THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30th July, 1963.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker);* Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Minister of Education);* Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing);* Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.;Mr. N. W. BOXILL and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of the 16th July, 1963 have been circulated, and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be confirmed.

There apparently being no objection, I declare the Minutes of the meeting duly to be confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement in reply to the Resolution passed by the House of Assembly on 16th April, 1963, on the motion of the hon. senior member for St. Peter regarding the setting up of a Committee to study the needs for industrial training and re-training and the establishment of Trade Schools throughout the Island. The statement reads as follows:-

STATEMENT ON APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE NEED FOR INDUSTRIAL TRAINING AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRADE SCHOOLS

On 16th April, 1963, a Resolution was passed by this Honourable House on the motion of the Honourable Senior Member for St. Peter requesting the Government to set up a Committee to study the needs for industrial training and re-training and the establishment of Trade Schools throughout the Island to meet the pressing present day industrial requirements.

2. Government has decided to establish within the next month a Committee whose terms of reference will be those indicated in the Resolution.

The following bodies will be invited to sit on the Committee:

The Barbados Worker's Union
Business Interests including the Employers' Confederation
The Apprenticeship Board
The Barbados Technical Institute
The Barbados Union of Teachers
The Ministry of Trade and Labour
The Ministry of Works
The Ministry of Education.

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

Report on the Training Scheme Fund for the financial year 1962-63.

Statement showing sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 31st March, 1963.

Statistical Service — Quarterly Digest of Statistics — No. 25 — March, 1963.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 8) Order, 1963.

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Scheduled Officers) Regulations, 1963.

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Scheduled Officers) (No. 2) Regulations, 1963.

Also on behalf of the Hon. Leader of the House, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (Bellairs Research Institute of McGill University) (Vehicles Exemption) Order, 1963.

The Customs Duties (Materials for smocking, embroidery and other types of handwork) Order, 1963.

The Customs Duties (Containers, Labels and Packaging Materials) Order 1963.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Report of the Irrigation Board for the year 1961.

Report of the Irrigation Board for the year 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of $37,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part 1 — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1963-64, No. 12, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 8) Order, 1963.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS it has been found in England and Europe that the system of dividing children into categories at the early age of eleven has proved unscientific and unreliable, procedural arrangements being now made in England to do away with the Common Entrance examination in its present form by the end of the current year,

AND WHEREAS incalculable emotional disturbance is caused in the minds of Barbadian children annually subjected to this harmful and dangerous system of early selectivity

BE IT RESOLVED that this examination be abolished and a more equitable and less rigorous method of selection for secondary education be introduced.

QUESTIONS

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Questions:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that Haggatts Factory in the parish of St. Andrew ceases to be a sugar-cane grinding factory and will not be available to reap the 1963-64 cane crop?

2. Is Government aware of the dire hardships such a cessation is likely to cause to the peasant cane-growers in the Scotland District in the said parish of St. Andrew?

3. What steps does Government propose taking in the immediate future to relieve the plight of cane-growers in the said area?

4. Will Government set about without delay to provide roads which will make for easier ferrying of canes from peasants' plots on to the Main Highway for dispatch to sugar factories which might be inclined to assist in the harvesting of the canes of peasants from the area?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Since the Haggatts Sugar Factory in the parish of St. Andrew ceases to operate as such any more, will Government cause an investigation to be made so that workers who have been employed at the said factory — both in the factory and otherwise — will be told without delay what compensation, if any, will be paid to them by the present owners of the said Haggatts Factory?

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the main road via Rock Hall in the parish of St. Thomas is now undergoing repairs?

Will the Minister issue a directive to have proper gutters constructed in order that the flow of water may be controlled?

2.45 p.m.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 92/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on 27th November, 1962;

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 113/1962 asked by the same hon. member on the 16th April, 1963.

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 117/1962, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas on 23rd April, 1963;

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 122/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter on the 7th May, 1963;

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 126/1962, asked by the hon. junior member for St. John on the 28th May, 1963;

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 127/1962, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on the 28th May, 1963; and

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 130/1962, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, are all ready.

BUS STOP AT EDGHILL CORNER

Mr. SPEAKER: Replies have been laid to Parliamentary Question No. 92/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will Government cause a shed to be erected at the bus stop at Edghill Corner St. Thomas, for the convenience of the residents at Melrose and Edghill, in the said parish?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the Oral Reply to that question is as follows:-

The Government has investigated the need for a bus shelter at Edghill Corner in the parish of St. Thomas for the residents at Melrose and Edghill and does not consider that it can be accorded a high priority in relation to the needs of other areas through the Island. However, steps are being taken to improve the facilities for the travelling public in that area by the construction of a platform over the open culvert.

CANEFIELD HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 113/1962, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the property known as Canefield House in the parish of St. Thomas can be an ideal centre for the establishment of a Trade School?

2. Will Government explore the possibility of acquiring the said property with a view to establishing a Trade School in the said parish to accommodate boys and girls living within the northern parishes?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The replies are as follows:-

The project of Trade Schools or Trades Training Centres has been under examination by the Ministry of Education. The Government has recently decided to appoint a Committee to consider this whole question, including the suitability of sites.

STURGES AND SPRINGVALE CORNER

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 117/1962 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas:

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

Is the Minister aware that the corner known as Sturges and Springvale corner situated in St. Thomas, is a threat and great danger to limb and life because of the narrowness of the road at the said corner?

