it is quite unnecessary as was said by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and hon. senior member for the City, that we should have to come in here today and blow the roof off in condemnation of the attitude of the members of the Other Place in this particular matter. We feel it is one on which the ground on which they stand is so much without foundation that if they are to maintain any reputation for commonsense and rational thinking that they can do nothing else than to agree to the proposals contained in the Resolution before the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken on at least three occasions on this subject in this session on this amendment to the Trade Union Act which was introduced by the Government. It is not the first time that I have spoken on this matter. I have spoken on a similar provision on many other occasions because even in the last session when members of this Party was in the Opposition and even when we were members of the former Government party, we were trying to urge upon the Government a rationalisation of all the trade union laws which are in a bit of confusion and bringing the law up to date as the law which obtains in civilised countries.

6.20 p.m.

I cannot say other civilised countries because it appears that there is a lot of fuzzy thinking in an island like Barbados. People are living in the 17th century and sometimes they are living in the early 16th century as well. My purpose is not to go through all the procedure which I have gone through either in this Session or in any other Session. I want to clear up certain ambiguities which may exist in the minds of hon. members. As to the question of the law as to peaceful picketing, that is set out in the text of the

Message which we are sending back to the Other Place. I think that people in Barbados are confused about peaceful picketing because they associate any group of working-class with some kind of rebellion. They are also confused because peaceful picketing has never been carried out to any great extent in Barbados and whenever they see two or three working-class people together they think that a revolution is going to their heads. That is why I referred to the anti-Jacobins at an earlier stage of the debate. Picketing usually arises out of or in contemplation of a trade dispute and invariably a trade dispute arises out of the employment or non-employment or the terms of the employment or the conditions of labour of any person in the Trade Union, restricting that within the confines of the Bill which we are considering, or of any person for that matter. A trade dispute can be in respect of the employment or non-employment of somebody who is not a member of a trade union. The workers at the instance or the initiative of the Executive of their particular Union would normally foregather outside the premises where the dispute has arisen or the premises of the employer and demonstrate in a peaceful manner by carrying placards or patrolling outside the premises in the street without creating any disturbance and showing that there is some kind of dispute going on and asking for the sympathies of the people.

The hon. senior member for the City says that he does not agree with peaceful picketing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I have never said that. I have always agreed with peaceful picketing but I do not agree with peaceful picketing at people's residences.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, even the Other Place is not opposed to picketing outside a business premises; the members of the Other Place are opposed to the idea of picketing at a man's premises because they believe that a Barbadian employer's house is his castle. I quite agree with what the hon. member has said, but people who object to peaceful picketing at premises cannot say that they are opposed to peaceful picketing because at common law in a British colony a person can go anywhere in this island, even where there is no dispute, and walk up and down outside anybody's residence provided that he does not create any offence. I challenge anybody to prevent me from going into Tudor Bridge and walking up and down outside the hon. member's residence and saying that no domestic servant should go inside there and discuss any matters with him. No businessman can tell me that I cannot picket his premises even for political purposes. I am not now referring to the hon. senior member for the City. I am merely exercising my right to pass up and down the highway and what you tell persons when you talk to them is your own business. Unless you publish abroad that somebody is a rogue and a vagabond — I am not referring to the hon. senior member for the City; but suppose you were to refer or were referring to somebody or to any organization with which you did not agree. There is nothing against a member of the Closed Brethren who says: "You are not going outside with them because they are not in fellowship." That is their right as any member of the community. This Government has no intention of passing any law against the Closed Brethren for peaceful picketing. If a member of the Closed Brethren has the right to tell his wife not to go in there how can you restrict a member of the Trade Union from picketing at a person's home? I am saying that a member of the Closed Brethren can go outside a man's house and wait until his wife has returned from Bridgetown and tell her that she has no right to go inside there because he is not a member of the Closed Brethren.