2. Will the Minister issue a directive to Highways and Transport to have the said corner widened without delay?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: The Replies are as follows:-

An investigation has been carried out and it has been revealed that there were no accidents at Sturges and Spring Vale Corner during the past three years.

2. Consideration will however be given to this area in the Government's overall plan for road improvements throughout the Island.

QUESTION 122/1962 HELD OVER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next is Question 122/1962, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is presently not in his place, and I will allow that to stand over for the instant.

CLIFF COTTAGE RESIDENTS WITHOUT CONSTANT SUPPLY OF WATER

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 126/1962 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John:

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

Is the Minister aware that residents in the Cliff Cottage area in the parish of St. John although provided with a domestic water service are often without a constant supply of water?

2. Will the Minister remedy this state of affairs as soon as possible?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: The Replies are as follows:-

I am aware that at certain times the residents of Cliff Cottage are without a constant supply of water. This is mainly due to the increased number of services in the area which causes the main to be overloaded at the lower elevations to the disadvantage of the higher area at Cliff Cottage.

It is proposed to extend the main from the St. John's Almshouse area to connect up with the Cliff Cottage main with a view to improving the present situation.

PENSIONERS WAITING TO RECEIVE PENSION

Mr. SPEAKER: Question 127/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph:

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

Is Government aware that Government pensioners have to wait for long hours to receive their pension on pay days and sometimes return home without receiving such pension due to the expiry of time?

2. Is the Government aware that because of the long period of waiting several of these pensioners become ill?

3. Will Government devise some means whereby payments to these pensioners can be made more quickly and more easily?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

I am not aware of any Government pensioners who have had to wait long hours to receive pensions on pay days nor of any persons who return home without receiving their pensions.

It is inevitable that there should be periods of waiting with 1,350 pensioners seeking payment on the two days alloted for the payment of Government pensioners but I am advised that the longest waiting period does not exceed one hour.

It has been drawn to my attention that some pensioners arrive at the Treasury an hour or two before the opening time, and recently some had arrived as early as 6. a.m. The Government cannot accept the responsibility for this self-imposed ordeal.

2. I am also not aware of any pensioners who become ill as a result of having to wait for long periods at the Treasury.

3. To avoid as far as possible delay and inconvenience, an additional paying teller is now available on the days allotted for payment of Government pensioners.

2.55 p.m.

FAULTY GUTTER AT CLIFTON HILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question to which the Oral Reply has been laid, is question No. 130 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

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

Is the Minister aware that due to a faulty gutter at Clifton Hill on Highway F of St. Thomas the residents in that area are in an unhappy state, owing to the stench from stale water that lodges in the gutter?

Will the Minister please use his good offices to have this state of affairs rectified immediately?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

I am aware that there was a faulty gutter at Clifton Hill. The affected area has been cleaned and weeded and it is proposed to have the gutter paved.

Mr. SPEAKER: There remains outstanding only the Oral Reply to Question No. 122 and I will allow that Question to remain over until the next meeting of the House.

The Question stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, who is not now in his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

LAYING OFF OF FIELD WORKERS WITHOUT PROPER NOTICE

Mr. SPEAKER: We proceed now with the consideration of Private Members' Business. The first Order of the Day under that Head stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas:- To move the passing of a Resolution relating to the laying off, without proper notice, of field workers.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists wherever field workers are concerned and as regards the system of laying off without proper notice given;

AND WHEREAS the said workers have families to support;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government notify all supervisors not to lay off any worker without giving him proper notice in order that the said worker be allowed time to adjust himself."

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a very simple one in that it will meet the unanimous support of this Chamber. It is the type of Resolution which should have come to this House several years ago but, unfortunately, no one felt disposed to bring forward such a Resolution. However, I have taken it upon myself to introduce this Resolution because it has been drawn to my attention by several workers in the community that the system which was in operation for several years has developed into much dissatisfaction among such workers. I feel, Sir, that wherever dissatisfaction exists among workers, especially if they happen to be Government employees, an immediate remedy should

be effected. It is true that this present Government has been in office for just a short time and therefore it is impossible for them really to attend to the needs of the community immediately. I feel that now that this Resolution has been introduced the Government will come to the rescue of these workers and effect immediate satisfaction.

Those workers who are employed on a monthly basis are given a month's notice before their period of office terminates and therefore these field workers, who are sometimes classified as casual workers, should also be entitled to similar consideration. That is what prompted me to introduce this Resolution. Some overseers have, until recently, been laying off some workers without any notice being given them, that is to say, that workers have had to leave their homes to go to work and on arrival there, they are told that there is no work for them. These workers, as you know, Mr. Speaker, have their families to support. They have expenses to meet and therefore some arrangement should be devised in order that they would be informed in advance — it may be a week or two before — that their services will be terminated. I do not feel that it is a difficult task for a Government to perform if the same thing takes place with monthly employees. These monthly employees are given a month's notice of the termination of their employment but the casual employees are not given any notice of the termination of their employment at all. What happens is that the overseers suddenly go on the field and inform these workers that they can gather up their tools. I know, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has plans to remedy this situation but it is fortunate for me at this time to have introduced this Resolution. The workers have bills to pay and no doubt Your Honour must have been subjected to much inconvenience with the people who reside in your constituency. I have had much inconvenience to undergo with these workers who come in to me from time to time. I wonder if I had them employed myself if they would be entitled to draw some kind of pension from me. However, these people are dissatisfied and now that I have drawn the matter to the attention of the Government no doubt the situation will be remedied in the future. Some of these people have to contribute to some society and some of them have to go into what is known as a "meeting turn" so as to get ends to meet because of the number of people to whom they have to attend.
3.05 p.m.

When these workers are laid off without proper notice, it is impossible for them properly to administer to their families, and much danger can accrue as a result. Some of these overseers, I believe, Mr. Speaker, are really not sincere, because this practice was in operation for several years. It is a fact that during the regime of the last Government, this state of affairs was very rampant where workers were laid off and no redress given, but I am sure that this Government will go into this matter seriously.

It is a very difficult undertaking for workers to be employed especially by Government when they have malice in their minds. I know that Your Honour as well as the other members of this Chamber have journeyed throughout this Island and have seen the number of people employed on the roads, how some of them sit down, and some of them just work an hour or two a day with their eyes on the clock waiting to get to their homes, and because of that irritation going on, the overseers might be justified to some extent in pursuing the same old pattern. I feel that if a few workers are guilty of this defect and bad practice, the entire set of workers should not be penalised. Some of them are honest workers and give a full day's work for a full day's pay; but on the other hand, there are some who seem not to realise that they are bringing harm and danger to themselves and not to the particular Government in office, and it is only when they are laid off that they realise their error.

I have been approached by several workers who no doubt might be termed as slackers and who do not give a fair day's work for a fair day's wage, but who, after they have been laid off, approach their representatives. When they are told that it is all their fault, they seem unable to understand at the outset, but when the discussion continues, they realise that they in some measure have contributed to the situation. Government no doubt stands to lose considerably if that practice is allowed to continue. These workers spread propaganda amongst other workers, and the propoganda which they spread happens to be of such that it does irreparable harm to the community, and we cannot afford to allow a few people in a community to distort the proper administrative responsibility and affairs of this Government. Workers must be told by their supervisors that they are workers employed by Government, that they pay taxes, that the taxes which they are called upon to pay in turn have to pay them, and therefore if they sit by and try to draw money without trying to work for it, they are doing harm to themselves and to the community.

I feel, however, Mr. Speaker, that these field workers should be given more consideration. They should be given a longer period of time to adjust themselves when a lay-off takes place. We know that it is impossible, Sir, for any Government to employ all the people in a community. It is also true that some of these workers go around saying to others that it is the Government that has to look for work for them. It is impossible for any Government to employ all the workers in a community, but a large majority, Mr. Speaker, seems unable to appreciate that fact, and we have got an uphill task in trying to convince such workers who from time to time must be laid off in order that the various projects might be tackled according to the financial implications involved. These workers must be told that when the period arrives for their dismissal either permanently or temporarily, they must shoulder their responsibilities as sincere and true workers to the community, and realise that when they are laid off, they must demonstrate some initiative on their part in some other avenue whereby they can acquire some means of eking out a proper existence. They must be trained, Mr. Speaker, that when they are working they must put up for rainy days, and as such the period can be attributed as a rainy day period as far as financial matters are concerned.

When these workers are employed, they seem to pay little or no regard for the temporary lay-off that must come at some time, and that is a situation which they seem not to be able to remedy. I feel that this Government can approach the matter in as simple a way as possible to allow these workers to be told before the period of lay-off that this lay-off will take place, and I am sure that if sufficient time was given to them, they would be able to adjust themselves, and much inconvenience which they at present endure will be minimized somewhat. In a large measure, I feel that the overseers are responsible.

This system of telling workers to check in their tools is really not good enough, because it makes the workers feel that sufficient consideration is not given to them and they are being classified as outcasts; but in humble submission, Mr. Speaker, I think that some proper conclusion can be arrived at through which these workers will become appreciative of the good work that the Government intends to do on their behalf, and that when these periods of lay-off take place, they will realise that it is not done intentionally, but is something that must happen even in private enterprise, and should therefore not be something new or strange to them. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that hon. members of this Chamber will be in wholehearted agreement with this type of Resolution.
3.15 p.m.

It is not a Resolution, as hon. members will see, to create any financial burden on the Government. The Minister concerned can issue a directive to the Overseers to inform these workers a week or two in advance when these periods of lay-offs are to take place and I am sure, if this is done, much inconvenience to which these workers are subjected would be reduced in a large measure. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in moving the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this motion, I would just say that it is somewhat difficult and slightly technical. I do agree that people should never have to leave their homes to go for a particular employment and then to be told that there is no work for them, but as the

Resolution is stated, they are casual workers and a casual worker is really not any person who is in steady employment. A casual worker is a man who works on a day to day basis. If you are working as a casual worker, you are working on a day-to day basis. You might be employed on a project which might be finished within a week, so I do not think an overseer can be always in the position to say that this work is going to finish on a Monday or on a Friday. It may be very difficult for him to say which day a particular job would be completed and, as a result of that, sometimes, some of these casual workers are turned off in this *ad hoc* way.

Sir, what I do deplore is some of the vindicitive ways in which some of these people are being treated. I do remember when Mr. Aneurin Bevan was Minister of Labour, he discovered that sometimes it was very hard with coal-miners working in a haphazard way and although their case was different from these casual workers, he felt as a result that those coal-miners should be given some guaranteed week for their work. But, as I have said, it is slightly different with casual workers here who are employed in the Public Works Department and the Department of Highways and Transport owing to the fact that they are laid off for a matter of weeks before they are re-employed and that is due to the shortage of work.