We have discussed this matter with them. They did not vote at Election time but they prayed for this Government every night although we are not in fellowship with them. I do not think that I am disclosing anything which is secret. They say that they prayed for us before the Election in order to ensure that we get the Government. A member of the Closed Brethren can go outside a man's house and tell his lawful wife that she has no right to go into the house to which she rightfully belongs and therefore how can you tell a trade unionist that he cannot go outside his employer's

house and tell his employer that he must not try to take away the rights of the Trade Union, because he may have put an advertisement in the *Advocate*. I say all that, Mr. Speaker, although it may appear to be *abductio ad absurdum*.

6.30 p.m.

In 1899, there was a case of *Lyons v. Wilkins* which may be known to Your Honour. The learned judges decided to adjourn the case until a decision was given in another case. You can make a careful study of the decision handed down particularly around the turn of the century which defied the dicta of reason and commonsense, and a lot of them were only susceptible to the hypothesis that the judges had a certain amount of prejudice. It is now accepted by eminent jurists that people like Lord Halsbury, Mr. Justice Wilkins and other members of the plantocracy did not like the idea of the rising tide of labour cases coming before them, and they gave decisions according to their prejudices. I am not suggesting that that sort of thing goes on nowadays, but I am referring to ten or twelve years ago.

It is known that instinctively people react in a certain manner. In the laws of nature, one finds that a hedgehog puts up its quills and goes on the defensive the moment it hears certain sounds or certain scents are brought to its nostrils and it reacts in a sort of automatic reflex. Translating that into human society, one can find out why certain people react in a certain way.

In 1906, the same year as the passing of the Trade Union Act, we had the case of *Ward & Co., Ltd., v. Operative Printers Assistant Association* which can be found in the law reports on page 327. That case was in 1906, whereas the case of *Lyons v. Wilkins* was in 1899. Mr. Justice Bird has said that to persuade a man to do something, that is, to picket could be dealt with under the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act. To tell an employer that he has to employ So-and-So is trying to compel the man to do something which he does not want to do.

You have a right to picket and to pass on information when there is a strike; you can go and picket outside a man's house. We say "yes" at common law, which is in contra-distinction to Statute Law. Statute Law can take away common law rights. This is what Sir Winston Churchill did in 1926. Two judges said in this case that you may have the right to do it, but they felt that you would be trying to coerce or compel a man to do something which he is not bound to do. We affirm the idea of freedom of action and freedom of association as is enshrined in the common law in their own judgement, but they were prosecuting it purely in view of the employer and not in view of the man in the street who has the right to picket. They say if you tell a man that you must not deal with this person or if you wear placards telling an employer that he must not employ someone, you are coercing him to do something against his will, and they granted an injunction in this case.

In 1906, the law was changed because the case of *Wardlock & Co.*, came before the Court. We affirm that you have the perfect right to picket outside somebody's house. At the time there was no Labour Party in the United Kingdom. Ramsay MacDonald and about five others in 1906 were doing the best they could. In that year, the Liberal Government enacted the 1906 Trade Union Act which was amended in 1930 to bring it up-to-date, and it remained unchanged until Sir Winston Churchill came along. This is a so systematic of a certain vested attitude. We can remember the time when Sir Winston Churchill took tanks down Sydney Street in London against the dockers. He used tanks against them because they had gone on strike. There was no riot or looting in England in 1926; there was a general strike, and Sir Winston Churchill rode down Sydney Street on the top of a British tank. It is not surprising that he repealed the Act.

The hon. member for St. Peter said that so far as the 1946 legislation is concerned, it does not matter whether you are a Trade Unionist or not, you had the right to declare and form a picket. The position is that you had a so-called Socialist Party in the country coming out strongly against the idea of peaceful picketing of private residences.

They had thrown out the Bill which was introduced by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

In the light of all of that and because of certain representations made by the Chamber of Commerce and other bodies to whom we referred the Bill, we decided that in a community like this no harm would be done by restricting what is the common law right of the subject, that is to say, that you will have to be appointed by a Trade Union. We felt that the people should be members of an organisation. We wanted to have officials and members of the Union doing the picketing. We do not want people to be charged with the statutory offence of watching and besetting the residences of persons.

6.40 p.m.

That is why we continue to say and have said when we introduced the amendment to the Trade Union Bill that this should be restricted to the people authorised by the Trade Union. We felt that the Other Place would have had no objection because it would be a safeguard to irresponsible actions on the part of persons who do not take the trouble to join a trade union.

May I give you a reason. In view of the fact that we brought in domestic servants, we do not want domestic servants who did not join a trade union to enjoy the privileges of people organised, let us say, a domestic servant inviting her boyfriend to come around and picket her mistress' premises the minute her mistress had a few words with her. She invites her boy friend up and she says that the Trade Union Bill has given her the right to carry on the mistress as she would like. We feel that she should be able to go to the trade union and state her case so that a responsible person would be able to go to the mistress and tell her that she had no right to dismiss her employee and that she should take her back, if not, they are going to organise a little picketing there. I do not envisage a trade union in circumstances like that taking people off their lawful jobs to picket for anybody who is working for \$10.00 a week, and it is for that reason that we put in the Bill "appointed by the trade union". The trade union would be responsible and there would be no difficulty at all.

As far back as 1899, Sir, Mr. Russell Gurney, who was the Recorder of London, recorded sittings of the Assizes in London and told the Grand Jury in the plea against Hibbert, popularly known as the Cabinet Makers' Case this. This was the charge to the Grand Jury. They had the same Grand Juries which we had until quite recently. This is an extract from the charge:-

"Among the acts forbidden by that Act is this, the molesting or obstructing any person, by watching or besetting any place, or the approach to such place, where his business is carried on, with a view to coerce such person to alter his mode of carrying on his business."

"This then is the question that you will have to consider, whether the evidence that is laid before you is sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case that the defendants did conspire to molest or obstruct the prosecutors, by watching or besetting their place of business, and whether they did this in order to coerce them to alter their mode of carrying on their business.

"And here you must observe that the question is, not whether they have endeavoured to take their stand by themselves refusing to work, and by persuading others not to work; this they have a right to do; but the question is whether they have tried to effect that object in a way that is forbidden by the Act, and with that purpose."

This is a way back in 1875, even before the 1906 Trade Union Bill was passed. I go on to read from the same charge to the Grand Jury:-

"The distinction to which I wish to draw your attention is well pointed out, as it appears to me, by Lush J, in a case in which a similar question arose, in which he says: to bring them within the terms of the Act under which the indictment is framed, there must have been threats or mo-

lestation otherwise than by endeavouring peaceably and in a reasonable manner to persuade others to abstain from work."

He goes on to say:-

"The question that we have to decide is whether the defendants did endeavour to control the free agency, or to overcome the free will of their fellow workmen, by force or intimidation. If there had been merely persuasion to the matter, whatever the consequences were, it would not be at all an unlawful act."

He went on to say:-

"It seems to me, gentlemen, that, guided as one may fairly be by that decision of the learned judge, and by that exposition of the law, in which I perfectly agree, I should suggest to you that the sort of question you will have to ask yourselves is, whether the evidence shows that the defendants were guilty of obstructing and rendering difficult of access the prosecutor's place of business or whether anything which they did was calculated to deter or intimidate those who were passing to and fro, or whether there was an exhibition of force, calculated to produce fear in the minds of ordinary men, or whether the defendants, or any of them, combined for that purpose, whether they combined in order to do it.

"If you think that, it seems to me, then it will be your duty to find a true bill; but if you think their conduct may be accounted for by a desire to ascertain who were the persons working there, or peaceably to persuade them or any others who were proposing to work there, to join their fellow workmen, who were contending whether rightly or wrongly, to act for the interests of the general body, it seems to me that there is no evidence sufficient to establish the charge that is here made. That is the main question you will have to consider."

I gave all the references because I want people to read them. You should know your trade union bill. In 1875 in the Cox Criminal Cases, the emphasis was on whether there was molestation, which is still the evidence in the Bill which we are still considering because watching and besetting a person's premises are all there in the Act, but as regards peacefully persuading a person anywhere in Barbados outside of his residence, we are back in 1875 when it was acknowledged to be a perfect right of persons where it was under contemplation. What the argument is in 1963, nearly 100 years afterwards, I really do not understand it.