Although I would like an overseer to give these people some sort of idea when they will be laid off, I do know that it would be somewhat difficult at some times for him to do so. Inasmuch as I would like to support this Resolution, it has placed me in a somewhat invidious position because knowing what a casual worker is I cannot go all out as I would like in supporting the Resolution. If the word "casual' means not definite and you have something in a casual way, you cannot demand that a overseer tell a worker exactly what day he would be laid off. What you can ask the overseer to do if a particular project is coming to completion is wherever possible to notify half of the men that as from next week they will be laid off.

With those few remarks, I second the motion.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, reading the Resolution, I had the impression that this matter dealt with field workers. I think in Barbados as soon as you use the term "field workers" you give the impression of an association with agricultural field workers but I understand that the Hon. Mover of the Resolution has been making reference to Government workers such as those employed by the Highways and Transport Department and the Public Works Department — those who work, I should say, not in the field but who work on the roads more or less and on Government projects.

Sir, I think the hon. member who has just sat down has got nearer to the problem than the Hon. Mover of the Resolution because the Hon. Mover of this motion has asked Government to intervene, and the moment he does that, I must think that he is referring to Government workers, because if they were privately employed, I do not think he would move a Resolution directly asking the Government to intervene.

As regards casual employees who work from day to day on Government projects, there is some difficulty in always being able to give due notice to them of when they would be laid off. The work is of such a nature that those people can only be termed as casual workers.

I understand that nowadays they have some measure of security because they are paid for public holidays and they get, if they qualify, annual vacation. But coming to the question of giving due notice of lay-offs, I quite appreciate what the Hon. Mover has in mind. I have had a lot to do with the laying off of workers some years ago and I always have been one who advocated that workers, whenever reasonably possible, should be given due notice of when they were going to be laid off, therefore, you can see that I do uphold what the Resolution wants to convey. However, you have to grasp the hard facts and to appreciate that some projects are of very short duration and they employ a small number of people. Very often, those who gain employment on these small projects are very casual indeed. We have a great army of unemployed and whenever a project of whatever magnitude comes up, it must be appreciated that there are always more people to offer themselves for employment than there are jobs.

3.25 p.m.

The difficulty is that although the Highways and the Public Works Departments have what they may term as a skeleton staff even of the unskilled workers, there are many other workers who come along and are engaged but they are not in anyway obligated to the particular Departments. In other words, they drift in and they drift out. During the crop season, they may be employed at a factory. During the building season they may be employed on some building project and, of course, at other times you will find them asking for work on Government projects; but the difficulty is that there are other employees who are semi-permanent. These workers are listed as such, they have greater security and I think they are given notice fairly well in advance of the termination of their employment; but there are others of whom you cannot say that their names appear so regularly on the register that the supervisors can regard them as people who are very eligible for notice being given to them of the termination of their employment. That is the great difficulty. It is very difficult to give notice of the termination of employment in respect of days' work. Although I uphold in principle the idea of giving notice to workers so that they may be able to gear themselves for other employment, yet I must realise the fact that there is a very great reservoir of unemployed workers who work here, there, and everywhere, and it is very difficult to insist that these people are qualified in the same manner as those who are called semi-permanent employees.

Mr. Speaker, the casual workers are placed in two classes. There are those who have been known to work on Government projects and those who simply come in now and again. I have had the experience of having to intervene in order to find out when workers may be re-employed when the lay-off period may be terminated; but I do not think I have known of an instance where any sort of notice was given. Generally, notice is given. I think that the instances where notices are not given are perilously few and there may be some instances where workers are very casual indeed, so much so that the supervisor does not regard the particular worker or workers as being eligible in any way for notice to be given to them. From the known periods of their employment they do not make the impression on the supervisor that they really require a notice being served on them. These people catch as catch can. Mr. Speaker, I hope that I am not repeating myself too much. There is a casual staff of skilled workers and a casual staff of unskilled workers who are attached to one or the other of the two departments which I have mentioned. I do not think that those who are attached to these categories have any cause for complaint in matters of this sort. I quite agree with the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who seems to be knowledgeable somewhat as to the conditions obtaining with workers of this sort. As to this question of giving notice to those who catch as catch can — it may be that a person may be employed on a Government project or sugar factory or elsewhere, and where a person is employed in such a case, that is one which must present difficulty to any of these departments where such a person has to be given due notice as to the termination of his employment. When you come to think of it, the principle behind giving a man notice is to give him time so as to get another job. A person is told: "I have no other employment for you as from today but you can hold on until the end of the week or until the end of the month." During that time that worker may be looking for a job. I think that, in principle, every member of this House will uphold the idea and would like the matter of job security to be the thing in Barbados. When it comes to the army of the unskilled people, the matter is even worse than in the case of other employees. The situation is really difficult. What these people want is the opportunity to get work. The giving of a notice serves no real purpose for an unskilled man who gets a week's notice and then he is unable to find work at the end of that period. It makes matter substantially difficult for him. The whole principle which lies

behind giving a man notice is, as I say, that he is given time to look around for another job; but if there is no other job for him to get, the idea of giving that man notice is a sham. What is the idea of giving him notice? We do not uphold the arbitrary ways of employers but we have to face some stubborn facts when we look around Barbados.