There is another important book which I have here in my hand which I regard more highly than that of Citrine on "Trade Union Law".
6.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, there is a book which I hold in my hand which I regard more than that of Mr. Citrine. It is a book entitled "Trade Union Law and Practice" by Horatio Vester and Anthony H. Gardner, O.B.E. On page 134, dealing with the matter of peaceful picketing, which is Section 2 of the 1906 Act, this is what it says:-

"It is lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union or of an individual employer or firm in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be if they do so merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

To allay the fears of hon. members who may still be fearing a French Revolution, the passage goes on to say this:-

"This provision is subject to the property rights of others and to the rights of others to go about their lawful business. Pickets are therefore not entitled to obstruct traffic by lying down in the highway," and a case is cited, "nor to obstruct pedestrians by deliberately standing in

their way, or touching them, or otherwise using violence and they are not entitled to trespass on private property. "Stay-in", "stay down," and "sit down" strikes all involve trespass, for an employee is only entitled to remain on the employer's property for the purpose of his employment, and if he "downs tools" his licence to remain on the property determines. If thereafter he remains on the employer's property against the wishes of the employer he is guilty of the tort of trespass and is not protected by the section."

Mr. Speaker, it could not be clearer than that. In the Other Place they want us to say that we must agree that a member of the Closed Brethren can tell a man's wife not to go into the man's home because he is not in fellowship but we should deprive a member of the Trade Union from telling a person who is going to seek a job or for some purpose connected with employment "You may not go in there". The person does not have to accept that advice. The striker is trying to get the sympathy of his fellows by preventing them from going to work. He says: "We are on strike and we would not like you to go and take the bread out of our children's mouths".

Mr. Speaker, I think I have read something which should substantially allay the fears of hon. members. I think I have fully explained what is meant by common law. The Statute Law came to Barbados in 1625 and the Common Law has grown up by customs, usages, a conglomeration of lots of things and in many instances it has been enshrined in the Act of Settlement, the Bill of Rights and the Parliament Act. There is a lot of legislation today in respect of which judges may not even appreciate the history of lawsuits and the privileges which people have been enjoying. That is the situation which we have.

There is one other criticism which I would like to make. I was surprised to hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter say what he said, that is, that we are polite. We have Standing Orders and those Orders have provided a method for dealing with a situation such as this. Far from being unconstitutional, we are being constitutional and far from being polite and annoyed we are merely inviting members of the Other Place to do what the Standing Orders invite them to do, that is to ask for what we have asked.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact, as hon. members are well aware, that four words occur in the first paragraph of the Message — the words "by a unanimous vote." If it had happened that the vote was not unanimous I would not be able to sign the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am asking leave that words "by a unanimous vote" be deleted from the first paragraph of this Message.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to delete the words "by a unanimous vote" from the first paragraph of this Message. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. (After a pause.) There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

The question that the Message as amended do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are a few more matters with which we would like to deal and I am therefore asking leave to move for the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16 and 18 in order that this sitting may continue uninterruptedly.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16 and 18 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

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

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 of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1963-64 No. 11

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution for the sum of \$60,040. At a Conference which was held in Jamaica in October, 1962, it was decided that consequent upon the breaking up of the Original Meteorological Service, a new Caribbean Meteorological Service should be formed. Since then there has been another meeting in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, and at a very early stage it was decided that Barbados should be established as the main Meteorological Station.
7.00 p.m.

In order to implement those proposals, we have to introduce this Resolution for the appointment of the staff that would be necessary for maintaining the Meteorological Station. I should like to explain very briefly to this House that a Resolution was presented here to employ a Meteorological Assistant at the beginning of the financial year, and he is not working on the Staff Establishment of this Island. The system which is now operating is that Piarco in Trinidad has the main Meteorological Station for the Eastern Caribbean, and the other main Meteorological Station is situated in Jamaica. There was a main Meteorological Station in the Bahamas, but that Station is closed down at the moment.