Those who are the representatives of people and we are all representatives of the people, when we meet people and they meet us we all know our Barbados. We know that if the smallest project is started next week say, in St. Lucy, there is an army of unemployed people who would gather on the spot waiting for a job. When that job is finished it might be that some of the people who have been employed there have worked for the first time. Now, what is there material in giving that man notice a week before the job has come to an end? What is the idea of giving that man notice that his employment would be terminated at the end of the week? A man who is employed more or less regularly has a reasonable expectation of work when he turns up for work on Monday morning. If he is told that there is no work for him, that must be a certain shock to him to find that there is no work, but this sort of employment is not at all of the same nature as work of a casual nature.
3.35 p.m.

While it might be a good thing to offer this Resolution and seek the concurrence of hon. members of this House in it, while it might be good to state or re-state the principle behind giving notice to a worker who reasonably turns out expecting work, we have to face the fact that there is more than one category of worker who is offered employment in the Government Service. There is a small number which might be called a skeleton staff attached to either of these Departments; there is another section which you may call semi-permanent; then there are those whom you cannot say where they belong. They go and work on Government projects, sometimes in Local Government projects, in a sugar factory, on building projects and almost anywhere else. Can we say that such a worker turns out reasonably expecting work at the beginning of every week? The moment we can say that a worker turns out with a reasonable expectation, then we are on good ground. If we cannot say that, what is the use of giving him notice. He wants work; he does not want a notice really. A notice may hurt in this instance unnecessarily, but it does not hurt in the same manner as it hurts a man who turns out reasonably expecting work, a man who is regularly engaged, who has been there for weeks and months and maybe for years, and is regarded as a staff man. That kind of notice is different altogether when he turns out with a reasonable expectation for work. The sort of very casual worker who is referred to in this Resolution does not turn up with that same reasonable expectation. Mark you, Sir, that does not say that a man has not the right to get work. No rational being could ever intimate that at all. Every man has a right to seek and expect work, but there are different circumstances altogether. Therefore if this Resolution seeks to insist that the very casual worker be given notice, it effects nothing really, Sir. You may give notice, but what follows after that? Not a job; and that is what the worker really wants.

Sir, I am not defending the arbitrary supervisor who thinks he can look at a man in the morning and say "I do not want you, go back home." Whenever a worker is in a position to reasonably expect that he should be offered work, due notice is a necessity. There are workers who turn out on projects who cannot claim that they are by any means regulars, and the nature of the job is such that even if the project lasted for a long time, that does not destroy the principle that it is one which is certain of termination. You cannot say after that that a worker can turn out in the Nth week with a reasonable expectation of work and that is why he should receive due notice.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have talked sufficiently long on this, and have made myself clear. Much as we all deplore any attitude on the part of any employer or group of employers to act in a manner as if they think a worker has no right to expect work, or as if he can just be hired and easily "fired" — we would all rise up in condemnation of that — at the same time we have got to face the facts as they appear in Barbados. A group of workers may be employed in painting a building that may run into weeks, but there is little point in giving him a formal notice since the workers can see for themselves that the work is nearing completion when the end is in sight. I would appreciate employers, however, whether they be Government or private employers, informing workers when a project is nearing the end, or that there would be no work on the particular project a week from that time. Under the terms of this Resolution, it does not clarify the meaning enough. To begin with, it says "field workers" which gives the impression that it refers to agricultural workers, whereas it means workers in projects under the direction of Government Departments, and here I say that these projects have obvious limitations, and for the workers, the majority of whom are very casual indeed, it cannot be said that they stand in the same circumstances as workers who, as regulars, have every reason to turn out expecting the continuation of their labours.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is one which I would like to support, more especially because in this country you can find a tremendous lot of unskilled labourers who must be characterised as casual labourers, and who in truth and in fact are casual because they work casually according as they get work, and casually because employers cannot afford to keep them as permanent employees. This, however, is not a Bill that is before the House; it is merely a Resolution, and a Resolution of this nature cannot be so worked as to call upon all employers.

The hon. member refers in the first line of the Resolution to "field workers", and although field workers out of this context might mean field workers of the Social Welfare Department, colloquially I understand what the hon. member means. He is thinking of the people at Dunscombe or Vaucluse in the parish which he has the honour to represent, but which we refer to as agricultural workers. Actually I can vote for the Resolution as it stands, but I am counselling the hon. member to accept an amendment which would make much more sense — not that his Resolution does not — than this at present does. You cannot call on the people at Dunscombe, Vaucluse, Hillaby or any of the places to do what this Resolution says, therefore I think in the hon. member's mind, he is thinking of Local Government employers and other Departments that spend Government money, that is, where you vote money for Boards.
3.45 p.m.

He wants to be able to say that this House is of the opinion that some consideration should be given to these people.

While I agree with the last hon. member who spoke, I am suggesting to the Hon. Mover of the Resolution to let his Resolution be worded this way because frankly we cannot tell those other people, who hire casual labourers, to tell their workers when they are going to lay them off. Take for instance that I have casual workers employed and I find myself without sufficient money in my pockets to hire them next week but I cannot tell yet because I expect some money to come to me during the end of the week. I cannot tell yet whether I may be able to employ them next week. I have to wait until Saturday comes and if I do not receive any more money, I would have to tell them that I have nothing to pay them with next week, therefore, do not come out on Monday morning. This Resolution deals with not only agricultural workers but all workers who are casually employed. We should pass a Resolution which we should be proud about and I am suggesting to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas not to take umbrage at the amendment which I am going to suggest to him. I suggest that the Resolution should read as follows:

"WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists where casual workers are concerned". — ("Casual Workers" instead of "field workers.")