We know that we are going to have Federation and it is desirable that there should be a main Meteorological Station in Barbados, with or without Federation, because Barbados has certain natural conditions for forecasting weather which are not available in Trinidad. In addition to that the various research projects which are being carried out here would make it easy to guarantee a very advanced type of Meteorological forecasts not only for Barbados, the Windward and Leeward Islands, but for the whole of the Caribbean and the eastern seaboard of the United States and Central America.

Under the present system we cannot brief pilots of aircraft on synoptic weather conditions because we have no forecasters available. The officers, therefore, that we are supposed to employ would be a Meteorologist and Assistant Meteorologists. These people are usually university-trained and they do a special course in Meteorology either at an Institute just outside of London near Reading, or in the United States of America.

We have already provided for the Assistant Meteorologists, but I should like to make it clear that an Assistant

Meteorologist is not the same as the Assistants whom we have already employed. The Assistant Meteorologists are qualified Meteorologists, and they are not merely Assistants in the sense that a man is a Clerical Assistant or something like that. They are all trained Meteorologists.

When this Station is established, Barbados will be entitled to give out weather forecasts to aircraft. We hope in the not too distant future to obtain a special type of equipment which will save a lot of work because we would be able to get charts from electronic devices from other centres in the region. We also hope to acquire the equipment which the late Mr. Reece had used and made this service available to the people of Barbados during his lifetime. I have inspected this equipment, and it has also been surveyed by experts in the Public Works Department. We think it would be a great asset to the Barbados public, if we were to acquire this equipment.

This Resolution embodies not only the salaries of the Meteorologist and Assistant Meteorologists, but the cost of Instruments and Equipment, the upkeep of Equipment, Transportation, Office Expenses and so on. There are certain other expenses such as the purchase of balloons, hydrogen or the chemicals for the generation of hydrogen, plotting charts, recording instrument charts and so on. This is unavoidable, if you are going to have a really efficient Station.

I think the Windward and Leeward Islands have agreed, in principle, that they will make their contribution when the time comes towards the upkeep of the Federal Meteorological Service when it comes into being and, therefore, our expenditure may be somewhat reduced.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION re COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education: To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the parcel of land described in the Schedule thereto for the purpose of extending the St. Paul's Primary School.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that this House do now approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the parcel of land described in

the Schedule hereto for the purpose of extending the St. Paul's Primary School.

I would just like for a brief moment to give some information to the House regarding the necessity for this action to be taken. The St. Paul's Primary School is a Girls' School which should accommodate about 500 children, but it now has a roll of 763. It is one of the most overcrowded schools as far as Primary Schools are concerned in the St. Michael's area, but it is not an isolated case in the problem we have to overcome, because the Bay Primary School has accommodation for 660 and has 833 on the roll. 7.00 - 7.10 p.m.

Erdiston Model School has accommodation for 220 and it has on the roll 511. St. Ambrose has accommodation for 96 with 230 on the roll. It is therefore imperative that a maximum extension to St. Paul's Girls' School should be undertaken and what has held this up so far is that there are one or two persons whose land abut and abound and because the owners have not got a good and marketable title and in accordance with law you have to seek that marketable title through compulsory acquisition. That is what this Resolution is about.

I think hon. members would like to know that tomorrow morning I have the honour and privilege to hand over to the headteacher of the St. Lawrence Boys' School the keys to the new building which we have constructed in accordance with the current Development Plan. That is a replacement school and this would be followed by the junior school and the new primary school which we are building on the land of Government House, therefore by the beginning of next term there will be three primary schools, two of them replacements, but all of them commodious enough to take care of the growing school population.

The House would also like to know that within the last year or so the primary schools have been improving in their work. The House will recall that in the last calendar year we completed extension of nearly 60 classrooms to accommodate 3,000 children and I should like to think that this splendid achievement on the part of the Public Works Department, on behalf of the Ministry of Works, has resulted in the even better results which the children of the Primary Schools have got this year. The results have been so good that we are admitting in the Secondary Grammar Schools from September nearly 700 children from Primary Schools. The Combermere School itself is taking in 142 which is an unprecedented number. It shows that the money which was spent last year for making more classrooms in schools and buildings new schools to replace old ones, is justified. We firmly believe if we provide the advantages, the children will do the best for themselves. Therefore, Sir, I have pleasure in moving the passing of this Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The revelation which the Hon. Minister has made has caused me to rise. He has said that he has been able to make available these additional classrooms and I myself am glad of that, but I want to have the assurance from him that he is not following the stupid example of his predecessor and that he would not be so misguided as to spend \$500,000 on a school to hold 500 children.