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member proceed to make his amendments at dictation speed in order that the Clerk

may be able to take it down? I know that it is difficult for his tongue not to move as quickly as his brain.

Mr. MOTTLEY: All right, Sir, I will try. It should read:-

"WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists where casual workers are concerned" — and let us leave out after the word "concerned" the words "and regards" and insert the word "with" and continue "with the system of laying off without proper notice given"; — and I will also suggest that you leave out "and WHEREAS the said workers have families to support", because that is somewhat superfluous. Now, the final Clause should read as follows:

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Government notify the proper departments" — leave out the words "all supervisors" — "not to lay off any worker without proper notice."

I believe that carries it to its fullest point of view. We would like to know that persons while they are employed are given notice that they would not be working next week. it may be that we expect no money until after the Estimates or until taxes are collected and therefore, we must lay you off until we get that. You could tell them a week ahead that you are laying them off. You should be able to say today, Saturday, that next week you will not be able to employ such and such a worker.

I suggest to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to accept the amendments which I have made and I am asking him to do so not because I think there is any inability on his part but because of his inexperience. This is really the proper way of putting it. If the hon. member accepted my amendments, I will have much pleasure in voting for the Resolution, but I will not vote for it if it is worded as it is. You are not passing a Bill or a law; you are passing a Resolution and you cannot go to any planter or person to tell him when to lay off any person whom he has employed casually. You can only pass something over which we have control. We have control over the Department of Highways and Transport, the Housing Authority and all the other several Boards which we provide money for in our Estimates. The hon. member must remember that the Auditor General or the Accountant General cannot pay out money to the Waterworks Department or any of these Departments for work done unless the money is passed by the Houses of the Legislature.

Sir, I do not think I should say more on this: I will only urge the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to accept my amendments. I believe his colleagues on the ministerial benches will agree with me that the amendments would be the correct thing. I will not vote for the Resolution as it stands but if the amendments are accepted, I will vote for it. I have purposely framed my remarks in this way, and I have refrained from utterances which I think will raise the ire of the hon. member.
3.55 p.m.

Before I take my seat, I should be glad if the Clerk would read back the proposed amendment as it stands so that the hon. introducer might hear it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should not be standing while the amendment is being read. The hon. member may sit with the understanding that he has only given way.

The CLERK read the amendment as follows:-

WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists where casual workers are concerned with the system of laying off without prior notice being given to them;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government notify the appropriate departments not to lay off any worker without prior notice.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, that is my amendment. If the hon. member would have his Resolution read out side by side with my amendment, he will see that brevity is the soul of wit, although it is not so with me. I am suggesting to the hon. member that, with my experience, he should accept the amendment.

Mr. BATSON: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was in here when I spoke in the first instance and introduced the Resolution so that there is a slight misunderstanding in that this Resolution specifically refers to Government employees and not private employees. When the hon. member suggests workers at Vaucluse, Dunscombe and other places, they are private concerns. I am not dealing with them; I am dealing specifically with field workers employed by the Government only.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is really a point of elucidation. Where the Resolution states that "much dissatisfaction exists wherever field workers are concerned" that reference may have caused the misunderstanding.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is a true Barbadian just as I am. If he were to stand up in his school and ask what is meant by "field worker" what answer will he get? You have workers at Bawdens, Dodds, Codrington and so on. If the hon. member means field workers then he does not mean workers at the Highways and Transport Department or casual workers at the Housing Authority, the Public Works Department, the Water Works Department and so on. What does the hon. member mean by "field workers"? Will he enlighten us on that point?

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. I am only drawing to Your Honour's attention the fact that the hon. senior member for the City said that what the Acting Clerk read out was his amendment but he would not take his seat; he would await the reading of the amendment. Your Honour told him that it would not be right for him to be standing while the amendment was being read.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition sat at my request so that the amendment might be read by the Clerk and then the Hon. Leader of the Opposition resumed his speech. After the Hon. Leader of the Opposition resumed his speech, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas rose on a point of order which turned out to be really a point of elucidation. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition gave way and he has now resumed his speech. I do not hold that the hon. member has concluded his speech.

Mr. SMITH: You will have to take it that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition gave way but the hon. introducer instead of getting up and saying that he agreed or disagreed with the amendment, mentioned that he had risen on a point of order. However, the hon. senior member for the City had finished his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I feel that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would be the only person to know whether he had finished his speech or not.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has been in this House for many years and did he think I would have finished my speech when I saw that somebody had risen on a point of order? But we all know that we have to accept that from the hon. member. However, Sir, as I was saying, what does the hon. introducer mean by "field workers"? Has he got in mind the hundreds of people who were employed at St. Thomas when they were laying down pipes and so forth? Does he regard those people as field workers? What is a field worker? If the hon. member means that a field worker is a field worker as we take it, I expect that he is dealing with plantations; but if the hon. member will make it quite clear from the point of view of parliamentary language what he means by "field worker" that would be a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in any way criticising the Resolution; I am offering the hon. member the right hand of fellowship in this matter. If the hon. member wants the Clerk to read my amendment along with his original Resolution he can have that done and the hon. members of his Party can vote as they like. I will not find myself voting

for his Resolution because it does not make any sense; I would not be such a colossal idiot to do so. Your Honour, with your reputation as Speaker of this House, and with your skilful use of the English Language, will appreciate the fact that whenever a Resolution comes before this House the Clerk must put it in the right way. We must also remember that there is the question of what is for posterity and it is also a question of the records of the House. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas knows that I would not attempt to do anything which would cause him any embarrassment. I will now take my seat and await what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has to say about this Resolution, but I suggest that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas should accept this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member formally move that amendment? That would not preclude the hon. senior member for St. Thomas from accepting it; however, to be on the safe side, let the hon. member move the amendment.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg formally to move the amendment, Sir.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk will you please read the amendment?

Mr. CLERK: The amendment reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists where casual workers are concerned with the system of laying off without prior notice being given to them;

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Government inform the appropriate Departments not to lay off any worker without prior notice."

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking on the amendment; I am speaking on the Resolution. Now, Sir, I do not know how the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is going to take the amendment, because I think it would be making the Resolution worse in my opinion. The Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists wherever field workers are concerned as regards the system of laying off without proper notice given;

AND WHEREAS the said workers have families to support;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government notify all supervisors not to lay off any workers without giving him proper notice in order that the said worker be allowed time to adjust himself.

Now, Sir, I will deal with the first part which says "WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists wherever field workers are concerned". This does not refer to Government workers, because as far as I can remember, Dodds has field workers, and the Pine, I believe, must have field workers; but it does not say anything about Government workers at all. The Resolution merely asks Government to notify all supervisors not to lay off any workers without giving him proper notice. To begin with, a supervisor cannot lay off any worker without the permission or instruction of the employer concerned. If the Resolution had said "notify all employers", I would be able to understand it, but as it stands, I cannot understand it one way or the other.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could the Leader of the House tell me whether he has been notified of any change in the Leadership of the Opposition?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am in sympathy with the hon. member, and I feel that he meant well when he brought a Resolution of this sort, but it is completely wrong. I am going to offer him some help if he will accept it. I feel, Sir, that this Resolution should be postponed for further consideration in order to give the hon. member a chance to bring it back with the right wording; but if he accepts the amendment made by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, he is making it worse and more confusing. In other words, it would not be his Resolution at all, but that of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. Whether or not I get a seconder, I am going to move that this Resolution be postponed for further consideration, because I do not think any other hon. member in here can understand this Resolution at all or to whom it refers. You cannot say that there are Government casual employees because no casual employees are mentioned in the Resolution, nor is anything relative to Government mentioned in it.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had been listening when I was adressing the Chamber, he would notice that I emphasised the word "overseer" and did not use the word "supervisor" as appearing in the Resolution. The word "supervisor" is a typographical error.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I can only go by what is in front of me. This Resolution was given notice of on 28th May, and therefore over two months have passed, and if it was a typographical error, the hon. member should have been in a position to see it.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is talking nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER: We cannot have that in here. But on what has the hon. senior member for St. Thomas risen?

Mr. BATSON: I rose on a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SMITH: As you have heard, Sir, the hon. member is accusing another hon. member of talking nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not to be pursued.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I was in sympathy with the Introducer of this Resolution, but now I cannot be. Imagine the Principal of one of the biggest schools in Bridgetown bringing something like this on the floor of this House!

Mr. SPEAKER: Let personalities be avoided and let us stick to the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot let it be said that the Principal of one of the biggest schools in the Island has anything to do with this. The Principal of the biggest school in this Island is my colleague, and I must rise to object.

Mr. SMITH: I said one of them, Mr. Speaker. When I got up to speak on this Resolution, Sir, I said I was in sympathy with the Introducer and began to offer my assistance, but he is so intelligent that he does not even know when one wants to help him, and gets up on the floor of the House to let members and the public feel that I am talking nonsense. Now if I am talking nonsense, this Resolution has caused me to do so.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, I think the hon. member need not labour that point, because Your Honour has already informed the House that that aside is not to be pursued.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will proceed with his analysis of the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the majority of them do not credit me with much sense, but I have enough sense to know when one is throwing a stone at me from when he is throwing mould, and surely the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has thrown a stone.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, the stone did not pass me; I did not allow it to pass.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, whenever there is an attempt to throw a stone, and I can just get down in the gutter, whatever comes up I am going to throw.

Mr. SPEAKER: That also will not pass here.

Mr. SMITH: I do not know, Sir, what this Resolution means. It is a waste of paper, because no one can understand it. The one who is talking nonsense cannot understand it far less those who know what they are talking about. I do not know whether this refers to plantation workers or Government workers, because nothing in this Resolution explains its meaning. If it refers to plantation workers, we have no authority to call on plantations asking them not to lay off workers. We cannot call on them either, as was said some time ago, to pay them for six days whether or not they have worked six days.
4.15 p.m.

We in this House cannot say that, although it was said some time ago, but I am not going to reap that up now, I am going to do so some time to come. We cannot tell private people how to run their private business and, as a matter of fact, we cannot even tell this present Government how to run its business.

In one part of the Resolution, the hon. member has the word "supervisors", and in another case, he has the word "overseer". The hon. member says that it is a typographical error. I say that the entire Resolution is an error because it has no meaning. How on earth can anyone sitting here say "aye" to this Resolution? I was going to move that the Resolution be postponed so as to give the hon. member the opportunity of redrafting it and saying what he really means or withdrawing it from the Order Paper.