I say that for the reason that the Hon. Minister would recall when I was on the other side in company with him on the Opposition, although not having the same philosophy, I objected then to the building of fancy schools. I said that it was not what we wanted, what we wanted was classrooms. I still say that the \$500,000 which was spent by the last Government to build a school to accommodate 500 children was too much taking into consideration the economy of this Island. I have had discussions with your present director or whoever he is and I do hope that the Hon. Minister is not pursuing the policy of spending so much to house so few.

However, Sir, dealing with this Resolution which is here to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of

land for extending the St. Paul's Girls' School, the Schedule reads as follows:-

"ALL THAT certain piece or parcel of land situate at Brittons Cross Road in the parish of Saint Michael in this Island containing by admeasurement One thousand seven hundred and twenty-five square feet or thereabouts Abutting and Bounding on lands of the St. Pauls' Girls' School, on lands formerly of one Pile, deceased, but now of Mrs. Small, on lands formerly of H. Doyle but now of Mrs. Wiggins, and on Brittons Cross Road or however else the same may abut and bound."

I think the Hon. Minister should be able to tell us the price which you are paying for this property. The Addendum states that you have come here for compulsory acquisition because the owner of the property is not in possession of a good and marketable title. Therefore, you must have reached agreement as to the dollars and cents which you are paying for the 1,725 sq.ft. of land which you are acquiring. The Hon. Minister should be able to tell us how much the property is being sold for. This is really needed because that school is really overcrowded.

I am saying this with a full sense of my responsibility, Mr. Speaker. It strikes me with the policy of the administration of education being what it is that you should take into consideration the acquiring of all those houses within the municipal area which now no longer are occupied by their owners from the point of view of their exorbitant cost. I am wondering if the policy of the Government would be that wherever it is possible and necessary to acquire some of these buildings, I wonder if the Government realise that they would make excellent sites for schools. As hon. members know, with some of these primary schools the more you add to them, you can never get sufficient space to accommodate the growing school population because as people come into an area the area is built up, therefore I think that instead of extending and extending on an old building that you better buy some of these places and turn them into schools. That is my opinion.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: In reply to the hon. senior member for the City, the first question which he asked was about the cost of the erection of these buildings. I agree with him that under the last regime he was quite concerned, and quite justifiably, about the high cost of school buildings and the unnecessary expenditure which went into building them. However, since this Government has come to power, the Public Works Department under the Ministry of Communications and Works has developed an entirely new technique to class room building and we have managed to implement a radical reduction in the cost. It is something like \$4,500 to the \$6,000 which it formerly cost for a classroom.

I may also say that this new school to be re-opened tomorrow would have nine class rooms and it has been erected at a cost of \$40,000. 7.20 p.m.

That is what I think has enabled both Ministries to proceed with the school building programme more rapidly than we would otherwise have done. The second question which was asked concerned the amount of land which is involved in this compulsory acquisition. The amount of land is 1,725 square feet and we are paying \$2,000 for it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member for the information.

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

RESOLUTION re INTEREST RATE ON LOAN TO TRANSPORT BOARD

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution that the rate of interest chargeable to the Transport Board on a loan of \$45,000 which was guaranteed

by the Government in accordance with Resolution No. 26/1963 be "one half of one per cent below the prime lending rate from time to time" instead of "being 6%, one half of one per cent below the prime lending rate from time to time" as was stated in the Resolution No. 26/1963.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution merely sets out that in March, 1962, there was an Agreement with the Barbados Workers' Union by which the Transport Board had to pay an increase in salaries and wages to the staff amounting to \$12,000 per month. This Agreement came into force from January, 1962 but the decision by the Barbados Workers' Union was not concluded until sometime in March and the Transport Board had to pay an amount of back pay. As a result of that, the Board borrowed this money, \$45,000, from the Royal Bank of Canada. The Government came down here with a Resolution for the purpose of guaranteeing this loan to the Transport Board. The Agreement was to the effect that the amount borrowed should be at the rate of six per cent, one half of one per cent below the prime lending rate from time to time. Rather the interest rate should have been one half of one per cent.