He has not said what he really means. He cannot expect to say one thing by way of the Resolution which he had brought in and then on his introduction of it get on the floor of the House and say some other thing. If the hon. member found out that it was wrong, he should have said when Your Honour called on him that he did not intend to deal with it today and it may have been put as the last item on the Order Paper. He would therefore have got the opportunity to get his facts together and at the opportune time let us really understand what he meant. The hon. member thinks that by getting up and trying to insult another hon. member that he is doing something. I will not have anything to say about it at all; let him do as he likes. In other words, hon. members will be able to see what is in him from the beginning. I am not going to take him out of the hole in which is is, let him pull himself out.

Sir, I do not think the Hon. Minister of Education would be able to vote for this Resolution as it stands. As a matter of fact, I do not know how he would be looking at his portfolio, I do not think the Hon. Minister of Education would be able to vote for it because if he does, it would make me look at him differently. Nobody else but the hon. member who introduced this Resolution would vote for it as it stands. Even his colleague, the seconder of this Resolution, told him straight that this is wrong. He did not say that this is wrong in as many words but he meant that. I am expecting to see the hon. seconder of this Resolution walk outside of this Chamber when the vote is about to be taken. This Resolution has no meaning at all. It means nothing as regards obtaining work for anybody, nothing is offered for and on behalf of workers. If something was offered by this Resolution, every progressive-minded person would be in favour of it, but in this case, it is not for the worker, the idler, the vagabond, the thief or anybody.

Sir, I am not going to make any motion because the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is big enough to take himself out of this hole. I tried to help him but what he did is just like saying: "you bite the hand of the person who fed you". I will not put out my hand to help him now. I will only say that to accept the amendments which were made by the hon. senior member for the City will make his Resolution worse. If he were to accept them, I would like to hear what the hon. senior member for the City would be saying about the hon. member when he is campaigning again. I do not want any person to tell me what the hon. senior member for the City would say of him. If the hon. senior member for St. Thomas accepts those amendments, I am quite sure that the hon. senior member for the City would have that jotted down in his book to use against the hon. member during the next election campaign. I know that when ever he brings out that book and says what he says all genial persons would be turned into vagabonds.

Sir, I will have nothing to do with this Resolution but to vote against it because it is not for the conservatives, for the progressives or anybody at all, therefore, I do not understand it.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution which we have before us is for the purpose of laying off workers with proper notice. The only thing which I see in this Resolution which I consider not to be correct is the word "field". That word should be deleted and the word "casual" inserted in its place.

People come to me day after day and night after night and tell me that after they have worked for a week or two on such and such a project, they have been laid off without further consideration. Those people are employed in the Highways and Transport Department or in the Public Works Department and after they have worked for two or three weeks, when they go out to work during the fourth week they are told that they are laid off. Because of that, I would ask Government to speak to the proper authorities and tell them not to lay off casual workers without proper consideration or without due notice given them. It is happening not only with workers in the Highways and Transport Department but in other Government Departments. Sir, I would be very glad if Government would warn the proper authorities about this.

It is no use our referring to other workers such as field workers. You cannot talk about field workers today, because I am certain that field workers cannot get sufficient work to do for a whole week. As a matter of fact, they are fighting one another to get into the estate to get work. However, when you come to workers in Government employment, the Government has power and jurisdiction to make such regulations, therefore, the Government should call upon the proper authorities at all times to say that you should not lay off a casual worker without proper notice.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I should like to move formally an amendment to the Resolution. It reads as follows:-

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member if he does not have a copy to hand the Clerk to read it out at dictation speed.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: It reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS much dissatisfaction exists amongst Central and Local Government casual workers in consequence of the fact that they are often laid off without proper notice being given them, and,

WHEREAS the said workers have families to support;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government take the necessary steps to ensure that wherever possible appropriate notice be given to the worker of the pending cessation of his employment."
4.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member concluded his address?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, in short, I think that that is the intention of the hon. member or I might say that that amendment carries out the intention of the hon. member. I feel that there could be no doubt about that amendment because it includes both Central and Local Government casual workers and it in no way includes the workers, casual or otherwise, of private bodies.

Mr. YEARWOOD: I beg to second that amendment.

The CLERK read the amendment as requested by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the amendment there is only one question which I would like to ask

the hon. member for St. James, because the text of his amendment is similar to mine and I will support it. All I want to know from the hon. member is this: as a lawyer will he say what is a proper notice for a casual employee, a person who is hired by the day and paid by the week?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will answer that question in his Chambers with the proper honorarium *(Laughter).*

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think that the hon. member would answer that question if, and when, I wend my way up the stairs of his office, but in this House he will answer that question or we will be here for a long time.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m. of the clock, the time when the consideration of Private Members' Business comes to an end and the House reverts to Government Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business is to resume debate on the following Resolution:-

Resolution to support the proposals contained in the statement made by the Honourable Premier in the Honourable House on 11th June, 1963, on the character of the proposed Federation of the Seven British Caribbean Territories and particularly to approve, amend and endorse the proposal that the new Federation should be independent from the establishment of the first elected Federal Government.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that that brings Government Business for the day to an end.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the Hon. Minister say that that brings Government Business to an end?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Well, Sir, if there is no Government Business then Government Business comes to an end *(Laughter).*

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 6th August, 1963, at 12 o'clock Noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 6th August, 1963, at 12 o' clock Noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

4.35 p.m.