At that time the interest rate at the Bank must have been six and a half per cent so that there was an error in the figures of six per cent rather than one half of one per cent below the prime lending rate from time to time. The interest rate fluctuates and whatever the rate is the Agreement is that it should be one half of one per cent below the normal lending rate. At that time the rate was six per cent and an error was made. We are now asking in this Resolution to amend the previous figures so that the rate should not be fixed at six per cent but it should be one half of one per cent below the prime lending rate from time to time. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing this Resolution but the position must be made clear to me. When the Transport Board wanted to borrow money as a result of the Agreement with the Barbados Workers' Union they had to grant retrospective pay. The interest rate was then six per cent and you are now asking that that rate be amended so as to allow the interest to be one half of one per cent below the prime lending rate from time to time. I quite understand what that means, but I wonder if the Hon. Minister can tell me if the interest rate was six per cent and it has gone up higher than that. When we passed the Bill saying that the rate should be not exceeding six per cent money is loaned to persons who have good collateral at five and a half per cent. Is it that the Bank has carried its interest rate from six per cent to six and a half per cent or seven per cent? This does not mean that you will be making this amendment so that the Transport Board will be paying less money on their loan of \$45,000; they are going to pay more money on that sum. As the Bank of England rate goes up and down the interest rate also fluctuates. Am I right in saying that the Board will be paying more than six per cent?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member, what has actually happened is this: at the time when the insertion of the words "six per cent" was made, that was an error. Those words were inserted because at the time of the preparation of the Resolution the prime lending rate of six and a half per cent was the rate of interest which was chargeable at that time. In other words, the standing rate of interest is one half of one per cent below the normal rate at any normal time. With the fluctuation, if the rate goes up it is one half of one per cent and if it should fall, it will be one half of one per cent.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one half of one per cent is only half per cent.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Very well, Sir.

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

REPLY TO QUESTION

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been drawn to my attention that the Oral Reply to question No. 105, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael, is ready. That question will be found on page 8 of the Order Paper. The Standing Orders have been suspended and I understand that there is no other matter under Government Business to be dealt with today. Therefore if the Government is prepared to lay the answer to that question, I will allow that to be done.
7.30 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have no such question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said the hon. senior member for the metropolitan parish. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not the senior member for the metropolitan parish.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I see the senior member for St. Michael, but I do not see any senior member for the metropolitan parish.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I take it that leave has been granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Re PRICE CONTROL INSPECTORS

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that there are Price Control Inspectors who have been employed by Government and paid from the Treasury for over twenty (20) years who have no pension rights?

2. Will Government take steps, whether by legislation or otherwise, to bring these officers within the ambit of a Government Pension Scheme?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in reply to Oral Question 105/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael:

"There are three Price Control Inspectors who have recently completed twenty (20) years' service with the Supplies and Subsidies Control Office."

"(2) The employees of this Office from its inception have been employed on a temporary and non-pensionable basis."

"(3) Government is actively investigating proposals to grant permanent and pensionable status to such of its temporary employees as may be performing services, the need for which is likely to persist indefinitely."

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Premier, and I hope that the others will be included.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House that under Private Members' Business, Order No. 19 be made the First Order of the Day for the next meeting.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I would like the permission of the House that under Private Members' Business, Order No. 7 be taken as Order No. 2 for the next meeting.

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

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask leave of the House to make Order No. 15, Order No. 3 for the next meeting.

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

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I am also asking that Order No. 17 be taken as Order No. 4 for the next meeting.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 30th July, 1963, at 2.30 p.m.

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

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

7.40 p.m.